

**The Applicability of Optimality Theory for the Analysis of Bilingual Grammar in
the Hungarian–American Bilingual Community in North Carolina:
A Comprehensive Description of the North Carolina Hungarian Club`s
Code-switching Patterns**

PhD Thesis

Tímea Kovács

Supervisor: Anna Fenyvesi, PhD

Pécsi Tudományegyetem

Bölcsészettudományi Kara

Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskola

Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Doktori Program

2009

To my family, for their unconditional love and support

Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to reach the point where I can express my gratitude to the numerous individuals and organizations that have contributed to this dissertation.

First of all, I would like to express my deep gratitude to Ágnes Bolonyai. Ágnes has been a great inspiration for me for her determined and humble attitude to her profession. I could never thank her enough for what I have learned from her as a researcher and as a mentor.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Anna Fenyvesi, for her insightful comments and constructive criticism. She has taught me crucial ways to analyze issues investigating interactions between language and society.

I am also grateful for the Hungarian Fulbright Commission for granting me a great opportunity to spend an academic year in the USA as a post-graduate researcher.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the subjects of my research for sharing with me the most personal accounts of their lives spent in immigration.

Table of contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Research questions

Chapter 3: Literature review

- 3.1. Functional approaches to code-switching
 - 3.2 Approaches to the meaning-making function of code-switching
 - 3.3. Interactional sociolinguistics
 - 3.4. The sociocultural approach
 - 3.5. The Markedness Model
 - 3.6. The Conversation Analytical (CA) framework
 - 3.7. Local vs. global approaches
 - 3.8. New CA approaches
 - 3.9. The Rational Choice (RC) model
 - 3.10. New perspectives
 - 3.11. Optimality Theory in analyzing bilingual use

Chapter 4: Theoretical framework

- 4.1. Optimality Theory (OT)
- 4.2. Optimality Theory in bilingual use: A structural approach to code-switching
- 4.3. Optimality Theory in bilingual use: A socio-cognitive model of code-switching
 - 4.3.1. The principles of Optimality Theory in analyzing bilingual use

4.3.2. The interaction of constraints: Two community specific instantiations of the universal bilingual grammar (Kashmiri-Hindi-English and Hungarian-English)

4.3.2.1. Optimal bilingual grammar: Kashmiri-Hindi-English code-switching

4.3.2.2. Optimal bilingual grammar: Hungarian-English code-switching

Chapter 5: Background information on Hungarian-American immigrant communities

5.1. Introduction

5.2. Sociolinguistic research on Hungarian-American immigrant communities

5.3. Hungarian-American immigrant communities: A history of bilingual contact

5.4. Hungarian-American immigrant communities: Structural position within the larger socio-historical context

5.5. Hungarian-American immigrant communities: Language use patterns

5.6. The Hungarian-American community in North Carolina: Sociolinguistic background

5.7. The NC Hungarian Club

Chapter 6: Method

6.1. Data collection

6.2. Analysis

6.3. Participants

6.4. Convention of typography, transcription, and translations

Chapter 7: Findings

7.1. Introduction

7.2. The NC Hungarian Club

- 7.2.1. Sociolinguistic characteristics of the NC Hungarian Club
- 7.2.2. Interpersonal language use
- 7.2.3. Functional language use
- 7.2.4. Attitudes to the act of code-switching
- 7.2.5. Emotional attitudes to the English and Hungarian languages
- 7.2.6. Motivation for attending the NC Hungarian Club
- 7.2.7. Motivation for cherishing Hungarian language and passing on Hungarian traditions
- 7.2.8. The lack of motivation for cherishing the Hungarian language and passing on Hungarian traditions
- 7.2.9. Attitudes to being a Hungarian-American

7.3. Statistically significant correlations

7.4. Summary of the NC Hungarian Club's sociolinguistic characteristics

7.5. An Optimality Theoretical analysis of bilingual grammar of the Hungarian-American bilingual community in North Carolina

- 7.5.1. The functions of Perspective-related code-switches
- 7.5.2. The functions of Faith-related code-switches
- 7.5.3. The functions of Solidarity-related code-switches
- 7.5.4. The functions of Face-related code-switches
- 7.5.5. The functions of Power-related code-switches
- 7.5.6. The interaction of constraints

7.6. Limitations of the study

Chapter 8: Overall summary

Chapter 9: Conclusion

Summary in Hungarian (*Magyar nyelvű összefoglaló*)

References

Appendixes

Chapter 1: Introduction

According to Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 5) “members of a discourse community of practice [...] have common knowledge of ways of relating to each other, ways of using their languages”. In other words, the maximal interpretability of communicative intentions hinges on a shared socio-cognitive reality against which the meaning of communicative acts can be optimally interpreted. Code-switching as a communicative act also needs to be interpreted in a shared socio-cognitive context, but the interplay between the socio-cognitive realities that the codes being switched activate requires a more complex analysis.

It is a widely accepted concept in the literature that code-switching is a natural and inherent component of bilingualism. Nevertheless, the ways of approaching the complexity of code-switching have been various. The two main perspectives of understanding the mechanism of code-switching have been the structural and functional ones. The functional approach focuses on how code-switching as a discursive act fulfils its meaning-making function in a given context. Within the functional approach, in line with the philosophical polarity regarding the essentialist and constructivist interpretation of `meaning`, there has been an ongoing discussion vis-à-vis the interpretability of the functional meaning of code-switching. Relying primarily on Auer's conversation analysis theoretical approach (1984, 1988, 1998), some theorists claim that code-switching *per se* can be interpreted as a meaningful act and should be analyzed in its micro, interactional-conversational context. Other theorists, however, relying primarily on Myers-Scotton's markedness model (1983, 1988, 1993b, 1998), claim that code-switching as a `marked`

linguistic act gains significance only if interpreted against a broader social, macro context taking into consideration the socially determined rules of well-formedness.

As a leeway out of the dichotomy embracing the theoretical approaches to the interpretation of the meaning-making function of code-switching, Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) adopted Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual language use, a comprehensive model based on an algorithmic representation of the empirically observed sociopragmatic functions that the act of code-switching fulfils. Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) claim that code-switching is a socio-cognitive mechanism fulfilling an array of sociopragmatically interpretable functions. They focus only on the meaning-making mechanism of code-switching, so they have excluded from the scope of their model the instances of code-switching prompted by lack of appropriate language competence, as well as borrowings, abbreviations, and proper nouns.

Adopting Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual use, Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) claim that the sociopragmatically meaningful function(s) that an instance of code-switching fulfils is always the optimal one in a particular context. Optimality Theory is based on the premise that the linguistic output is the optimal one among the candidates, or linguistic inputs, competing for surface representation. Therefore, if code-switching is realized, then it fulfils a particular function in the given context the most optimally, more optimally than a monolingual realization, or in given linguistic contexts, a switch to a different language would. In the process of competing for surface realization, the candidates, or linguistic inputs, go through a set of constraints which act as sociopragmatic principles. The constraints are arranged

hierarchically and are violable, which means that the successful output might violate all the constraints but not the highest ranked one. A code-switch, therefore, can be interpreted as the most successful candidate optimally fulfilling the sociopragmatic function required by a given situation. As the successful candidate cannot violate the highest ranked constraint, the fulfilled function is the optimal one and is ranked above other functions activated in the given context.

Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) gathered all sociopragmatic functions emerging from the literature on code-switching and classified them comprehensively as the subfunctions of the five sociopragmatic principles acting as constraints. These five violable and hierarchically conflicting constraints determine the socio-cognitive mechanism of code-switching. Although the constraints are universal, their ranking, which actually settles the order of the conflicting constraints, is community specific and is constant in a given speech community.

The ranking of the five constraints can be set up by observing the sociopragmatic functions that the instances of code-switching fulfill in the examined speech community, and representing these functions in algorithmic tableaux. Adopting this method, Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) have set up a ranking of constraints specific to a Hindi-Kashmiri-English trilingual speech community in India and in a Hungarian-American bilingual immigrant community in the USA.

The aim of the present study is to provide a qualitative analysis of the applicability of the ranking of socio-cognitive constraints governing the socio-cognitive mechanism of code-switching, proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) in the Hungarian-American speech community in North Carolina, USA. Secondly, it attempts to give a sociolinguistic analysis of

the examined community based on quantitative data in order to find those sociolinguistic variables which make this community susceptible to the proposed ranking governing the sociocognitive mechanism of code-switching. Hence, my intent is to describe the particular socio-cognitive context in which there is a presumably shared knowledge of the sociopragmatic functions of code-switching governed by an optimal bilingual grammar. Sociolinguistic data necessary for such an analysis have been collected via sociolinguistic questionnaires filled out by the informants of this study as well as by empirical observation.

The main aim of the study, therefore, is characterize the socio-cognitive dimension of the examined Hungarian-American immigrant community which determines the optimality of sociopragmatic functions that instances of code-switches are expected to fulfill in particular situations governed by a community-specific ranking of constraints of a bilingual grammar.

The significance of this study lies in that, on the one hand, it provides ample empirical – quantitative and qualitative – data for the applicability of Bolonyai and Bhatt’s (forthcoming) Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual language use on a Hungarian-English corpus. Also, it offers a large-scale sample of Hungarian-American language use. The sample consists of 54 hours of recorded sociolinguistic interviews with 39 Hungarian-Americans living in North Carolina. The conversations have been transcribed to provide a text of 2,174 pages (12-point Times New Roman, double-spaced).

Chapter 2: Research questions

This particular study focuses on the applicability of Bolonyai and Bhatt's (forthcoming) Optimality Theory framework for the analysis of bilingual use of the Hungarian-American immigrant community living in North Carolina, USA. More particularly, it focuses on what sociopragmatic functions the instances of code-switches fulfill, and how they are governed by the bilingual community grammar shared by the examined community. In addition to the qualitative analysis of the mechanism of code-switching and that of the sociopragmatic functions fulfilled by it, the study also aims to provide a sociolinguistic analysis – based on qualitative data – of the examined community to highlight those characteristics along which the community can be defined, and which make this particular community susceptible to the specific bilingual community grammar determining the ranking of socio-cognitive constraints proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming).

Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) claim that the sociocognitive meaning-making mechanism of code-switching is determined by conflicts between linguistic candidates competing to fulfill the most optimally a given sociopragmatic function required by the linguistic situation. Relying on the premise of Optimality Theory in bilingual use, this study aims to provide evidence of how the optimal sociopragmatic function instantiated by a particular situation is realized by the successful linguistic candidate competing for surface representation. The study aims to examine how sociopragmatic optimality is maximized by the act of code-

switching and which other sociopragmatic functions activated in the linguistic situation have been overridden by the successful linguistic candidate.

Representing the sociopragmatic functions (classified as principles) fulfilled by the successful candidate and the other ones activated in a linguistic situation but overridden or fulfilled by the successful candidate in algorithmic tables, the study aims to provide empirical evidence for the applicability of the proposed community-specific ranking of constraints in the examined speech community.

However, as the sociopragmatic function that the act of code-switching fulfils is influenced by the macro-linguistic social context as well, the salient tendencies of code-switching will be analyzed against the sociolinguistic variables, language use, and attitude patterns of the members of the examined speech community with a view to finding statistically significant correlations rendering the examined community susceptible to its ranking of constraints.

In other words, in this study I set out:

(1) To show how the Optimality Theory for bilingual grammar can be applied for the Hungarian-American bilingual immigrant community in North Carolina, and how the constraints interact with each other in a community-specific ranking, based on the qualitative analysis of the empirical data.

(2) To find statistically significant correlations, relying on the quantitative analysis of the survey data (based on the results of the questionnaires) in the Hungarian-American immigrant

community's quantified sociolinguistic characteristics (with special emphasis on the salient differences between first- (G1) and second-generation (G2) speakers), their participant- and function-related language use patterns, their motivation in cherishing Hungarian language and traditions, and their attitudes to code-switching, to English and Hungarian, and to being an American-Hungarian.

(3) To find out, relying on the results of the qualitative and quantitative analyses, what is the function of code-switching in the Hungarian-American speech community in North Carolina, USA.

Chapter 3: Literature review

3.1. Functional approaches to code-switching

Since Gumperz's (1982: 59) definition of conversational code-switching "as the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems", there have been attempts at understanding the why's and how's of code-switching. By now, there is a consensus that the use and meaning of code-switching is not arbitrary but can be interpreted as interdependent "between the subjective, the objective and the social worlds" (Bolonyai 2005: 24). Going along this threefold distinction of perspectives to the meaning of code-switching, theorists vary in terms of the significance they contribute to the subjective, objective and social factors as the most salient in the interpretation of code-switching.

Placing the meaning and interpretation of code-switching in the dimension of subjective, objective, and social realities, there is also an ongoing discussion among functional theorists about the divisive issue whether code-switching can be assumed to index certain constructs of an already existing, `objective` social reality, or whether it must not be assumed to index any social construct, but only as a linguistic means of constructing, (re)negotiating a `subjective` reality. This ongoing debate can be placed in the wider context of the discussion of phenomenology ((re)constructivism) and essentialism ((post)structuralism) in social sciences, that is, how much social reality can be taken for granted, and from a linguistic perspective, how much of it is

constructed and/or indexed or categorized by language. Specifically, there is a polysemy of how much interpretation of the instances of code-switching can rely purely on the linguistic and conversational (‘objective’) meaning of these instances; how much should rely on the broader (‘social’) context of these instances; and how much interpretation is subject to the individuals’ idiosyncratic (‘subjective’) use of code-switching.

3.2. Approaches to the meaning-making function of code-switching

In the literature on code-switching, there has been an ongoing debate whether the meaning-making function of code-switching can be interpreted a priori as a social act, assuming that code-switching per se is meaningful against the social, political, historical and cultural constraints of its setting (Fishman 1966; Myers-Scotton 1983, 1993, 1998, 2001; Woolard 1988, 1989; McClure and McClure 1988; Gal 1979, 1988), or whether code-switching should be considered a priori as a conversational act, and all interpretation of its meaning against its wider context should come after and rely on a sequential turn-by-turn conversational analysis of code-switched instances in a particular situation (Auer 1984, 1998; Wei 1995, 1998, 2005; Stroud 1992, 1998; Torras and Gafaranga 2002; Gafaranga 2005).

The first approach to the function of code-switching focuses more on the ‘why’ aspect of code-switching, the objective aspect of it, placed in the wider context of the social world with its constructs existing irrespective of the constructive force of code-switching or that of any other

linguistic means (‘top-down approach’, Heller 1988). In contrast, the focus of the conversation analysis approach is more about the ‘how’s’ of code-switching, that is, to demonstrate how language actually constructs its social reality (‘bottom-up approach’, Heller 1988). In interpreting the meaning of code-switching, the former approach relies on knowledge of the wider social context in which code-switching is integrated. The latter, however, interprets the meaning of code-switching with the help of the linguistic evidence relevant in the particular context of code-switching.

Different ways of interpreting the meaning of code-switching can also be detected in terms of how universal or idiosyncratic it is claimed to be. As a continuation of the early interactional sociolinguistic traditions of Blom and Gumperz (1972), some theorists claim that there is a universal (but ethnographically community specific) normative framework which creates the context in which the meaning and function of code-switching can be interpreted (Fishman 1966; Blom and Gumperz 1972; Gal 1979; Woolard 1988, 1989; Heller 1988; Myers-Scotton 1993, 1998).

In contrast to theorists interpreting the meaning-making function of code-switching in a universal framework, others claim that the instances of code-switching are more of idiosyncratic value as the community in which they occur is heterogeneous. Therefore, instead of assuming a normative, static framework, these theorists prefer a more dynamic, conversation-based, descriptive approach, which does not interpret the meaning and function of code-switching in a universal framework but rather demonstrates how that framework is created locally in a

conversation (Auer 1984, 1988, 1998, 2005; Zentella 1997, Gardner-Chloros 1991; Stroud 1992, 1998; Wei 1998, 2005; Gafaranga 2005).

3.3. Interactional sociolinguistics

Blom and Gumperz (1972) defined code-switching as fulfilling situational or metaphorical functions. According to their definition, code-switching either takes place in a certain situation or at a specific social event in which code-switching is the expected language choice (situational switching), or it is used to refer to a certain social event, topic or subject matter even though there is no relevant situation for it (metaphorical switching). Hence, Blom and Gumperz (1972) assume a direct relationship between a social event or a topic and a code or a language choice. However, they pointed out (1972: 421) that even though code-switching can be interpreted in the wider social context, the relation between a code, a topic and a social event evolves dynamically, so no rigid one-to-one relationship can be assumed between them.

Later, in an attempt to clarify the complexity of the interpretability of language use in given situations, Gumperz (1982: 99) called for such a conversational study of code-switching which “might bridge the gap between macro- and micro-analysis by providing insights into the functioning of broader social concepts in interpersonal relations.” Therefore, he added the conversational function to the repertoire of code-switching functions to provide the means of interpreting code-switching in a given linguistic context. He emphasized that code-switching is a

“conversational contextualization cue” fulfilling such discourse related functions as “quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiterations, message qualification, and personalization vs. objectivization” (1982: 61). Gumperz claimed that the contextualization cues help to reconstruct the wider social reality, and code-switching, as one of those cues, reflects “the underlying un verbalized assumptions about social categories” (1982: 99). Therefore, code-switching as a contextualization cue helps to interpret the wider social context. However, the issue of how such an interpretation can be achieved has not been elaborated by Gumperz and triggered further discussions.

3.4. The sociocultural approach

In explaining the nature of linguistic choices, the sociocultural approach places the greatest emphasis on the objective, essentialist social world as the primary context of interpreting the instances of code-switching. In line with this, linguistic choices and their interpretability are supposed to fall within the community repertoire of a speech community determined by external social factors. Therefore, the scope of analysis focuses more on the external social factors, and less on the individual’s choices constrained by idiosyncratic factors.

In the continuum of how much social meaning is actually thought to be reflected by language use, more precisely by the act of code-switching, the sociocultural approach can be

positioned at one extreme of the dichotomy tilting towards its `objective` or `essentialist` extreme.

Adopting Fishman's (1966) definition of domains, one of the functions of code-switching was defined as situational by Blom and Gumperz (1972), claiming that in certain domains or situations code-switching is the relevant language choice. Consequently, particular language use patterns can be detected in specific domains. Code-switching as a choice in particular situations is determined by the social, political, and historical characteristics of a speech community. Seen from this perspective, code-switching is not the choice of the individual social actor but is rather seen as the most relevant choice for the speakers of a given community complying with its presupposedly existing and socioculturally determined rules.

Examining code-switching in the sociocultural dimension, its meaning can be interpreted in the `we/they code` dichotomy of Gumperz (1982) expressing in- and out-group solidarity. Thus, code-switching is analyzed in the larger social and political context, in which the distinction between the `we` versus `they codes` becomes relevant (Gal 1979, 1988; Heller 1988; Woolard 1988, 1989; McClure and McClure 1988).

As I have pointed out, although the sociocultural approaches provide information about how language reflects socially, historically and/or culturally determined realities, they do not explain the meaning of the individual choice of speakers as social actors in an interaction. Hence, these models do not deal with the idiosyncratic meaning of code-switching, that is, with the linguistic choice of the individual speaker.

3.5. The Markedness Model

Drawing on the insights of the sociocultural approach according to which language choice can be interpreted in a broader social context, Myers-Scotton (1983, 1988, 1993b, 1998) provided the normative framework of the Markedness Model. She claims that all instances of code-switching can be interpreted as universal realizations of the speakers' rights and obligations defined by a particular sociocultural context. The actual associations between language choices and the instantiated rights and obligations, however, are community specific depending on the community's social norms. Furthermore, she claims that, with the help of their linguistic choices, more particularly by code-switching, individual speakers do not only express but also try to negotiate their "rights and obligations", the normative social constraints specific in and relevant to a given speech community. Consequently, code-switching is seen as a linguistic device serving the idiosyncratic motivations of the speaker in the process of negotiating and indexing meaning against or in line with the expected rules and obligations, the normative social constraints, of a speech community.

The Markedness Model is an attempt to unify sociolinguistic and cognitive approaches in order to understand the real nature of code-switching. Linguistic choices are seen as determined by universal cognitive processes as the markedness metric, which actually assesses the linguistic choice as marked, unmarked, is an innate cognitive human faculty. However, the actual community specific set of rights and obligations in which these linguistic choices gain their actual meaning of markedness or unmarkedness are determined by constructed

sociocultural norms. Therefore, linguistic choices are constrained by a universal innate cognitive faculty as well as by community specific constructed sociocultural norms.

The bottom line of Myers-Scotton's approach is that there are rights and obligations shared by a specific speech community. As such, all linguistic choices are an "indexical set of rights and obligations holding between participants in the conversational exchange" (Myers-Scotton 1988: 152). Relying on this theoretical assumption, all conventionalized conversational exchanges can be interpreted as marked or unmarked choices (Myers-Scotton 1988, 1993b). The unmarked choices are the expected ones, complying with the community's sociocultural, pragmatic and linguistic sets of rights and obligations (Myers-Scotton 1993b). The utterances in non-conventionalized exchanges are exploratory, which means that they are of idiosyncratic nature and can be interpreted as individual linguistic choices of experimental nature rather than utterances interpretable in a particular sociocultural normative context.

As speakers are supposed to "exploit the possibility of linguistic choices in order to convey intentional meaning of a sociopragmatic nature" (Myers-Scotton 1993b: 57), they make linguistic choices which can be interpreted as such by the other participants of a speech event. The linguistic choices are interpreted by speakers in a given community who "interpret the same interaction as communicating more or less the same social intention" (1993b: 61). As all speakers operate their own "degrees of markedness" (Myers-Scotton 1988: 155), on the basis of which they make linguistic (marked or unmarked) choices, this markedness model is claimed to be universal. However, as these choices are determined by the speakers' motivations to negotiate their positions in a given situation against their sets of rights and obligations (Myers-Scotton

1988: 180), there is a normative basis on which this set relies. As the salience of certain factors determining the interpretability of linguistic choices varies in different communities, the normative basis is not universal but rather community-specific.

Conversely, the rights and obligations along which marked and unmarked choices can be defined and interpreted are determined by an array of linguistic (interactional) and extra-interactional factors. Therefore, when interpreting the meaning of language choices of speakers, linguistic as well as extra-interactional factors such as the sociolinguistic variables of the examined speech communities, situational factors, and the sociopragmatic values and norms of the particular code-switched languages have to be considered.

The Markedness Model claims that, with the help of code-switching, speakers intentionally convey a sociopragmatic meaning relevant to the other participants of a speech act interpretable in the context of the set of rights and obligations defined by a particular, extra-linguistic, sociocultural reality. Opponents of this model, however, question how much meaning and intention can actually be ascribed to code-switching per se. According to Stroud (1992: 131), as there is no universal and objective way of evaluating the actual intended meaning of the speaker and the meaning perceived by their interlocutor(s), the analyst should not assume any extra-linguistic social reality, but should rather demonstrate how meaning and intention is constructed at the (con)textual level of a particular interaction, and then how it can be interpreted in its interactional social reality.

The Markedness Model has been under criticism for assuming a normative set of rights and obligations given *a priori* in a given speech community. However, its basic assumption that

code-switching has an actual socially meaningful value has been widely accepted. The main conclusion of this model is that the act of code-switching is universally meaningful, yet its sociocultural concept varies in different speech communities. By integrating the socioculturally determined linguistic choices of the speakers of a given community into a normative framework posited on the universal dichotomy of marked and unmarked linguistic choices, the Markedness Model has successfully moved away from the static, socio-cultural-political normative models into the direction of a more dynamic, yet universally normative community framework of code-switching.

The model premises that there are four factors determining the dynamic variability of linguistic choices, – the relative prominence or salience of factors, the salience of one factor across interactions in a given community, the relative salience of one factor compared to that of another and the negotiation of the salience of situational factors – which act as guidelines. Their actual realization, however, should be subject to profound sociocultural research in a given community. The four factors, therefore, create a theoretical, normative and universal framework that can be flexibly adapted to the specific characteristics of a given speech community.

The Markedness Model has attempted to unify the subjective reality, the intentions of the individual speaker; the cognitive aspect, with the markedness metric claimed to be an innate cognitive faculty; and the social reality, through its community specific set of rights and obligations, of code-switching into a normative but dynamically variable framework. However, the subjective aspect of code-switching, the choice of the individual as a social actor to exploit

their linguistic repertoire in order to make intentional utterances in line with their personal motivations, is the least elaborated in the model.

3.6. The Conversation Analytical (CA) framework

In line with the constructivist, phenomenology-based interpretation of the interaction between language and social reality, Auer (1984, 1988, 1998) claims that the analysis of code-switching should focus on its actual conversational instance specific characteristics rather than on extra-interactive factors determined by the wider social context. As the extra-interactive rules and regulations of code-switching are open to the subjective interpretation of the analyst, the main focus should be on the sequential turn-by-turn discourse-oriented conversational analysis of language alternation. The main purpose of Conversation Analysis (CA) (Auer 1984) is to give a local interpretation of language alternation as a conversational activity relying on interactional evidence rather than on extra-linguistic assumptions.

Auer (1984: 6) claims that code-switching should be taken seriously as a conversational activity, a contextualization cue. As such, he distinguishes between two main types of code-switching: participant- and discourse-related code-switching. Any language alternation therefore provides cues either about “attributes of the speaker” or “the organization of the ongoing interaction” (Auer 1984: 12). All these cues have to be interpreted at a conversational level, where they first become relevant (Auer 1984: 96).

Auer does not reject the need for a larger-scale extra-conversational explanation of code-switching instances. However, he claims that analysis of language alternation should be implemented “in the framework of conversation analysis, which, taking into account grammatical restrictions where necessary can work up and relate to larger scale sociolinguistic statements” (Auer 1988: 209). In line with that, according to the CA model, all instances of code-switching have to be analyzed at a conversational level and, following that, in the wider social context. However, opponents of this model claim that all interactions and conversations occur in a social context, therefore no sequential conversational analysis can be implemented without a simultaneous, extra-conversational sociolinguistic analysis.

Auer’s CA model has been criticized for ignoring “the texture that aspects of the wider social context provide to conversational partners” and downgrading – or even ignoring – “speaker motivation” (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai 2001: 5).

Although according to Conversation Analysis it is necessary to interpret the act of code-switching in a wider social context, it primarily focuses on the local, conversation and interaction specific examination of code-switching. As such, it demonstrates how the meaning and function of code-switching can be interpreted in the actual interaction against the idiosyncratic variables of the individual relevant in the local context of the conversation. As it does not assume the *a priori* existence of an objective social reality and categories, it is also wary of making global interpretations or setting up a normative framework of code-switching.

The main purpose of the CA approach is to minimize the subjective interpretation of code-switching against a social reality subjectively constructed through the perception of the

analyst. It focuses on the sequential analysis of instances of code-switching, and it does not make assumptions about a socially constructed extra-conversational context in which these instances can be interpreted. As such, it strengthens the fundamentally linguistic, discourse analytical approach to the meaning-making functions of code-switching. Hence, by not assuming that an extra-conversational, socially constructed wider context exists *per se* in which the instances of code-switching become actually meaningful, it fails to explain how code-switching acts for the actual speakers as a social means of negotiating the different extra-conversational social realities of different speech communities.

We have seen above that the various approaches to the interpretability of meaningful instances of code-switching can be positioned along the continuum of the (re)constructed and essentialist language reflects society continuum. These different approaches are posited on this theoretical continuum tilted towards one of its two extremes, with one claiming that the meaning of code-switching can be attributed to extra-contextual/interactional social structural evidence and the other claiming that it can be attributed to intra-contextually/interactionally constructed social reality. In recent theoretical approaches there have been attempts to narrow the gap between these different approaches and to provide a more unified approach to the interpretation of the meaning of code-switching.

3.7. Local vs. global approaches

In addition to the debate whether the meaning of code-switching can be assumed relying on extra-interactional factors or it should be demonstrated in the interaction proper, there has been a discussion of whether code-switching as a choice lies more with the individual constrained by the dynamics of specific interactive episodes (Auer 1984; Appel and Muysken 1987; Zentella 1981, 1997) or constrained more by a community's linguistic repertoire (Myers-Scotton 1993b, 1998, 2001; De Fina 2007; Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming)).

Auer (1988: 190) claims that as a speech community is heterogeneous by definition, there are no rigid regulations, so the linguistic choice is open to the individual's negotiation "throughout an interactive episode". Therefore, the local analysis of linguistic choices in a given utterance should be at the center of analysis.

In contrast, Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (1993b) relies on the assumption that there is a normative basis in each speech community. On the basis of that, "members of the same speech community interpret the same interaction as communicating more or less the same social intention" (Myers-Scotton 1993b: 61). Therefore, the interpretation of local instances should be based on global "societal norms" and "community patterns" rather than on individual conversation units (Myers-Scotton 1993b: 109).

As an alternative to the on-going discussion of the two main theoretical approaches to code-switching, some researchers placed the bilingual individual and the inherent idiosyncratic

psycho- and sociolinguistic characteristics of their linguistic repertoire at the center of their focus. Zentella (1981) claims that the factors triggering code-switching can be classified as “on the spot” (depending on the topic, on the psychological setting, and on the audience), “in the head” (psycholinguistic), and “out of the mouth” (discourse-related: phonological and syntactic) factors. She concludes that as a consequence of these factors, in bilingual communication, the three most important functions of code-switching are “footing”, “clarification”, and “crutching” (1997). Adopting Goffman’s (1979: 5) concept of footing that “a change in footing implies a change in the alignment we take up ourselves and others present”, Zentella (1997: 93) claims that code-switching serves the function of “footing” when speakers switch to another language with the intention of “underscoring or highlighting the realignment they intended” or to “control their interlocutor’s behavior”. In other words speakers code-switch to shift their narrative roles or to check for the interlocutor’s approval, attention, and comprehension. Code-switching may also function as a means of clarification. Instead of the monolingual speech strategy to repeat utterances louder or slower to clarify their meaning, bilinguals rely on the act of code-switching. They switch to the literal translation of an utterance to convey its most authentic meaning. Contrary to footing and clarification, some code-switched utterances serve no purposeful communicative meaning, they are rather prompted by the speaker’s momentary loss of word or by the previous speaker’s switch. These “involuntary” code-switches are categorized by Zentella as “crutches”.

This three-fold categorization of Zentella’s (1997) is the result of a thorough and descriptive analysis, which is based primarily on the actual situational and conversational analysis of the needs of the bilingual individual. Conversely, it places less emphasis on the

examination of code-switching as a community specific act in the wider social context of bilingual communities.

Gardner-Chloros (1991) goes even further by claiming that as the motivations for linguistic choices are multiple, no rigid correlation should be assumed between external factors and the speakers' motivation (1991: 178). Conversely, even though code-switching is an inherent part of a community's linguistic repertoires, the imaginative force of an individual's repertoire might be more determinant than the community norms (Gardner-Chloros 1991: 47).

3.8. New CA approaches

Although all followers of the CA model agree that all interpretation of code-switching instances should rely primarily on conversational local evidence provided by the conversation analysis of speech, they differ on the extent to which they regard code-switching to be interpretable also as a socially meaningful act reflecting social reality.

Stroud (1998: 322) emphasizes that conversational code-switching is so intertwined with social life that the interpretation of its meaning should rely on "an understanding of social phenomena". Therefore, he calls for an ethnographic perspective which should be "wedded to a detailed analysis of conversational microorientation and viewed against the background of a broad notion of context" (Stroud 1998: 323). As such, he emphasizes the need to reconcile the macro- and micro-analytical methods for understanding the meaning of code-switching.

Wei (1998) also claims that the meaning of code-switching has to be interpreted in the broader social context. However, he points out that the task of the analyst is to demonstrate how the social meaning is constructed in the interactional process rather than assuming that “in any given conversation, speakers switch languages in order to ‘index’ speaker identity, attitudes, power relations, formality, etc.” (Wei 1998: 163). That is the answer to why the “broad why questions” always have to rely on the analysis of how meaning is locally constructed (Wei 1998: 163).

As a strong opponent of language-reflects-society approaches, Gafaranga (2005: 281) claims that the interaction between language and society is more complex and could only be understood from a theory of interpretive processes in conversation. He has called for the need of a “demythologized” perspective to language alternation. In line with that perspective, he claims that “language alternation must be seen as practical action and that it relates to the social structure in so far as language itself is a social structure” (2005: 283). As in his interpretation language alternation is itself a categorization device and a means of expressing the speaker’s identity, an inquiry into the organizational force of code-switching in bilingual talk should not look into the wider social context (2005: 292). Rather, he places conversation in the center of attention and calls for a “whole-conversation” approach (2005: 297). As such an approach is currently unavailable (and he doubts if it ever will be available), he states that there are only two ways of interpreting the meaning of language alternation. One is a “single instance sociology”, which focuses “on one significant aspect of talk organization”. In line with this approach, it must be examined what linguistic and non-linguistic resources have been drawn upon to produce a particular instance. However, theorists should not presume that the same set of linguistic and

non-linguistic resources will be relevant in interpreting the meaning of another instance. As opposed to this “single instance sociology”, language alternation itself can be examined as “a significant aspect of talk organization” (Gafaranga 2005: 297). In this latter case, theorists should examine how language alternation creates meaning in various different situations without presupposing an *a priori* existing social reality. On the contrary, this approach premises that language defines social structures, and as such it cannot rely on any non-linguistic resources or social structures that need to be explained but only on the conversational instance of language alternation as a means of organizing talk.

3.9. The Rational Choice (RC) model

We have seen that there is a common ground for the necessity of a comprehensive model unifying the ethnographic, conversational and sociolinguistic approaches. Driven by the same need to integrate social theories into a comprehensive model of language alternation, Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai propose the Rational Choice (2001) model relying on the social theory of rationality by Elster (1983, 1986).

In order to reconcile the macro-level, essentialist, sociocultural approach to the interpretation of code-switching with the micro-level, constructivist, conversation analytical approaches, Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001) focused their theory on the individual speaker, who, as a rational social actor determined by the sociocultural dimension of a given community,

makes their idiosyncratic linguistic choices which gain their actual meaning in the context of various interactions.

Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai criticized the CA approach for “downgrading or even ignoring speaker motivation” (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai 2001: 5). Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001) claim that, by focusing fundamentally on the sequential and interactional analysis of code-switching, the CA approach fails to take into consideration the individual variation in code-switching patterns. They claim that code-switching is determined by the individual’s rational choice to express intentionality. Therefore, the individual’s rational linguistic choice as a means of optimizing their intentionality and motivation has to be interpreted in the individual’s linguistic repertoire contextualized by extra-linguistic, societal norms.

As a reinterpretation of the Markedness Model, they propose the Rational Choice (RC) model based on Elster’s (1983, 1986) concept of rationality. By placing rationality at the center of motivating linguistic choices, the RC has shifted its emphasis more into the direction of the choice of the individual. RC is a normative framework, but it is rather individual than community based.

According to this framework, speakers are rational actors who make cognitively based linguistic choices propelled by the aim of intentionality and by the speakers’ estimation of what choices will grant the greatest utility in a given situation (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai 2001). These choices, however, have to pass through three filters. First, there are external constraints on speakers: their linguistic repertoires (their “opportunity set”) are constrained by large scale

external societal factors, and the discourse structure of their communities. Secondly, they are filtered through internal constraints: by a markedness evaluator, and by somatic markers. A third filter is rationality (Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai 2001: 22).

By setting rationality as its centerpiece, the Rational Choice model gives the possibility of a more individually tailored and local interpretation of the meaning of code-switching than the markedness model. However, among the filters it sets to linguistic choices, not only individual but large scale societal or external factors (first filter) are also listed. Markedness also remains a significant internal constraint (second filter) to linguistic choices, but rationality newly emerges as a third filter.

In defining rationality, the Rational Choice model claims that acting rationally means that “speakers take account of their own beliefs, values, and goals, and that they assess these in regard to internal consistency and available evidence” (Myers-Scotton 2001: 22). The model claims that evidence is everything that “can be seen or heard and stored as intuitions, frames, rights and obligations sets, certainly as norms, and even as somatic markers” (Myers-Scotton 2001: 22). In line with this definition, the concept of evidence, therefore, involves both external (“norms”) and internal constraints (“somatic markers”), belonging to the group of first and second filter. As such, the concept of evidence seems too broadly defined, and it is not clear how the third filter, rationality relates to it.

Even though its concept of evidence seems to be too broadly defined, the Rational Choice model sets up a normative framework that enables the complex interpretation of linguistic choices of individuals influenced by external (societal and discourse-related) and by internal

(markedness metric, somatic markers) constraints as well as by rationality. Although the Rational Choice model is too abstract, it attempts to unify the individual, the community-based, the conversation-based descriptive, and the sociolinguistic normative models into a comprehensive one.

3.10. New perspectives

As I have pointed out above, in the quest for a unified understanding of the meaning of code-switched instances, some recurring patterns have emerged as belonging to the fundamentally conversational analytical or sociocultural normative frameworks.

Relying on various approaches, researchers take different stances on how the meaning of code-switching can be interpreted. Wei (2005), for example, criticizes the Rational Choice model from the perspective of the Conversation Analysis framework, for making too many assumptions about the speakers' rationality and other extra-interactional factors instead of focusing on the locally relevant instances of code-switching. He does not reject, though, the notion that there are rights and obligations determining language choices, but these should be explored in the framework of Conversation Analysis. He calls for a dual approach which would unify the Conversation Analysis and Rational Choice models in order to help understand the complexity of code-switching (Wei 2005).

In line with Wei's (2005) call for a dual approach, among the CA theorists we can see two main new perspectives. Parallel to the emergence of the neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography (Rampton 2007, Wei 2007) and the anti-universalist ethnopragmatics (Goddard 2006) in the field of functional code-switching research, there have been attempts to give a comprehensive, universal, and bottom-up approach to code-switching based on the (ethno)cultural examination of a specific speech community.

Ethnopragsmatics is gaining momentum, and it tilts more towards the essentialist, ethnologically determined approach to the meaning of language choices. Wierzbicka's concept of cultural scripts (1994, 2006) opens up a new dimension in the interpretation of code-switching. It claims that cultures have different scripts, different shared understandings of reality, and one concept of reality could be totally lacking in another script. Therefore, the linguistic means of expressing those concepts are also lacking. However, as bilinguals have access to two linguistic realities, two ways of approaching and interpreting reality, they rely on code-switching as a way of filling conceptual gaps inherent in one language by switching to another.

In the same vein, Pavlenko (2005) claims that different cultures have different emotional scripts. Therefore, the array of a linguistic means for the expression of certain emotions may not overlap in different cultures, and it could explain why bilinguals switch from one language to another to express certain emotions.

Chan's (2004) sees code-switching as a textualization cue, expressing pragmatic motivations. He claims that the act of code-switching "prompts the listener to interpret the forthcoming message somewhat differently, but it does not necessarily "signal" or "index" some

contextual presuppositions” (2004: 16-17). Therefore, the intended meaning of the code-switched instance has to be decoded by the listener based on pragmatic principles relevant in the particular context. In other words, the act of code-switching is a textualization cue *per se*, however, its contextualizing function is actualized by the listener’s interpretation based on pragmatic principles instantiated in a particular situation.

The other perspective goes more in line with the constructivist, phenomenology based approach in social sciences. Gafaranga (2005) sees language as a means of constructing its social reality, as a membership categorization device. Therefore, code-switching, as any linguistic choice, has to be examined as a way of (re)constructing social reality. Individuals (re)construct their realities by categorizing, identifying themselves in certain ways, and by affiliating to the rest of their reality through their linguistic choices. Hence, code-switching has to be examined as a linguistic device of a membership categorization (Gafaranga 2005) through its construction of (social) identities, roles, and stances. Various researchers (Rampton 1998; Antaki, Charles, and Widicombe 1998; Torras and Gafaranga 2002; Auer 2005; Chen 2005) have analyzed code-switching as a means of identity construction. Williams (2005) has focused her research more on code-switching as a means of assigning roles. Jaffe (2007) has claimed that by examining code-switching as a way of constructing stances, we can get more insight into how speakers construct their realities with the help of code-switching.

We have seen that there are divisive issues in the interpretation of code-switching as a meaning-making act. There are theories claiming that code-switching is a linguistic device used to construct and negotiate social realities (Rampton 1998; Antaki, Charles, and Widicombe 1998;

Torras and Gafaranga 2002; Gafaranga 2005; Auer 2005; Chen 2005; Williams 2005; Jaffe 2007), therefore, it cannot be interpreted as meaningful against the categories and institutions of an assumed language-external and social reality. Therefore, the analyst should demonstrate how that reality is actually constructed through the local interaction-bound interpretation of the meaning of code-switching (constructivist-based CA analysis, cognitive, local, bottom-up approach, and micro-analysis). On the other hand, theorists claim that there are existing societal norms, and for the profound interpretation of the meaning of code-switching, it has to be analyzed in the global, macro-sociolinguistic reality of a given utterance (essentialist-based sociocultural, global, top-down approach, macro-analysis). Also, there are different approaches to interpreting code-switching as an inherent part of a community's linguistic repertoire or as the result of a cognitive process of the individual speaker. If it is seen more as part of a community repertoire, its meaning is determined by the community's norms and sociolinguistic characteristics (Markedness Model). However, if it is seen more as part of the individual's linguistic repertoire, then the ultimate cognitive choices lie with the individual (Rational Choice Model).

As a result of the constant interplay between the two main theoretical approaches to the interpretation of the meaning of code-switches, new tendencies, integrating some elements of one another's theoretical approaches, have emerged. In the sociocultural approach, thanks to the emergence of ethnopragmatics based on neo-Hymnesian ethnographical traditions, the dimension of the ethno-centered interpretation of the meaning of code-switching has strengthened (Wierzbicka 1994, 2006; Pavlenko 2005; Rampton 2007). Among the followers of the Conversation Analysis tradition, the need for a new dual approach integrating the results of the

sociocultural approach in the cognitive framework of the Conversation Analysis method has become more apparent (Wei 2005; Rampton 2007).

3.11. Optimality Theory in analyzing bilingual use

In the quest for a unifying, comprehensive, and universal framework of the how's and why's of code-switching, a new perspective has been proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) focusing on the interpretation of the meaning and functions of code-switching from a sociocognitive perspective.

Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) set up a sociocognitive, normative community framework interpreting the meaning of code-switching in consideration of the cognitive, objective and social factors interplaying in the mechanism of code-switching. Bolonyai and Bhatt's model provides a unified theoretical framework of how the sociopragmatically meaningful instances of code-switching can be assumed to index certain social constructs and to (re)negotiate the (con)textual framework within an ethnographically specific bilingual immigrant community's linguistic repertoire.

The uniqueness of the model is that it attempts to adapt the Optimality Theoretical framework of generative grammar for the analysis of bilingual speech in order to describe the mechanisms of bilingual grammar, with special emphasis on code-switching.

Therefore, this approach is based on the assumption that, like in monolingual speech, there are universal grammar rules that determine the mechanisms of code-switching in bilingual speech. Relying on a sociocognitive theoretical base, the model premises that the interpretation of the instances of code-switching should be based on their implicitly conveyed meaning. Therefore, as a leeway out of the ongoing discussion between the constructivist, primarily conversational or the more essentialist, sociocultural approaches, the model enables the interpretation of code-switching on the basis of its conversational setting, but referring to (previous) extra-interactional, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic knowledge as well.

In line with the premises of generative grammar, the model assumes that there are universal grammar rules governing the mechanism of code-switching. These rules act as constraints, referred to as principles, and actual code-switched speech production (output) is the optimal result of the competing candidates (input) filtered through the hierarchical and violable set of constraints. This set of constraints is universal in every bilingual speech community, however, the ranking of these hierarchical constraints is community specific. Therefore, the model also integrates the universal and community-specific approaches in the interpretation of code-switching. The idiosyncratic nature of code-switching is of less importance in this model.

Relying on thorough and comprehensive research of the relevant code-switching and pragmatics literature, Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) claim that there are five global principles acting as constraints and determining the occurrence of sociopragmatically meaningful instances of code-switching in every bilingual speech community. These are the Principle of Interpretive Faithfulness (FAITH), the Principle of Symbolic Domination (POWER), the

Principle of Social Concurrence (SOLIDARITY), the Principle of Face Management (FACE), the Principle of Perspective Taking (PERSPECTIVE).

Optimality Grammar for the analysis of bilingual use attempts to set up a grammatical approach to how the sociopragmatic constraints salient in a given speech community determine the linguistic repertoire of that given community, more particularly its code-switching mechanism.

The quintessential aim of this dissertation is to demonstrate how an Optimality Theoretical approach to bilingual grammar works in the qualitative sample of interview data collected in the Hungarian-American bilingual community in North Carolina, and what quantitative sociolinguistic, language use, motivation and attitude variables determine the code-switching patterns observed in this community.

Chapter 4: Theoretical framework

4.1. Optimality Theory (OT)

Optimality Theory (OT) (Prince and Smolensky 1993, 2004) is a generative grammar-based formal framework attempting to apply generative grammatical rules in order to describe how natural languages work. It is currently one of the dominant paradigms in phonology, and is a relatively new framework used in syntax. Although OT is a generative-grammar-based theoretical framework, its main premise is that – instead of focusing on the input representations of linguistic utterances, which is in the primary focus of generative grammar – the significant regularities of natural languages can be understood by analyzing the output structure, the surface realizations of utterances. As opposed to the method of generative grammar, which turns the input configuration into potential output structures (surface realizations) by applying generative processes, OT claims that relying on an algorithmic-based representation of empirically observed output representations, the actual rules governing linguistic mechanisms can be understood. While generative grammar sets rules of well-formedness, OT moves toward setting “constraints” of well-formedness.

OT premises that actual speech production is the result of a derivational process between a generative device (GEN), a set of ranked constraints (CON), and an evaluative part (EVAL).

As a derivational process, OT always proceeds from an underlying representation (UR), which is fed as input to the generative (GEN) function. GEN is a cognitive device of universal grammar that generates constraints through which the underlying candidates (inputs) have to pass before surface realization (output). The underlying candidates are in conflict with each other, striving to become the actual output realization, the optimal candidate complying with the rule of well-formedness. The number of potential competing candidates (inputs) is infinite. However, through the derivational process, their number is reduced to only one, which ends up as the optimal candidate, the actual surface realization. The actual surface realization is the candidate that complies the most optimally with the universal rule of well-formedness.

The evaluative part of universal grammar (EVAL) evaluates the competing candidates, the potential output representations. The candidates are inputs with a corresponding output representation. The output representation is selected out of the set of all possible output representations or candidates. The competing candidates have to undergo a set of violable and hierarchically ranked constraints, and the EVAL part of generative grammar will select, out of an indefinite number of inputs, the optimal one. The optimal candidate is the one that violates the lowest ranked constraint(s) but not the highest one. There is a strict hierarchy in each language, meaning that the order of constraints cannot be changed in a given language, and the higher ranked constraint has absolute priority over the lowest ranked one(s). However, since not necessarily all constraints are activated in a given linguistic situation, only the relevant ones are arranged into hierarchy. The derivational speech production process, through which the particular underlying representation is turned into the corresponding surface realization, activates only the relevant constraints.

The constraints are violable because even the optimal candidate, the actual output representation, may violate some of them. The only inviolable rule in terms of the constraints is that a candidate violating the highest ranked constraint activated in the relevant speech production process cannot be the optimal one.

The constraints of well-formedness are universally applicable, but their actual ranking is always language specific. Hence, it is the actual language specific ranking of constraints that determines the optimal candidate. For a language specific ranked set of constraints, a candidate A is more harmonic than candidate B if A is more harmonic with respect to the highest ranked constraint on which the two candidates differ. The optimal candidate (the selected output) is the candidate that is more harmonic than all the others with respect to the ranked constraints. There is no cumulative effect of constraints, which means that no matter how many lower-ranked constraints one candidate violates if it does not violate the highest ranked constraint, it will end up as the optimal candidate.

The ranking of constraints is based on an algorithmic computational process applied on empirical data. Although there are linguistic characteristics rendering particular languages more salient toward a specific ranking, the ranking of constraints is always based on empirical data and not on theoretical specification and generative configuration. The empirical data are fed into algorithmic models, into tableaux (Tableau 1). The constraints are arrayed in columns in order of ranking with the higher-ranked constraints to the left of the lower-ranked, and the candidates are arrayed in rows. The input is given in the upper left-hand cell. The asterisks in each cell represent the number of violations of that constraint in that candidate. The horizontal arrow

points at the optimal candidate – the actual output. The fatal violation is indicated with an exclamation point after the asterisk.

Tableau 1: An illustration to OT's algorithmic representation

Inputs	Constraint X	Constraint Y
→ (a)		*
(b)	*!	

The interactions observed between the constraints activated by the competing candidates in a particular speech production process are analyzed and summed up in algorithmic tableaux. If a candidate which complies with constraint X but violates constraint Y turns out to be the surface realization, then constraint X must be a higher ranked constraint than constraint Y. The more empirical data are provided, the more well-grounded is the ranking. However, setting up an algorithmic computation model regarding the ranking of relevant constraints in a particular speech production process does not require that specific amounts of data are provided.

The constraints are always specific to the rules governing speech production in a definite field of study. As OT was fundamentally meant to describe speech production processes in phonology, the two most important constraints in phonology are markedness and faithfulness. The constraint of faithfulness requires that that the output candidate is identical in every regard to the input.

4.2. Optimality Theory in analyzing bilingual use: A structural approach to code-switching

Relying on the premise accepted in cross-linguistic research that code-switching is not an arbitrary choice of the speaker but there are certain rules or “preferences” governing it, Bhatt (1997) adopted the OT framework to bilingual use to describe the structural rules of code-switching. Relying on cross-linguistic evidence, he presumes that there is a universal grammar that “determines and perhaps delimits the range of ‘grammatical’ code-switched utterances in a given bilingual context” (Bhatt 1997: 224). Therefore, the question is not “whether there are any structural constraints on code-switching, but rather what is the best way to characterize them” (Bhatt 1997: 224). As a leeway out of the dichotomy between previous theories emerging along two lines – between those which attempt to set up universal rules based on empirical generalizations to explain how code-switching works, and those which claim that the structural rules governing code-switching should always be examined in the relation of the codes actually switched – Bhatt sets “‘violable’ (soft) constraints much in the spirit of OT” (Bhatt 1997: 224). Bhatt collected all universal constraints noted as empirical generalizations in previous studies and turned them into a set of universal constraints governing the structural rules of well-formedness in code-switching. Bhatt claims that “there are no rules of code-switching per se” (Bhatt 1997: 236), only universal constraints of which interactions the patterns of code-switching emerge (Bhatt 1997: 236). The constraints are soft, violable and ranked in a strict dominance hierarchy. “All possible output representations for a given input are examined by a set of

(violable) ranked constraints ... The optimal, harmonic, output representation is the one that has the least serious constraint violations” (Bhatt 1997: 236).

In other words, in the spirit of OT, the candidates (inputs or underlying representations) competing for being selected the optimal candidate (the output or the surface realization) go through a set of structural constraints, evolving from cross-linguistic evidence, which governs the rules of well-formedness in code-switching. The constraints are universal, but the strict hierarchy that arranges them into an order of ranking is always language-pair specific, depending on the interaction of the switched codes. The constraints can be violated, but the optimal candidate can never violate the one posited as the highest one in a particular speech production process.

OT in bilingual use is a universally applicable theoretical framework for exploring the structural mechanism in code-switching. It is universally applicable because it does not claim – contrary to previous studies – that there are universal rules of code-switching, of which counter-evidence has constantly been provided in the literature, but it only sets violable constraints, which govern well-formedness in code-switching. As these constraints are universal but ordered in a specific ranking with respect to the structural mechanism of the switched codes, the model can be adopted to describing the structural interaction of any language pair(s) participating in the process of code-switching.

4.3. Optimality Theory in analyzing bilingual use: A socio-cognitive model of code-switching

Relying on Optimality Theory, Bolonyai and Bhatt's model (forthcoming) is an attempt at describing the socio-cognitive regularities in the meaning-making mechanisms of code-switching. Claimed to be universally applicable in any bi- or multilingual speech community, Optimality Theory in analyzing bilingual use is a framework which aims to demonstrate how the socio-cognitive constraints of code-switching, in interaction with each other, filter the linguistic inputs to finally select the output indexing or constructing the optimal socio-pragmatic meaning and/or fulfilling the appropriate socio-pragmatic function in a given utterance. Relying on the thorough and comprehensive overview of previous literature on code-switching, pragmatics, and conversation analysis, Bolonyai and Bhatt set up five constraints, of which interaction, the optimal socio-cognitive meaning of code-switching is created, indexed, and decoded in a given linguistic utterance. These universal optimality filtering constraints are as follows: the Principle of Interpretive Faithfulness (FAITH); the Principle of Symbolic Domination (POWER); the Principle of Social Concurrence (SOLIDARITY); the Principle of Face Management (FACE); the Principle of Perspective Taking (PERSPECTIVE).

The premises of Bolonyai and Bhatt's framework (forthcoming) can be enumerated as follows:

- (a) Optimality Theory for bilingual use is a socio-cognitive framework, aiming to describe the socio-cognitive meaning-making process of code-switching in a universally applicable community framework.
- (b) It claims that there is a universal bilingual grammar that sets up, generates and evaluates violable socio-cognitive constraints that determine the actual surface representation of the competing monolingual and code-switched candidates.
- (c) The community-specific framework of OT relies on the algorithmic representation of code-switched outputs, surface realizations, and is backed by the knowledge of socio-cultural characteristics of the examined community. OT for bilingual grammar presupposes that there is a community grammar of bilingual speakers that is understood and shared by the members of the community.
- (d) OT is based on the empirical observation of emerging patterns of code-switched outputs represented in an algorithmic system.
- (e) The code-switched outputs emerge through the interaction of universal but community specific hierarchical set of constraints.
- (f) The language-pair specific ranking of constraints is based on the algorithmic computation of empirically collected output realizations. The wider range of data provides a more solid ground for setting up the ranking, though it does not require a certain number of empirical data and a given number of algorithmic computations. However, ample data have to be provided and

represented in algorithmic tableaux to set up the ranking of each candidate in relation to one another.

(g) The constraints are arranged in a strict dominance order. The inputs (candidates) are competing with each other to become the optimal candidate, the surface realization. The inputs (candidates) undergo a universal set of constraints and the optimal candidate will be the one, most harmonic with the constraints, violating the least ranked constraint and complying with the highest ranked in a particular linguistic situation.

(h) The constraints are soft, which means that they are violable. The only inviolable rule is that no candidate violating the highest constraint in a given linguistic situation can be the optimal one. It is always the actual community-specific ranking of constraints which determines which candidate is the optimal in a particular linguistic situation complying with the rules of well-formedness in the examined community.

(i) The interaction of the violable constraints in a particular situation is activated by the underlying socio-pragmatic function or meaning that the competing candidates are meant to fulfill and index. The optimal candidate, out of the monolingual and code-switched one(s), will be the one fulfilling the particular socio-pragmatic function or indexing a socio-pragmatic meaning the most optimally.

(j) Although in OT the number of candidates is infinite, in the OT framework for bilingual use, it is reduced to only the number of codes that can potentially be involved in the act of switching.

(k) The candidate, either the monolingual or the code-switched one(s), that violates the lowest ranked socio-cognitive constraint(s) and complies with the highest one, activated in that particular linguistic situation, will be the optimal one.

(l) As the framework focuses on the meaning-making mechanism of code-switching, it discusses only those instances of code-switches which index or construct a socio-pragmatically meaningful function. All other instances of code-switches, resulting from the reduced linguistic competence of speakers (due to language loss, attrition, unstable bilingualism) as well as instances of code-switches filling up linguistic gaps, or borrowings are excluded from the scope of this framework.

(m) OT for bilingual grammar does not set the direction of code-switching as inherently more meaningful than the other one in relation of the codes. It premises that the switch per se can be meaningful irrespective of the direction of switching. Therefore, code-switching of any direction from/to the switched codes is included in the scope of examination.

(n) A comprehensive list of all the socio-pragmatic meaning-making functions (over 130) of code-switching in the relevant literature (120 studies) have been classified under five principles (see the comprehensive list in Appendix 1), which act as universal but soft constraints. They are as follows: the Principle of Interpretive Faithfulness (FAITH), the Principle of Symbolic Domination (POWER), the Principle of Social Concurrence (SOLIDARITY), the Principle of Face Management (FACE), and the Principle of Perspective Taking (PERSPECTIVE).

4.3.1. The principles of Optimality Theory in analyzing bilingual use

In the following subsection, the five principles acting as sociopragmatic constraints are discussed in more detail. First, the principle of Faithful Interpretiveness (FAITH) is elaborated on.

1 The principle of faithful interpretiveness [FAITH]

Bolonyai and Bhatt claim that such instances of code-switching can be subsumed in the principle of faithful interpretiveness which “maximize informativity with respect to specificity of meaning and economy of expression. i. e., [social] actors code-switch to the language that more faithfully and economically captures the intended conceptual, semantic-pragmatic, often socio-culturally or ideologically grounded, meaning” (forthcoming: 6).

In other words, the main socio-pragmatic function of code-switches classified under the principle of faithful interpretiveness is to express the most economically and faithfully the intended meaning of the speaker when the semantic-conceptual attribute of the monolingual candidate does not allow its most optimal meaning-making formation. All Faith-related instances enable the speaker to index or construct the most optimal interpretive conceptual, ideological, socio-cultural meaning of an utterance in a community-specific, culturally-bound context. In bi- and multilingual communities, Faith-related instances are fairly frequent (Backus 2001; Montes-Alcala 2007; Bhatt 2008) given that bi- and multilingual speakers have a higher recognition of

the different culturally grounded connotations of their utterances than their monolingual peers. In order to capture and index the most economically and faithfully the actual culture-bound, ideologically grounded, semantic-conceptual meaning of a linguistic utterance, bi- and multilingual speakers can readily rely on code-switching. By differentiating the linguistic form of an utterance, its specificity in meaning is accentuated more economically.

Numerous functions of code-switching listed by other researchers can be classified under the principle of Faith. After a thorough and comprehensive study of all sociopragmatic-related functions of code-switching in the relevant literature, 16 have been found to comply with the definition of Faith. To name but a few examples, code-switching functions as *le mot juste* (the most proper or suitable expression) (Myers-Scotton and Jake 1995; Gardner-Chloros et al. 2000), to express “highly specific” cultural connotations (Backus 2001), “stylistic embroidery” (Valdes-Fallis 1976; Callahan 2004), religious invocations (Callahan 2004), or linguistic routines or clichés (Montes-Alcala 2001).

With a view to illustrating how Faith works, three examples taken from previous studies as well as from my joint research with Bolonyai will be provided.

In the examples, numbers refer to the lines and the letters stand for the different speakers. The code-switched instance is indicated by bold letters in italics (unless otherwise indicated). The translations are provided in brackets.

Example [1] illustrates “how CS is employed to recall and rebuild cultural memory in the here-and-now of text production” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 8). The extract is taken from an English daily newspaper in India. The figures refer to the lines.

Example [1]

- 1 A “There have been several analyses of this phenomenon. First, there is the
 2 religious angle which is to do with Indian society. In India a man feels
 3 guilty when fantasizing about another man’s wife, unlike in the west. The
 4 *saat pheras* (‘seven circumnavigations’) around the *agni* (‘fire’) serves as
 5 a *lakshman rekha* (‘line one does not cross’)¹.

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 8))

The Hindi-English language of this newspaper extract places the utterance in the appropriate contemporary setting of Indian society interwoven by Hindu and English cultural interaction. The Hindi quotes are from the most important cultural narratives of Hindu culture: the Vedas (the historical narrative) and the Ramayana (the great Hindu epic). The Hindi terms serve as a sub text to the main English text. By originally leaving the Hindi terms without giving any English explanation or translation, the readers are oriented to place the text in the context of contemporary Indian society intertwined by the English language and traditional Hindu culture

¹ The English translations in brackets have been not been part of the original quote, they have been provided by Bolonyai and Bhatt.

entrenched in the cultural-historical texts of the Vedas and Ramayana. The switch to Hindi (lines 3 and 4) evokes a socio-cultural meaning that is rooted in ancient Hindu culture, transmitted by the historical texts. The monolingual English version could not convey the same semantic-conceptual meaning of this socio-culturally bound term. Therefore, between the two competing candidates – the monolingual English one and the switch to Hindi – the latter complies more optimally with the socio-pragmatic function of Faith of indexing a socio-culturally grounded meaning.

Example [2] has been recorded by Auer in a conversation between five Spanish-German bilinguals in Hamburg in an apartment. One participant, a guest (C), at some point of the conversation wants to smoke a cigarette and seems to be hesitating between staying in the room, which would be an accepted code of conduct in his continent, South America, or going outside into the corridor, in compliance with German social rules. The figures refer to the lines, and the letters refer to the various speakers.

Example [2]

- 1 J “Por qué por qué quieres ir al *flur*?”
 (‘why do you want to go out in the corridor?’)
- 2 C “para fumar”

(`in order to smoke`)

(...)

3 J “aquí no hay aquí no hay *nichtraucher*”

(`here we don't have no-smokin`)

(Peter Giese, unpublished data, 1992/93, cited by Auer (1998: 6))

In Auer's analysis, the switch in line 3 to German acts as a discourse-related switch which accentuates the difference in South American and German codes of conduct regarding smoking (Auer 1998: 7). While in South America smoking in an apartment is a widely accepted way of behaving, in German culture there are non-smoking rules forbidding smoking in apartments. The switch to German in a prevalently Spanish conversation is an indication of such a differentiation. It illustrates that the concept of non-smoking apartments is more unusual in South America than in Germany.

In Bolonyai and Bhatt's framework, the code-switch is an example of complying with the principle of Faith. The two candidates competing for the most optimal meaning-making surface representation are the monolingual Spanish form (*no fumador*) and the code-switched German term (*nichtraucher*). Although the Spanish term conveys the same meaning as the German one, it lacks the cultural-bound particularization of the German candidate. The German code-switch placed in a basically Spanish conversation contrasts the peculiar ways in which South American and German cultures relate to the habit of smoking. Therefore, the German code-switch captures

the intended meaning more faithfully and economically, which is a basic tenet of the principle of Faith. Hence, in the OT framework, the German code-switched term is evaluated as the one complying more optimally with the principle of Faith.

Example [3] has been taken from the Hungarian-American sample of interviews conducted among Hungarian-Americans living in North Carolina by myself and Bolonyai in the course of 2007 and 2008². The speaker, a first generation immigrant, speaks about how the safety measures introduced after the September 11th attacks have rearranged American public safety and the social landscape.

Example [3]

- 1 A “Most itt azóta van rend, amióta előjött ez az ... izé, a *homeland security*
 2 probléma, most mindenhol civil ruhás, meg egyenruhás rendőrök vannak,
 3 és ezek ... az ilyen bűnözések egy kicsit lecsökkentek, mert mindent
 figyelnek.”

(Now, here it's been order since this ... this whatchamacallit, the homeland security problem has come up, now there are policemen in plainclothes and uniform everywhere,

² I as a Fulbright post-graduate visiting researcher conducted research in the Hungarian-American immigrant community under the supervision of and in cooperation with Ágnes Bolonyai, a Professor of English at the State University of North Carolina.

and these ... like the crimes have decreased a little, because they are watching everything.`)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In Bolonyai and Bhatt's interpretation, the switch from Hungarian to English is an illustration of how a code-switched utterance constructs a more specific, authentic, economic socio-cultural meaning than the monolingual candidate would (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 9). The speaker switches in the first line to English *homeland security* to index a socio-cultural meaning embedded in American culture. After the September 11 attacks, the US introduced severe security measures to restore the notion of public safety. As this event and its impact on the contemporary American socio-political setting are deep-seated in American people's mentality, the speaker relies on the English code-switched term instead of the monolingual Hungarian candidate to express it. The hesitating word-search "ez az izé" (whatchamacallit) in line 1 before the switch takes place also indicates that the speaker does not find a corresponding Hungarian term that would construct the same authentic meaning. The semantic equivalent of homeland security could be the Hungarian "nemzetbiztonság" (national security) or "honföldbiztonság" (homeland security) terms, though none of those have the same socio-political connotation as the English one. Applying Bolonyai and Bhatt's model, in this utterance, the code-switched term is more harmonic with the principle of Faith expressing a socio-cultural concept embedded in a particular culture than the monolingual one.

2 The principle of symbolic domination [POWER]

According to Bolonyai and Bhatt those instances of code-switching can be classified under the principle of symbolic domination which enable “[social actors] to maximize symbolic dominance and/or social distance in relational practice, i. e., [social] actors switch to the language that is best positioned to index or construct power, status, authority, social distance, and/or difference between self and other(s).” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 14).

Therefore, such instances of code-switching are subsumed in this principle which enable the speaker to express or negotiate socio-cognitive structures or relational frames according to the perceived or desired social status of participants in interrelation to one another. The three principles of OT in bilingual use “framing relational-interpersonal communication” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 6) are Power, Solidarity, and Face. As a higher social status (dominance, power) cannot exist without presupposing a lower one (concurrence, solidarity), the principle of Power is in a complementary position in relation with the principle of Solidarity responsible for social concurrence. The principle of Solidarity and Face will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

A code-switch complying with the principle of Power is a linguistic resource drawn upon to index, in unequal social relations, a higher, dominant, or superior position among the participants of a linguistic situation. In some diglossic language pairs, the direction of code-switching per se can assign a dominant position, but this rule cannot be taken as universal. It is always the given situation and the way in which participants position themselves in relation to

one another that contextualizes code-switches as linguistic means serving to index unequal social status, power, or dominance.

Code-switching as a means of indexing social relations has been widely discussed in the code-switching literature. Of the socio-pragmatic functions of code-switches enumerated by previous theorists, 26 have been classified under the principle of symbolic domination. To mention but a few, Power can express “they-code” (Gumperz 1982), “authority” (Lin 1990; Canagarajah 1995), “elite closure” (Myers-Scotton 1995), increasing social status or distance, (Myers-Scotton 1993; Canagarajah 1995; Rindler Schjerve 1998), and “power-wielding” (Auer 1998; Jorgensen 1998; Wei 1998; Esdahl 2003).

Two examples provided by Bolonyai and Bhatt to demonstrate how the principle of Power works will be discussed in more detail.

Example [4a-b] is a passage from a casual conversation that took place in New Delhi, India, among Kashmiri (mother-tongue) Pandit family members. The languages involved are Hindi, Kashmiri, and English (italicized and bold).

Example [4a]

1 A “zamiin par aapka bhii hak hai”

(`you also have the (ancestral) right to that land`)

2 B “are hameN kyaa karnaa hai zaraa si us zamiin ka (1.0) tumhe cahiye kyaa”

(`what am I going to do with that little piece of land tumhe cahiye kyaa`)

3 A “mujhe nahiN cahiye *but you should demand what is yours*”

(`I don't want (it) ... `)

4 B “*I am not interested, if you are, you do it*”

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 15))

In Bolonyai and Bhatt’s interpretation the switch in line 4 from Hindi to English “demonstrates a clear instance of how the exercise of assertiveness and authority is rendered in English” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 15), that is, how the switch to English enables the speaker to gain a dominant position in this particular situation. In this speech community, a former British colony, there is a stable markedness feature of the codes involved. English is the official language, the language of “power and prestige”, while among community members Hindi is the default language, the language of solidarity, the “we-code”. Kashmiri is also used, though rarely, mostly for intimate speech functions.

In this example, the conversation between speaker A and B is about a piece of land that speaker A wants to share with speaker B. Speaker B, however, seems reluctant to accept this offer even though he is traditionally entitled to that piece of land. Speaker B switches to English

when he runs out of arguments and simply wants to end the conversation making speaker A understand that he has no intention of using the ancestral piece of land that he has a right to. Speaker B draws upon a switch to English, the language of prestige and power, to gain authority in the situation, which finally tops the argument. The switch to English also indicates that speaker B wants to keep a distance from the ancient culture which grants him the right to use a piece of land he does not want. By switching to the official language of English from the traditionally default language of the Pandit community, speaker B not only places himself in a distant position from the community's default language but also from his traditional rights vested in this community. The switch to English per se expresses authority and distance, while the monolingual instance would require more linguistic or meta-linguistic resources to draw upon to express the same socio-pragmatic meaning. Consequently, the switch to English is a more optimal candidate complying with the constraint of Power.

In the second part of the same conversation [Example 4b], the switch to English in line 4 is of interest to us. Speaker C is also a member of the Pandit family, she is Kashmiri dominant, but she starts her utterance in Hindi, indicating affiliation and solidarity with speaker A, who is an older member of the family. However, she switches to English, the language of authority. The switch grants her control over the situation and enables her to top the argument and to close the conversation without giving more explanation. The switch to English also involves face management. By taking on the position of authority, the speaker mitigates a face-threatening act, that is, she wants to rely on B's financial assistance if need be. The switch to English, hence, complies more optimally with the constraint of Power, Face, and Power than the monolingual candidate or a switch to Kashmiri. However, it violates the constraint of Solidarity.

[Example 4b]

- 1 A “... jeb mein paisa honaa chahiye”
 (‘you need to have more money in your pocket’)
- 2 C “are, aisaa kuch nahiiN hai”
 (‘Oh, it’s nothing like that’)
- 3 B “kyuN, aap bina paisoN ke apnaa kaam caeto ho”
 (‘Why you get through life without money.’)
- 4 C “mujhe paise kii kabhii zarurat paRhegii, *I will ask B*”
 (‘When/If I need money, I will ask B.’)
- (cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming:15))

In the next example [5], the switch to English line 5 is an indication of how “authority and social distance” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 16) is created.

In this conversation, a first generation Hungarian-American immigrant in his mid-thirties speaks about his job as a real estate vendor. He recalls an episode which he sets as an illustration of what he finds strange in his American colleagues’ attitude.

Example [5]

- 1 A “Azaz nem hülyéskedek. Nekem volt a ház, amikor adtam
 2 el, és ki volt égve a körte, és azt mondja, azt mondta, azt
 3 mondta az *inspector*, hogy *call electricians*, a *licensed*
 4 *electrician*, a *certified electrician*. Há` mondom, hogy, *put*
 5 *a fucking lightbulb in it*. És azt mondja azt mondja nekem
 6 a másik *agent*, hogy az nem, mert nem azt írták neked
 7 föl... És ez nekik teljesen normális.

(‘That’s right, I’m not kidding. I had a house, when I was selling, and a light bulb was burned out, and he says, he said, the inspector said, ”call electricians”, the ”licensed electrician”, ”certified electrician”. Well, I say, ”put a fucking light bulb in it”. And he says, the other agent says to me, ”no, [you can’t do it] because that’s not what was written down for you [on the paper]”. ... And this is completely normal to them.’)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

The switch to English in line 4-5 (*put a fucking lightbulb in it*) illustrates how the speaker ”constructs a commanding identity for himself” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming:17). By

switching to English, the speaker intentionally and directly puts himself into the recalled situation and into a position superior to the American inspector by using an imperative. The propositional force of the imperative is accentuated by the use of a swear word, which also indicates the speaker's high level of frustration with the situation. The switch to English complies with the principle of Perspective as well. It enables the speaker to leave the role of a narrator and to take on his own role in the recalled episode. The switch to English fulfils a two-fold function: it places the speaker into a superior position in relation with the other inspector, as well as enabling him to shift roles (perspectives) between being a narrator of the episode and a participant of it.

By switching, the speaker intentionally fulfils two socio-pragmatic functions: he gains the position of authority expressing his frustration with the situation, and he places himself in the recalled situation as a participant. The switch to English is a more economical expression, as it fulfils a two-fold socio-pragmatic function. It sets the interpersonal relations of the participants of the recalled episode (complying with Power), as well as serving as a discourse-related function of taking different conversational roles (complying with Perspective).

3 The principle of social concurrence [SOLIDARITY]

Solidarity is another principle (in addition to Power and Face) which is used to define interpersonal social relations between the participants in a given situation. Such instances of

code-switching can be classified under this principle which enable “[social actors] to maximize social affiliation and solidarity in relational practice, i. e., [social] actors switch to the language that is best positioned to index or create solidarity, affiliation, connection, intimacy and/or similarity between self and other(s).” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 19-20).

Under the principle of Solidarity, linguistic resources, more particularly instances of code-switching, serve as means of expressing either a perceived lower position in an unequal situation or as means of expressing solidarity with or a sense of belonging to a group. As the default language of communication in a given speech community varies, the language of solidarity and the actual meaning of the switch has to be interpreted in light of the particular community’s language use patterns.

In the Optimality Theoretical framework, numerous instances of code-switches cited by other theorists have been subsumed under the principle of Solidarity. These instances express the disposition of the participants, acting as social actors in an interaction where the roles are hierarchical, based on affiliation, equality or solidarity rather than on domination, power, or authority. 23 such entries have been detected, such as the “we-code” (Gumperz 1982), code-switches expressing “intimacy” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming), “inclusion” (Canagarajah 1995), the “default language” (Meeuwis and Bloomaert 1998), and “decreasing social distance” (Myers-Scotton 1993; Canagarajah 1995).

Three examples listed below illustrate how the principle of Solidarity functions. Example [6] involves Hungarian-English code-switching in an e-mail written by a mother to her son. The extract shows how the switch to Hungarian (right after the English opening line) “maximizes

closeness” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 21) and expresses the mother’s “true` concern for her son” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 21), both functions listed under the principle of Solidarity.

Example [6]

- 1 A “I’ve tried to call several times, but your voicemail picks up immediately.
- 2 *Minden rendben?* (‘Is everything all right?’) Call or e-mail me back.”

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 21))

The mother opens her letter in English to make an informative statement to her son. However, she switches to Hungarian in line 2 to express her emotion, her concern for her son. In the mother-son relation, Hungarian is the language of intimacy, and closeness. As such, the mother can express her motherly concern for her more optimally in Hungarian than in English. The switch to Hungarian serves more optimally the function of Solidarity than the monolingual English candidate. It is also true that by switching to Hungarian, the mother loses her authority, and control over the situation, as she exposes her true motherly emotions in the language of shared intimacy with her son, making her more vulnerable as a person. Therefore, the switch to Hungarian violates the constraint of Power. When the mother switches back to English in the

next sentence to make a request to her son, she resumes her superior role, the role of motherly control, indicating her regained authority.

Example [7] is taken from an exchange of emails between a bilingual Hungarian-American professor and her Hungarian graduate student studying in the US.

Example [7]

- 1 A “Köszí szépen, M. **Ha esetleg át tudnád rendezni a funkciókat** *in*
2 *alphabetical order*, az nagy segítség lenne.”

`Thanks very much, M. If you could maybe re-organize the functions in alphabetical order that would be great.`

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 22))

The example above shows how a lack of code-switch, that is a monolingual candidate as surface realization, complies more optimally than a code-switched instance with the principle of Solidarity. The lack of switch in line 1 (in bold) is a clear indication of how Solidarity is created at the expense of losing `face` and the position of authority. As both participants are native speakers of Hungarians, Hungarian is perceived as the default language of their communication. However, as the graduate student is also working together with the professor, there is an official

work relationship between the student and the professor. Hungarian, the native language, acts as a means of creating an unofficial relationship between the professor and her student based on the common cultural, historical heritage, as well as a sense of belonging in a foreign, American setting. English, though, is the language of work, indicating an official relationship, in which the student is definitely in a subordinate position to the professor. The professor's email is a request to the student. By not switching to English, the professor indicates that her request is from an equal partner, from another Hungarian living in the US, and not from a professor, who could simply command the student to carry out this task. By relying on the language of solidarity, the professor also hints that the request she makes is not supposed to be part of the official cooperation between her and the student. Therefore, the lack of code-switching shows that instead of commanding the student, who is, in an academic hierarchy, much lower positioned than the professor, the professor uses the language of solidarity to express a polite request. A polite request, which can be rejected, while a professor's command cannot, means that the professor loses part of her superior face and position of authority. However, to save complete face-losing and to gain some authority, the professor in line 1 switches to English to clarify the request in English. In Bolonyai and Bhatt's framework, the lack of code-switch, the monolingual candidate complies more optimally with the principle of Solidarity than a perceived code-switched instance. Yet, the code-switched instance would serve more optimally as a means of mitigating authority- and face-losing, complying with the principle of Power and Face.

Example [8] is an indication of how a code-switch creates solidarity based on the "value of ethnic connection" (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 22). In this situation a customer is trying to withdraw money from a post office. The conversation takes place between the customer and

the clerk in Nairobi. In Nairobi, both Swahili and English are used as official languages, but for service functions Swahili is preferred. Lou is the language of the Lou ethnic group (Myers-Scotton 1993).

Example [8]

1 A (Clerk) “Ee ... Semma”

(‘OK ... what do you want?’ (literally: ‘speak’))

2 B (Customer) “Nipe fomu ya kuchuka pesa.”

(‘Give me the form for withdrawing money.’)

(...)

3 A “Bwana, huwezi kutoa pesa leo kwa sabau hujamaliza sika saba.”

(‘Mister, you can’t take out money today because you haven’t finished seven days since [last withdrawal].’)

4 B (switching to Luo) “*Konya an marach.*”

(‘Help, I’m in trouble.’)

5 A (also speaking Luo now) “Anyalo kony, kik inuo kendo.”

(I can help you, but don't repeat it.)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 22))

According to Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 23), this example is a clear indication of how code-switching acts by “maximizing the value of ethnic connection” as a means of constructing “a relation of solidarity and alliance at the discourse level as well”. In this situation, Swahili is the unmarked choice, and both the speaker and the customer start their conversation in Swahili despite their shared Luo ethnic origin. Swahili is used in service-related domains to guarantee equal treatment in a multi-ethnic society, and the participants of the situation comply with this rule. However, when the customer realizes that he is in trouble because he cannot withdraw money, he switches to Luo (line 4). By switching to Luo, to the ethnic language shared with the clerk, he signals that he intends to move away from the official frame of their service-like relationship and wants to establish a common platform based on their shared ethnicity. Creating this common ground, this sense of togetherness, he hopes that he can expect more solidarity and some extra help from the clerk exceeding his official scope of authority. By responding in Luo, the clerk indicates that he places himself into the same ethnic group, which is a more intimate association than between a clerk and a customer. As a member of the same ethnic group indexed and instantiated in this situation by the switch to Luo, the clerk displays more solidarity with the customer and helps him even violating some rule.

In the OT framework, the code-switch to Luo is evaluated as a more optimal candidate than the monolingual Swahili. The code-switched instance by instantiating the notion of shared

ethnicity constructs a platform of solidarity enabling the customer and the clerk to leave the social frame of a service encounter and to carry out a task violating the official rules.

4 The principle of face management [FACE]

Adopting Goffman's stance on face, "an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image that others may share" (Goffman 1967: 5), Bolonyai and Bhatt claim that face is "the social value and standing a person claims" (forthcoming: 24). Relying on this proposition, they have classified such instances of code-switches under the principle of Face Management which enable "to maximize effective maintenance of `face`, or public image of self in relation to others, i.e., [social] actors switch to a language that is best positioned to manage their interpersonal relations consistent with face need of self and/or others (e.g., appreciation, tact, deference, and respect, positive or negative politeness)." (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 23-24).

In other words, face is the constructed and approved public façade of a person that determines their social status and their interpersonal relationships. Face-work is the embracing term for all social and interactional practice that an individual gets engaged in to achieve or orient themselves to a desired social status. Face-work is a bidirectional activity: it involves certain social practices that challenge the self's face schemas by others (face-threatening acts) as well as the practices deployed by the self in order to minimize or avoid face threat (mitigating,

minimizing, avoiding face-threatening acts). Politeness is assumed to be a typical social practice aimed at minimizing face threats (Brown and Levinson 1987). Positive politeness is aimed at creating a positive face, with such practices involved as “appreciation, approval, liking and connection” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 24). Negative politeness, though, including such social practices as “maintaining distance, restraint, autonomy, freedom from imposition” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 24) are considered to be aimed at managing negative face needs.

Therefore, all those code-switched instances which pose a potential threat to the positive and negative needs of the speaker’s face as well as all those mitigating these threats are listed under the category of face management.

Studying the literature on code-switching, Bolonyai and Bhatt have subsumed various socio-pragmatic functions of code-switching described by previous theorists under the principle of Face. For example, avoiding “risking loss of face” (Gumperz 1982), “mitigating or defusing face threats” (Heller 1988; Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai 2001), “dampening directness” (Gardner-Chloros and Finnis 2003), and “mitigating request” (Zentella 1997), etc.

Below, two examples will be provided to demonstrate how face management can be optimally accomplished through code-switching. Example [9] is a good illustration of how code-switching can be used to express positive politeness by mitigating a request.

The conversation below takes place in C’s house with C, the mother, C’s children (B, D), and the maid (A) present. The children (B, D) are visiting their mother’s (C) house where A works as a maid. The conversation takes place in New Delhi. The bilingual conversation

predominantly takes place in Hindi, with some switches to Kashmiri between the mother and the children.

In this tri-lingual speech community, A speaks only Hindi (normal font) and does not speak Kashmiri (italicized), whereas the mother speaks Hindi and Kashmiri and the children: English and Kashmiri. Therefore, the only language all the participants of this situation speak is Hindi. The code-switch that will be examined more closely is in line [5] (in bold letters).

Example [9]

1 A “kyaa baj rahaa hai”

(`What time is it (getting to be)`)

2 B “bas cay pinee ka waqt ho rahaa hai”

(`Just getting to be the time to have tea`)

3 C “*vuch aayas caay tyath*”

(referring to B) (`look, he’s getting the urge to drink tea`)

4 D “mujhe bhii piinii hai, main bana detiihuN”

(`I also want to drink (tea), I will make it`)

5 C “D *vanyi chak vatshmatsayi*, **zaraa A ke liyee bhii paani rakh degii**”

(`D, now that you are up, can you put some water (for tea) also for A`)

6 D “haaN”

(`yes, (Okay)`)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 25))

At some point in the conversation, D stands up to make some tea. C, the mother asks D to make tea for A, the maid, as well. She starts her utterance in Kashmiri, when speaking to D, then, she switches to Hindi (line 5). In the first part of the utterance, she uses Kashmiri as that is the default language with her children. However, when she makes a request that involves A as well, asking D to make some tea for A, she switches to Hindi. The switch serves as an example of how code-switching can function as a means of expressing positive politeness. In her turn, C asks D some favor, that is, to make some tea for A. This request can be interpreted as a face-threatening act. In the deeply hierarchical Indian society, A is placed at a lower rank than the other members of the family, who are her employers. By switching to Hindi, C manages to maintain a positive face for the maid showing considerateness towards the maid’s needs, being aware of the fact that A understands Hindi, but not Kashmiri. The switch to Hindi fulfils some other functions as well. It also complies with Solidarity, as the common language of all the participants is Hindi. However, the children tend to speak Kashmiri (or English) with the mother. The mother, when making a request taking into consideration the maid’s needs – that she might also want some tea

– as well as her language preference, which is Hindi, she switches back to Hindi. By doing so, she involves the maid in the conversation and expresses solidarity with her. Therefore, the switch also complies with the principle of Solidarity. The switch to Hindi from Kashmiri also indicates that the mother moves away from the default language used with her children. Instead of Kashmiri, she makes a request to her child in Hindi, a language that the children probably understand but do not use. Switching from a language of we-code (with the children) to a language of they-code (used between the mother and the maid), the mother gains control of and authority in the situation. When she makes a request switching to Hindi she indicates that she is in authority and the request cannot be rejected. The switch, hence, complies also with the principle of Power.

The switch to Hindi enables to the speaker to achieve a three-fold goal: to express positive politeness toward the maid (principle of Face), to express solidarity with the maid (principle of Solidarity), and to gain control of the situation in relation to the speaker's children (principle of Power).

The next example [10] illustrates “the skillful use of code-switching as a `dialogic` tool in the management of multiple face needs” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 26).

Example [10]

1 A (Lifting a bottle of water) “Oh, my God. Let me just do it by myself.”

2 (Spilling the water on the kitchen cabinet counter) “Ah! Sorry, sorry!”

3 “*Nagyon nehéz volt ez. Bocsánat.*”

(‘It was very heavy. I’m sorry.’)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 26))

The conversation takes place in the home of a Hungarian-American bilingual family, where Hungarian is the preferred home language. The participants are an 8-year-old boy and his mother. They are having dinner when the boy offers to make some lemonade for himself in spite of his mother’s dispreference. When he spills water on the kitchen counter, he apologizes to his mother. First in English, then he switches to Hungarian (line 3). The act symbolizes the multiple management of face needs. When the boy spills water on the kitchen counter, his attempt to demonstrate his ‘adult’ competence and boldness to act against her mother’s will fails. His first reaction is to apologize to his mother in English, his dominant language – but his mother’s dispreferred choice – trying to save his desired face as an independent, competent boy. Then, he switches to Hungarian, the shared language of intimacy and the preferred choice of the mother, in order to ask for her forgiveness. By switching to Hungarian, he reconstructs his face of his mother’s son – apologizing in a language that his mother prefers – acknowledging his incompetence. The switch to Hungarian, hence, fulfils multiple functions of the subtle face-threatening and face-saving acts deployed by the son to position himself in relation with his mother.

5 The principle of perspective taking [PERSPECTIVE]

Relying on concepts applied in the field of communications and pragmatics (“footing” by Goffman 1979; “frame” by Goffman 1974; “voice” by Bakhtin 1981; “stance” by Ochs 1992; and “positioning” by Davies and Harré 1990) Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) have developed the principle of Perspective to include all discourse-related practices in bi- (or multi)lingual speech mode that enable the speaker to set up, to enter, and to leave (to shift between) dual or multiple `realities` instantiated by the code they use and appropriated by the situation. According to Bolonyai and Bhatt, those instances of code-switches can be subsumed under the Principle of Perspective which enable “to maximize perspectivity in interaction, i.e., [social] actors switch to a language that is best positioned to signal what is assumed to be currently salient point of view and socio-cognitive orientation in discourse.” (forthcoming: 27-28).

In other words, the main function of code-switching complying with the principle of Perspective is to accentuate some aspect of bi- or multilingual reality against some other aspect either by contrasting them, by placing them into simultaneous vision, or by bringing them into a common focus. Hence, the principle of Perspective enables the speaker to construct and focus on some aspect of reality from the speaker’s prominent point of view. The act of code-switching under the principle of Perspective fulfils its main discourse-related function, that is, constructing and focusing on the desired aspect of discursive reality (the time, the place of the setting, the voice of participants) relying on its conversational resources, such as quotations, intertextuality, repetition, emphasis, discourse markers. Not only does the principle of Perspective enable the

speaker to construct and put into focus one aspect of reality, is also enables them to position themselves, to take a stance, in the discursive reality. Therefore, such discourse-related functions as irony, sarcasm, which position the speaker in a distance from the constructed reality, are also included in the principle of Perspective.

Susceptible to the nature of bi- or multilingual discourse, where speakers are constantly engaged in changing perspectives because they intend to take different positions in time, space or to take different roles required by the needs of the interaction or the genre of a linguistic utterance, functions of perspective-related code-switches have turned out to be the most numerous in the literature of code-switching (53 entries). Such socio-pragmatic functions of code-switches have been evaluated as expressing perspective-taking as “quotation” (Gal 1979; McClure and McClure 1988; Auer 1995), “message qualification”, “reformulation”, “elaboration”, and “clarification” (Gumperz 1982; Lin 1990; Callahan 2004), “parenthetical remarks” and “off-stage” talk (McClure and McClure 1988; Halmari and Smith 1994; Montes-Alcalá 2007), “reiteration”, “repetition”, and “emphasis” (Gumperz 1982; Callahan 2004; Montes-Alcalá 2007), shift of “key” and “tone” (Auer 1995), “irony”, “sarcasm”, and “parody” (Woolard 1988; Pandey 1995; Stroud 2004), “role-shift” (Auer 1995; Zentella 1997), “double-voicing”, “bivalency”, “heteroglossia”, “hybridity” (Rampton 1995; Bhatt 2008), “footing” (Zentella 1997; Auer 1998), and as a “contextualization cue” (Gumperz 1982; Wei 1994; Auer 1995).

Example [11] provides a clear instance of how code-switching under the principle of Perspective “offers multiple affordances” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 32). It marks a

change in footing, it enables the speaker to position himself as `other`, and to put his American vision into a parodic focus.

In this situation, two Hungarian-American men speak about the initial difficulties they encountered in the US. The speaker recalls one particular instance when he was – according to him – unfairly fined 100 dollars for inadvertently overdrawing his bank account by four cents. He expresses his frustration over this situation, particularly, over the way he was treated in the bank when he made a complaint.

Example [11]

- 1 A “És bementem személyesen és megkérdeztem, hogy mi van, és föl hívtam,
 2 és és egyszerűen egy dolgot fogtak föl, az ő szempontjukból egy dolog
 3 volt fontos, hogy én nem értem a helyzetet. És el kezdtek magyarázni,
 4 hogy *we’ll explain you the situation.*”

(And I went [to the bank] in person, and asked them what was going on, and I called them, and and they understood one thing only, from their perspective there was only one thing that was important that I do not understand the situation. And they began to explain that, “we’ll explain you the situation”.)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 31-32))

The speaker starts his turn in English and switches to Hungarian (line 4) when he directly quotes the American bank clerk. In Bolonyai and Bhatt's OT model for bilingual use, the switch to English is more harmonic with the perspective-taking constraint relevant in the situation than a potential monolingual candidate. The switch fulfils a three-fold function enriching the propositional force of the utterance. By switching to English when quoting the clerk, the speaker shifts roles of being a narrator to giving voice to the quoted person. This shift in roles positions the narrator of the story in the role of the `other` in the recalled episode. The switch, therefore, reconstructs the dialogic nature of the recalled situation placing the narrator of the story into his original position of the `other`. The position of the `other` places the narrator into distance from the recalled episode, letting the speaker (the bank clerk) `play his own role`. This position of contemplative distance from the recalled episode adds a parodic note to it. Letting the participants of a recalled episode `speak for themselves` is a conversational resource of parody. The switch to English, hence, fulfils three socio-pragmatic functions: it reconstructs the dialogicity of the situation by giving voice to the quoted person, it positions the speaker as `other`, and it allows the speaker to parody the American bank clerk.

The next example [12] is also a clear indication of how a code-switch complies with the principle of Perspective by shifting roles as well as emphasizing the dialogicity of the situation by contrasting the perspective of `others` to `ours`. In this conversation, three multilingual (English-Hindi-Kashmiri) Kashmiris are talking about a plight of migrant Kashmiris. The switch in line (2) is of interest to us.

Example [12]

- 1 A “What are the politicians doing about the migrant problem I would like to know”
- 2 B “They do nothing, they say *kashmiriyon ko pahle khud organize hona paRhega*”
 (‘Kashmiris themselves have to first get organized’)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 20))

The switch to Hindi fulfils two functions. By literally quoting the local Hindi politicians’ response to the English question in line (2), the speaker gives voice to the politicians. The switch also enables the speaker to shift his role of a narrator to taking on the role of the local politicians. This switch well-illustrates the dialogicity of the situation, the political dialogue taking place between the local Hindu politicians (they) and the migrant Kashmiris (us). This shift in perspectives is optimally expressed by the switch to Hindi. The switch to Hindi activates the constraint of Power as well, as the switch from English, the official language, the language of power and dominance, to Hindi, the language of unofficial communication, violates the constraint of Power.

Example [13] shows how a code-switch complying with the constraint of Perspective, through the discourse-related function of repetition, manages to “maximize the intended socio-pragmatic effect” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 33), by making more prominent the new message or altering the old message of an utterance. The example comes from the data collected in a Sikh Punjabi community in West London by Gardner-Chloros et al. (2000: 1319). In the extract, the speaker is recalling a funny episode when a friend was so tired that she fell asleep at the airport.

Example [13]

(Context: talking about waiting with a friend during an overnight delay at an airport)

1 A “... and she was sleeping all over the place, so I had to stay awake

2 *digdthi-firdthi si* everywhere, so I had to stay awake”

[falling around she was]

(`she was falling around everywhere, so I had to stay awake`)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 33))

According to Bolonyai and Bhatt's interpretation, the code-switch in line 2 demonstrates how the switch to Punjabi in the predominantly English utterance – by complying with the constraint of Perspective – “lends emphasis to the point of the story in a way that goes beyond the original statement” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 33). The switch to Punjabi, which is the verbatim repetition of the English sentence, though “more expressive” than the English utterance (Gardner-Chloros et al. 2000) does not add to, modify or alter the original content of the English utterance. The switch to Punjabi enables the speaker, by contrasting the Punjabi form of the utterance to the surrounding English text, to give more emphasis to it. The code-switched instance fulfils the discourse-related function of repetition more efficiently than the monolingual candidate as it highlights a particular, the funniest aspect of the story, without simply repeating it, without making it sound redundant.

In this section, we have demonstrated how the five principles set by Bolonyai and Bhatt function as universal constraints. Bolonyai and Bhatt use the embracing term of `principle` to include the functions that the successful linguistic input has to fulfill to become the output representation activated by the socio-pragmatic needs of the utterance. The principles, however, also act as constraints as they filter the inputs and eventually set the rules of well-formedness in bilingual grammar.

4.3.2. The interaction of constraints: Two community specific instantiations of the universal bilingual grammar (Kashmiri-Hindi-English and Hungarian-English)

4.3.2.1. Optimal bilingual grammar: Kashmiri–Hindi–English code-switching

As has been pointed out earlier, the universal constraints stated as principles might be in conflict, and through their interaction, the actual surface realizations emerge. In Bolonyai and Bhatt’s (forthcoming) model, the number of the inputs, the competing candidates, has been reduced to the number of codes involved in the act of switching: the monolingual and the code-switched candidate(s). It must be noted that the two candidates differ only in their formal representations and have “non-distinct semantic representations” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 35). In accordance with the OT model, Bolonyai and Bhatt claim that the underlying representations (UR), the potential outputs, are fed into the evaluative part (EVAL) of the generative bilingual device, which selects the optimal candidate by filtering them through a set of constraints (CON). The constraints are generated by the generative device (GEN), which is universal, though the ranking of the constraints is community specific.

As the main premise of the OT model in bilingual use is socio-cognitive optimality, the candidates are evaluated with regard to how optimally they fulfill the socio-pragmatic function

relevant in a situation relying on linguistic resources instantiated by the act of code-switching. Optimality is a relative notion as it is the result of the interaction of the relevant constraints. The constraints are hierarchically arranged and violable. The ranking of the constraints is instantiated by a particular speech community's rules of well-formedness. Although the constraints can be violated by the candidates, the only inviolable rule is that the highest ranking constraint determines ultimately optimality in a given situation, and the optimal candidate cannot violate the highest ranked constraint. The optimal candidate that complies with the highest ranked constraint emerges as the surface realization. OT in bilingual use combines a deductive, empirically-based approach with a theoretical one in exploring the rules of well-formedness in bilingual grammar. The principles, stated as constraints, which determine the universal rules of well-formedness, have been set up relying on relevant theoretical evidence. The particular instantiation of these principles, through their actual ranking in a bi-or multilingual speech community, is set up relying on the algorithmic representation of the surface realizations or outputs collected as empirical evidence in tableaux. There is no definite number of algorithmic representations required for the setting up of the constraints. Nevertheless, enough data must be provided to deduce the relation of the constraints to one another. Also, the more empirical data and their algorithmic representations are provided, the more well-grounded is the ranking.

Bolonyai and Bhatt, relying on the algorithmical representation of empirical data of code-switched instances have set up two community specific instantiations of the bilingual university grammar. The hypothetical ranking of constraints in Hindi-Kashmiri-English code-switching is as follows:

{FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE}>> POWER >> SOLIDARITY

The constraints are ranked in ascending order of dominance from right to left. In this hypothetical ranking, Solidarity is the least dominant, the lowest ranked constraint, while Faith, Perspective, and Face are the most dominant, the highest ranked constraints. Faith, Perspective, and Face are equally ranked, which means that they are not in conflict with one another. When filtering the candidates, the constraint of Power outranks Solidarity, and Faith, Perspective, and Face outrank Power, and Solidarity, as well.

Bolonyai and Bhatt have provided the algorithmic representations of four Kashmiri-Hindi-English code-switched instances to demonstrate how the hypothetical ranking has been computed. In the first example, the interaction of two constraints, Power and Solidarity have been examined and their ranking vis-a-vis each other has been set.

Example [14] – The interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY

1 A “mujhe nahiN cahiye *but you should demand what is yours*”

(‘I don’t want (the land), but you should demand what is yours.’)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 15))

Example [14] is in part the repetition of example [4a] cited above. As has been already pointed out that in that particular conversation, speakers switch to English to express assertiveness and authority, while Hindi expresses shared ethnicity, intimacy, and solidarity. Therefore, in this particular utterance, in line 1, the switch to English definitely complies with the constraint of Power. The monolingual candidate, however, complying with the constraint of Solidarity, would violate the constraint of Power. The two competing candidates, the English code-switch, and the monolingual Hindi, undergo at least two constraints, Power and Solidarity before becoming surface realizations. The other three constraints, Faith, Perspective, and Face are not relevant in this utterance. The interaction of the constraints and the competition of the candidates have been represented in a computational tableau.

Tableau 2: Interaction of POWER and SOLIDARITY (POWER >> SOLIDARITY)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSPECTIVE	FACE	POWER	SOLIDARITY
→ (a) “mujhe nahiN cahiye <i>but you should demand what is yours</i> ”					*
(b) `mujhe nahiN cahiye, magar tohyi gasyi panun hakh mangun`				*!	

The constraints are arranged in columns following the hypothetical ranking. The candidates are arranged in rows. The stars indicate the constraint that a given candidate violates.

The candidate violating the highest ranked constraint is indicated by an exclamation point. As has been pointed out earlier, in this particular linguistic utterance, two constraints are active, Power and Solidarity. The monolingual candidate would comply with Solidarity but would violate Power. The English code-switch, however, would act contrarily, complying with Power, but violating Solidarity. Adopting an empirically-based, inductive approach, it can be detected that out of the two candidates, the English code-switch has become the actual surface representation (indicated by a horizontal arrow). As OT for the analysis of bilingual use relies on the notion of optimality, it can be computed from the actual surface representation that the English code-switch must be a more optimal candidate than the monolingual one. As the candidates undergo a hierarchically arranged set of constraints filtering optimality, the actual surface representation complying, in this particular utterance, with the constraint of Power violating the constraint of Solidarity indicates that the constraint of Power must outrank Solidarity. Therefore, the empirically-based, inductive, computational approach reinforces the hypothetical order of Power outranking Solidarity. Further examples have been provided to show the relation of the other three constraints vis-à-vis one another. Example [15] provides evidence of Faith outranking Power.

Example [15] – The interaction of FAITH and POWER

1 A “(...) The *saat pheras* (‘seven circumnavigations’) around the *agni*

2 (`fire`) serves as a *lakshman rekha* (`line one does not cross`)"

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 8))

The switch to Hindi from English is an example of fulfilling the constraint of Faith. However, the switch to Hindi from English, to the language of shared ethnicity and socio-cultural heritage from the official language, the language of power and prestige, complies with Solidarity but violates Power. The relation of Faith and Power is of interest to us, though.

Tableau 3: Interaction of FAITH and POWER (FAITH >> POWER)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSPECTIVE	FACE	POWER	SOLIDARITY
→ (a) “The <i>saat pheras</i> (`seven circumnavigations`) around the <i>agni</i> (`fire`) serves as a <i>lakshman rekha</i> ”				*	
(b) `The seven circumnavigations around the fire serve as a line (one does not crosses)`.	*!				*

As the intended socio-pragmatic meaning of the utterance is to express most authentically and economically the cultural notion entrenched in Hindi culture, the code-switch to Hindi fulfils this function of Faith more optimally than the monolingual English candidate. The switch to

Hindi, therefore, complies with the constraint of Faith, while the English monolingual one violates it. With a view to the constraint of Faith, the code-switched instance is a more optimal choice than its monolingual counterpart. The switch to Hindi activates two other constraints as well. The switch to Hindi, to the language of shared cultural heritage, complies with Solidarity, but violates Power. The monolingual English candidate, though, would comply with the constraint of Power, as English is the official language, the language of power and authority, but it would violate Solidarity.

The switch to Hindi, hence, complies with Faith and Solidarity but violates Power. As the actual surface representation is the code-switched candidate, and violating the higher ranked constraint in the relevant interrelation of candidates renders the surface representation of the given candidate impossible, the constraint of Faith must be a more dominant constraint in terms of optimality than the constraint of Power. It is important to note that in this example, Solidarity seems to outrank Power as the successful candidate complies with it, but not with Power. However, according to OT for the analysis of bilingual grammar, a higher ranked constraint overwrites the conflict of the lower ranked. In the interrelation of Power and Solidarity, we have seen that Power outranks Solidarity, so the ranking of a third constraint (in this case, Faith) becomes relevant only to the constraint ranked higher in relation of the other two (in this case Power).

In sum, we have seen that Power outranks Solidarity, and Faith outranks Power, so the relation of the three constraints can be computed as follows:

FAITH >> POWER >> SOLIDARITY

Further examples are necessary to complement the ranking by positioning the two other constraints: Perspective and Face.

Now, let's consider the interaction of Perspective and Power. In Example [16], the speaker switches to Hindi from English to “animate the local politicians’ response to the Kashmiri migrant problem” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 20).

Example [16] – The interaction of PERSPECTIVE and POWER

- 1 A “What are the politicians doing about the migrant problem I would like to know”
- 2 B “They do nothing, they say *kashmiriyon ko pahle khud organize hona paRhega*”

(... Kashmiris themselves have to first get organized)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 20))

The switch to Hindi (line 2) optimally serves the function of perspective taking by giving voice to the local politicians and by enabling the speaker to shift from his role of a narrator to that of the local politicians. The switch to Hindi, therefore, complies more optimally with the constraint of Perspective than the monolingual candidate. The switch to Hindi, however, violates the constraint of Power as it moves away from the language of power to the language of Hindi, indicating shared ethnicity and a distance from English.

Tableau 4: Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and POWER (PERSPECTIVE >> POWER)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSPECTIVE	FACE	POWER	SOLIDARITY
→ (a) “They do nothing, they say <i>kashmiriyon ko pahle khud organize hona paRhega</i> ”				*	
(b) “They do nothing, they say “Kashmiris should first themselves get organized””		*!			

Adopting an empirically-based, inductive way of logic, it can be detected that the actual surface representation is the code-switched one, which complies more optimally with the socio-pragmatic function of Perspective necessitated by the situation than the monolingual candidate. The switch, however, violates the constraint of Power. Relying on the fundamental premise of

OT that the most optimal candidate, the actual output cannot violate the higher ranked constraint, the constraint of Perspective must outrank the constraint of Power.

As Faith, Face, and Solidarity are not activated by this utterance, more data must be provided to determine their rank in interaction with the other constraints and one another.

The interaction of Face, with Power and Solidarity is shown in Example [17]. In this example, the switch to English indicates how it fulfils the principle of Face by mitigating a face-threatening request. The switch is also an example of fulfilling the constraint of Power, violating the constraint of Solidarity.

Example [17] – The interaction of FACE, POWER and SOLIDARITY

1 A “mujhe paise kii kabhii zarurat paRhegii, *I will ask B.*”

(‘When/If I need money I will ask B.’)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 15))

The intended socio-pragmatic function of this utterance is to enable the speaker to avoid or mitigate a face-threatening act, the potential act of negative politeness, when he is borrowing money from B. In this multilingual speech community, there are three candidates to fulfill this intended function through surface realization: the monolingual Hindi, the code-switch to English,

or to Kashmiri. In this community, each code has a clear role: English is the official language, the language of power and authority, Hindi is the unofficial language, and Kashmiri is the language of intimacy of the Kashmiri minority. Mitigating a face-threatening act is the most optimally achieved by gaining authority and/or control in the situation. As English is the power of authority, the switch to English (line 1) complies with Face as well as with Power, rendering it a more optimal candidate than the monolingual Hindi or the code-switch to Kashmiri. The switch to English violates Solidarity, but as has been pointed out previously, Solidarity ranks below Power, so it does not conflict with the English code-switched candidate. In sum, the optimal candidate, the switch to English, the actual surface realization complies with Face and Power, violating Solidarity. The second most successful candidate, the switch to Kashmiri, also complies with Face, but it violates Power. If the output complies with Face and Power, while the second most successful candidate complies with Face but violates Power, then adopting an algorithmic way of thinking, Face must outrank Power.

Tableau 5: Interaction of FACE, POWER and SOLIDARITY (FACE >> POWER >> SOLIDARITY)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSPECTIVE	FACE	POWER	SOLIDARITY
→ (a) ”mujhe paise kii kabhii zarurat paRhegii, <i>I will ask B</i> ” `When I need money, I will ask B.`					*
(b) mujhe paise kii kabhii zarurat paRhegii, <i>ba pratsh B-as</i>				*!	
(c) mujhe paise kii kabhii zarurat paRhegii, main B-se maang luuNgaa			*!		

Relying on the empirical data provided above, the ranking of constraints vis-à-vis one another can be computed as follows:

POWER >> SOLIDARITY [Example 14]

FAITH >> POWER [Example 15]

PERSPECTIVE >> POWER [Example 16]

FACE >> POWER [Example 17]

In an algorithmic representation, as no evidence has been provided for the conflict between Faith, Perspective, and Face, the ranking of constraint in the Kashmiri-Hindi-English speech community follows Bolonyai and Bhatt's hypothesis:

{FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE} >> POWER >> SOLIDARITY

4.3.2.2. Optimal bilingual grammar: Hungarian-English code-switching

The ranking of constraints in the Hungarian-English data (collected in the Hungarian-American immigrant community) differs from the Kashmiri-Hindi-English ranking. According to Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 41), the Hungarian-English ranking is as follows:

{FAITH, PERSPECTIVE} >> SOLIDARITY >> {FACE, POWER}

The first example indicates that in the interaction of Solidarity and Power, Solidarity outranks Power.

Example [18] – The interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER

- 1 A “I’ve tried to call you several times, but your voicemail picks up
2 immediately. *Minden rendben?* (‘Is everything all right?’) Call or e-mail
 me back.”

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 21))

In this utterance, the intended meaning of the switch to Hungarian is to enable the mother to expose her genuine feelings of worrying about her son. By switching to Hungarian (line 2), which is the language of intimacy and closeness shared with the son, the mother can maximally express her motherly concern. The switch to Hungarian, however, violates the constraint of Power as it deprives the mother of her superior position, control over the situation. The optimal output, the actual surface representation is the code-switch to Hungarian, which complies with Solidarity but violates Power. Relying on the premise of OT, the optimal candidate cannot violate the highest ranking constraint, so Solidarity must outrank Power. Perspective, Faith, and Face are not activated by this utterance.

Tableau 6: Interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER (SOLIDARITY >> POWER)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSPECTIVE	SOLIDARITY	FACE	POWER
→ (a) “I’ve tried to call you several times, but... <i>Minden rendben?</i> ”					*
(b) ‘I’ve tried to call you several times, but ... Is everything all right?’			*!		

The next example [19] shows how Solidarity and Face interact with each other in the Hungarian-English data.

Example [19] – The interaction of SOLIDARITY and FACE (and POWER)

- 1 A “*Köszí szépen, M. Ha esetleg át tudnád rendezni a funkciókat in*
2 *alphabetical order, az nagy segítség lenne.*”

(‘Thanks very much, M. If you could maybe re-organize the functions in alphabetical order that would be great.’)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 22))

In this utterance, the professor makes a request to her graduate student. Making a request involves face-work, and in order not to lose face, the professor should retain her superior position, her authority in the situation. As English is the official language of their cooperation, the professor's potential switch to English would function as a means of avoiding face-threat by retaining a superior position. As such, the switch to English would comply with the constraint of Face and Power as well. However, the professor opts for making the request in Hungarian, in their language of shared ethnicity, the language of solidarity. By complying with the constraint of Solidarity, the professor demonstrates that she makes a request to her student on the shared platform of Hungarian ethnicity rather than from the superior position of a professor. The monolingual candidate, hence, the lack of code-switch, which is the actual surface representation complies with Solidarity but violates Face and Power. The monolingual candidate violates two constraints, while the English code-switch only one, however, the monolingual candidate violates the lower ranked constraints. As violating a higher ranked constraint is lethal, the monolingual candidate ends up as the optimal choice in this utterance. In sum, Solidarity outranks Face and Power.

Tableau 7: Interaction of SOLIDARITY and FACE (SOLIDARITY >> FACE)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSPECTIVE	SOLIDARITY	FACE	POWER
→ (a) “Köszö szépen, M. <i>Ha esetleg át tudnád rendezni a funkciókat ...</i> ”				*	*
(b) “Thank you very much, M. If you could maybe re-organize the functions ...”			*!		

In the examples listed above, we have seen that Solidarity outranks both Face and Power. However, we have not seen empirical evidence of the interaction of Faith and Perspective with Solidarity. Example [20] indicates how Faith and Solidarity relate to one another.

Example [20] – The interaction of FAITH and SOLIDARITY

- 1 A “Most itt azóta van rend, amióta előjött ez az ... izé, a *homeland security*
- 2 probléma, most mindenhol civil ruhás, meg egyenruhás rendőrök vannak,
- 3 és ezek ... az ilyen bűnözések egy kicsit lecsökkentek, mert mindent
- 4 figyelnek.”

(`Now, here it's been order since this ... this whatchamacallit, the homeland security problem has come up, now there are policemen in plainclothes and uniform everywhere, and these ... like the crimes have decreased a little, because they are watching everything.`)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

This utterance provides clear indication of Faith outranking Solidarity. The speaker switches to English in line 1 to express the most authentically a socio-cultural concept embedded in contemporary American life. The switch, hence, complies with the constraint of Faith. However, it violates Solidarity, as the speaker switches to the language of Power, English, from the default language of the conversation, Hungarian. As the actual surface representation is the switch to English, it is the more optimal choice serving the intended socio-pragmatic function of maximum authenticity. The actual surface representation, the code-switched candidate complying with Faith, is a more optimal choice than the monolingual candidate complying with Solidarity. As based on the OT framework, no successful candidate can violate a higher ranked constraint, Faith must outrank Solidarity.

Tableau 8: Interaction of FAITH and SOLIDARITY (FAITH >> SOLIDARITY)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSPECTIVE	SOLIDARITY	FACE	POWER
→ (a) “... amióta előjött ez az ... izé, a <i>homeland security</i> probléma ...”			*		
(b) “... amióta előjött ez az ... izé, a honföld biztonság probléma ...”	*!				*

The next example [21] provides empirical evidence of Perspective outranking Solidarity.

Example [21] – The interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY

1 A “... És el kezdtek magyarázni, hogy *we’ll explain you the situation.*”

(...and they began to explain that, “we’ll explain you the situation”.)

(cited by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 31-32))

In this extract, the speaker switches to English to give voice to the other person in the recalled episode to reflect the dialogicity of the situation as well as parodying the American bank clerk. The switch, therefore, enables the speaker to shift perspectives, to leave the role of the

narrator to taking on the role of the quoted American bank clerk. The switch to English complies with the constraint of Perspective but violates the constraint of Solidarity as English is the language of power, the language of the American, host society. The monolingual candidate, on the other hand, would not so efficiently enable the speaker to take different roles, or perspectives as well as expressing the speaker’s parodic stance on the situation. However, it would comply with Solidarity. As the actual surface representation is the switch to English, following OT logic, Perspective must outrank Solidarity.

Tableau 9: Interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY (PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY)

Candidates	FAITH	PERSPECTIVE	SOLIDARITY	FACE	POWER
→ (a) “... És el kezdtek magyarázni, hogy <i>we explain you the situation.</i> ”			*		
(b) ‘... És el kezdtek magyarázni, hogy “megmagyarázzuk Önnek a helyzetet”.’		*!			*

Based on the empirical evidence provided above, the ranking of constraints in the Hungarian-English data can be computed as follows:

SOLIDARITY >> POWER [Example 18]

SOLIDARITY >> FACE [Example 19]

FAITH >> SOLIDARITY [Example 20]

PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY [Example 21]

Adopting an algorithmic representation of the rankings, it can be concluded that Faith and Perspective are ranked above Solidarity, while Solidarity ranks above Power. As no evidence has been found for a conflict in the interaction of Faith, and Perspective, or in that of Face and Power, they are ranked equally. Hence, the community ranking of constraints in the Hungarian-English data can be set up as follows:

{FAITH, PERSPECTIVE} >> {SOLIDARITY} >> {FACE, POWER}

Chapter 5: Background information on Hungarian-American immigrant communities

5.1. Introduction

Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual grammar premises upon the assumption that there is a universally applicable bilingual grammar, consisting of five principles, acting as constraints of linguistic inputs, of which ranking varies in different bi- or multilingual communities.

Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) have set up four socio-cultural-historical aspects relying on which the ranking of constraints can be hypothesized. These are “(1) differences in socio-cultural norms; (2) history of bilingual contact; (3) structural position of bilingual group within the larger social historical context; (4) and collective agency in how communities organize their bilingual resources and (re)negotiate meanings of code choice and CS in particular socio-political economies” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 14). In order to set up a hypothetical order of rankings in the Hungarian-American bilingual community in North Carolina, it is necessary to examine this particular community along these aspects proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming).

As the first aspect of community characteristics defined as “differences in socio-cultural norms” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 14) seems to be too vague in terms of its scope of study, it will be excluded from my investigation. The focus of my investigation, instead, will be on the three other socio-cultural-historical aspects. First, the history of bilingual contact will be

analyzed, that is, a historical overview of Hungarian-American immigration will be given. It will be followed by an examination of the structural position of the bilingual group within the larger social historical context, that is, how Hungarian-American communities can be positioned in the U.S. social context in terms of their socio-economic status. Thirdly, Hungarian language use patterns will be examined in the Hungarian-American immigrant communities. This will be followed by a short overview of the socioeconomic status and language use patterns prevalent in the Hungarian-American community in North Carolina, and finally, the Hungarian Club of North Carolina (later referred to as the NC Hungarian Club) will be introduced.

The aim of this part is to characterize Hungarian-American communities along their history, their socio-economic status, and from the perspective of the collective agency in how communities organize their bilingual resources. More precisely, how language use, with special emphasis on code-switching, functions in these communities. The underlying concept of this part is to show how the sociolinguistic characteristics of the Hungarian-American immigrant communities, more particularly those of the Hungarian-American community in North Carolina, define how these communities exploit their bilingual resources.

Relying on these sociolinguistic characteristics, I claim that the Hungarian-American community is not a uniform one but is made up by two most distinctively separable subcommunities, first- and second-generation groups. Therefore, I claim that the community specific ranking of the socio-cognitive constraints determining the mechanism of code-switching proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) is susceptible to the different sociolinguistic patterns emerging in these two subcommunities.

The analysis on the Hungarian-American communities is based on the comprehensive research of relevant literature. The respective part on the Hungarian-American immigrant community in North Carolina relies on Bolonyai's (unpublished) survey conducted in 2007 as well as on US Census Figures. For the description of the NC Hungarian Club, empirical data are provided by participant observation, by an ample quantity of personal interviews, as well as by sociolinguistic data deriving from questionnaires filled out by the members of the community (see the sample questionnaire in Appendix 2).

Prior to the analysis of the Hungarian-American bilingual communities along the three aspects outlined above, a short overview of sociolinguistic research on Hungarian-American immigrant communities will be presented.

5.2. Sociolinguistic research on Hungarian-American immigrant communities

The earliest comprehensive sociolinguistic research on Hungarian-American immigrant communities analyzed Hungarian-American immigrant communities from the perspective of Hungarian language maintenance efforts. In his monograph, Fishman (1966) examined the Hungarian-American community's organizational efforts aimed at maintaining the Hungarian language and traditions from the beginning (the 1870s) to the 1960s with special emphasis on the traditional Hungarian-American ethnic organizations such as Hungarian Catholic Churches,

schools, the media, and special Hungarian events. He claims that Hungarian-American communities – alike other central and eastern European immigrant groups – have been caught in the supposedly contradictory dilemma of either maintaining their ethnic traditions and language or trying to be fully integrated in mainstream society. The success of the Hungarian-American community's maintenance efforts were exacerbated by the American society's stigma attached to these immigrants because of their rural background and later because of Hungary's political affiliation with Germany. Fishman claims that with the emergence of the first second-generation, Hungarian maintenance efforts already weakened, however, these second-generation members could still read, write, and speak in Hungarian. The position of the Hungarian language was further undermined by the post-World War II period and by the third generation of Hungarian-Americans; Hungarian language loss had been complete, even though this generation did not feel the stigma attached to previous Hungarian generations. Parallel to this, the use of Hungarian in the traditional ethnic Hungarian organizations had also been on the decline. Fishman points out that the most successful Hungarian organization in cherishing Hungarian traditions and language has been the Hungarian Scout Organization. The significance of Fishman's monograph is that it was the first comprehensive study analyzing the process of Hungarian maintenance efforts both from a historical and a sociolinguistic perspective.

Later research concentrated on particular communities, especially on the 'old-timer' Hungarian-American communities founded by the early waves of Hungarian-American immigrants. Papp published her research findings on Hungarian-Americans and their communities in Cleveland, Ohio (1981). Examining this particular community from the perspective of Hungarian language use, she has also pointed out that although second-generation

speakers of Hungarian were perfectly bilingual; the concept of Hungarian for them had already changed. However, it was World War II that significantly weakened Hungarian language use among second-generation speakers. According to her, 50,000 Hungarian-Americans served in the US army during World War II, the majority of whom after the war did not return to their original Hungarian settings. She also points out that the Hungarian Scout Organization has been the most successful in preserving the Hungarian language and culture for the second-generations.

Kontra's work (1990) examined a traditional Hungarian ethnic community, South Bend, in Indiana in the period of 1978-1981 from the perspective of sociolinguistic and structural language use tendencies (40 interviews, 80 hours of Hungarian recordings). He has shown that in that particular community in the 1980s, the process of language shift or assimilation was taking place at an accelerating rate. In the 1980s, of the three traditional Hungarian ethnic organizations – the churches, political, and social clubs – only the churches functioned. The Hungarian Catholic Church was the only one that offered Hungarian-language masses every Sunday. Family remained the main domain where the use of Hungarian still prevailed, but reciprocal communication was common, that is, the children rarely responded to their parents' Hungarian in Hungarian, but rather in English. In addition to describing the sociolinguistic aspects of language shift in this particular community, Kontra has also offered a comprehensive analysis of the structural differences of Hungarian-American language use as compared to standard Hungarian. He has classified these structural changes in terms of phonology (aspiration, long vowels, the retroflex *r* sound, vowel harmonization, diphthongs, etc.), morphology (the lack of harmonization of *-val*, *-vel* suffixes, the replacement of the inessive case ending with superessive, etc.), semantics (word order, numerical agreement, redundant pronouns, syntactic

calques, etc.), vocabulary (borrowings, code-switching, intralingual deviations, interlingual deviations, hybrid words, etc.), personal names (orthography, spelling, last names, first names, middle names, etc), and in terms of communicational interferences (*tu/vois* forms, *szokott* plus infinitive).

Bartha conducted research on the social and linguistic characteristics of the Hungarian community in Detroit (Delray), Ohio, in 1987 (15 sociolinguistic interviews, 20 hours of recordings), and she published some of her results in 1995-1996. She claims that a shifting importance of the Hungarian language to the English one as well as more evident signs of Hungarian language attrition can already be seen with the emergence of second-generation speakers. The process of attrition runs parallel with the functional reduction of Hungarian – second-generation speakers use no Hungarian in the most important public domain, that is, the workplace. Furthermore, as second-generation speakers learn Hungarian as a second language, in an English-speaking, environment, they acquire a modified Hungarian language system that has been subject to externally induced changes, such as interference, transfer, convergence as well as to internally induced changes, such as analogical leveling, overgeneralization, and category switch. Although internally and externally induced changes influence the speech of both first- and second-generation speakers, in the former group's language use lexical changes are predominant, while the internally induced ones are more typical of second-generation speakers.

The permanent influence of the analytical English language strengthens the analytical attributes (the tendency to replace suffixes with analytic or periphrastic constructions or the

overwhelming use of Hungarian personal pronouns) of the agglutinative Hungarian. This process of attrition emerging with the second-generation gradually results in complete language loss.

In 1994, Bartha conducted sociolinguistic research in New Brunswick, New Jersey (45 subjects, 180 hours of recordings). In her study, Bartha has pointed out that the functional reduction of the Hungarian language takes place at a slower rate than, for example, in Detroit. Bartha has examined how this community's language use patterns correlate with its speakers' attitude to and ideological concept of the Hungarian language. She has found that these factors play a crucial role in decelerating the pace of language shift, which is normally completed by the third generation. As a result of the positive attitude to and positive concept of Hungarian, it remains the primary symbol of Hungarian ethnic identity. For the whole community, Hungarian is a shared value and the use of Hungarian prevails in such situations as well where – in other Hungarian-American communities – English does, for instance, when speaking with spouses (it is true, though, that mostly in the non-mixed marriages) and with children. Bartha claims that the process of language shift always has to be examined in the subcontext of the attitudes and concepts attached to languages, as these can delay, though eventually cannot stop, language loss.

Fenyvesi (1995) conducted research (20 interviews, 13 hours of recordings) on the linguistic changes that Hungarian spoken by a Hungarian-American immigrant community (in McKeesport, Pennsylvania) undergoes in a language contact situation in 1993. Her study is a comprehensive analysis of the structural changes that Hungarian as an agglutinative language undergoes due to English interference, changes induced by the language contact situation, as well as to the natural simplification tendencies of the Hungarian language, that is, internally

induced language changes. The contact-induced linguistic interference tendencies emerging in the Hungarian-American language in McKeesport have been demonstrated on the levels of phonology, (e.g. the presence of aspiration, the lengthening of stressed short vowels, etc.), morphology (e.g. disharmonic inflections, replacement of pre-verb constructions, the loss of the case marking system, etc.), syntax (e.g. presence of overt personal pronouns, lack of agreement between subject and verb, the overt use of the passive, etc.), lexicon (e.g. borrowings, the address system, code-switching, etc.).

Going along the same theoretical line, Fenyvesi (2005) in her study on the language use characteristics of the Hungarian-American language in Toledo has focused on the different linguistic tendencies emerging in this community other than in standard Hungarian-Hungarian. She has concluded that the most noticeable differences are word order, the use of redundant personal pronouns, analytical structures, the overt use of past participles with a passive meaning, the loss of the possessive marking, singular and plural forms of nouns, and lack of agreements.

Kovács (2005) conducted research on the expression of dual Hungarian-American identities, and the written language skills of second-generation speakers of New Brunswick analyzing second-generation Hungarian-American soldiers' letters sent home during World War II. Her findings show that the majority of second-generation speakers had a balanced dual ethnic identity, were perfectly bilingual, though, preferred the use English for written communication. The Hungarian language knowledge of the subjects showed some signs of attrition, but it appropriately fulfilled its communicative function.

5.3. Hungarian-American immigrant communities: A history of bilingual contact

The first and most numerous Hungarian wave of immigration (1.5 million people), who came to the US in the period of 1870 and 1914 was propelled by socioeconomic reasons.³ Mostly, people from the rural areas of Hungary came and settled down in the traditional Hungarian communities in such as in Ohio, New Jersey, close to big steel mills and mines where they were employed mostly as semi- or unskilled workers (Puskás 2000: 119, Fenyvesi 2005: 267). These early settlers came to the US to earn some money and then to go back to Hungary (Papp 1981: 105, Fenyvesi 2005: 266), they never really wanted to or could integrate in the US host society (Kontra 1990: 24).

As these early immigrants settled close the steel mills and mines, they were also living in close-knit communities with their fellow workers, many of whom were Hungarians (Papp 1981: 105). In the 1930s in New Brunswick, for example, one-fifth of the entire Hungarian-American population working in steel mills and mines lived in a few nearby streets and constituted a very close-knit community (Kovács 2005: 158).

The following waves of immigration were propelled by political rather than economic reasons, and most of the immigrants left Hungary with no intention of returning. After the fall of the liberal democrat revolution, in the period between 1921 and 1940, 38,541 Hungarian liberal

³ According to Papp (1981), between 1870 and 1920, an estimated 1,078, 974 number of Hungarians immigrated to the United States.

democrats entered the United States (Papp 1981: 129). The majority of them were highly qualified intellectuals (Fishman 1966: 7-8). After the treaty of Trianon, many “sojourner” types of immigrants who had been planning to return to their homeland, had to change their plans as they did not want to return to the successor countries (Puskás 2000: 197-198, Fenyvesi 2005: 267).

The next large wave of Hungarians (26,000 people) (Papp 1981: 139), the DP’s (Displaced Persons) came to the US after World War II propelled also by political reasons. The third wave of immigration (35,705 people) (Papp 1981: 142) came in 1956 and 1957 during and after the Revolution of 1956.

Although the political orientation of these later waves of Hungarian immigration varied, they all left Hungary for political reasons, and had no intention of returning soon when they left.

The end of the 1950s put an end to the mass immigration waves of Hungarians into the US. More than 50% of the foreign-born American-Hungarians came to the USA before 1965 (Papp Z. 2008: 376). The 1980s, however, saw a rise in the number of Hungarian immigrants: 175,000 came in the 1980s (Fenyvesi 2005: 268).

In the second half of the 1990s, a considerable rise in the number of Hungarian immigrants can be detected. In the period of 1995 and 2000, 11,900 Hungarians immigrated to the U.S. as compared to 7,442 between 1990 and 1994 (Papp Z. 2008: 376). These immigrants came to the US mostly for economic reasons (Papp Z. 2008: 453).

As for the present situation, according to the U.S. Census Bureau Data, in 2000, 1,398,724 people professed to be of Hungarian-American ancestry. 904,662 of them claimed to be of first Hungarian ancestry, while 494,062 of second ancestry. That makes Hungarian-Americans the 21st largest ancestry group in the US, the third largest ethnic population of eastern European origin after people of Polish and Russian descent (Fenyvesi 2005: 269).

5.4. Hungarian-American immigrant communities: Structural position within the larger socio-historical context

Hungarian-American immigrant communities are socially and economically quite heterogeneous; however, examining them from a historical perspective, depending on the time of their immigration, they can be classified into distinctively separable groups. Depending on the date of immigration, and the reasons for immigration, Hungarian immigrants can be characterized in terms of their socio-economic status in the American society as well as by the success of their integration efforts into American society.

The first wave of Hungarian immigrants worked mostly as semi- or unskilled workers in close-knit immigrant communities close to big American steel mills and mines, so they had limited access to upward social mobility. Other socio-cultural and political factors such as a hostile US policy to immigrants during World War I (Fishman 1966: 8), their low qualifications,

and their poor English language competence also hampered their process of integration in the USA.

The following waves of Hungarian-American immigrants left Hungary for political reasons and had more extensive opportunities for achieving a higher socio-economic status in the US society. After the fall of the Liberal Revolution in 1919, mostly highly intellectual liberals fled Hungary, who – primarily thanks to their high qualifications – could be more successfully integrated in the US society having more access to upward social mobility.

The following large wave of Hungarians were the DP's after World War II, mainly the supporters of the neo-conservative Hungarian regime, and as such, they had intellectual and social capital reserves that they could rely on when they came to the US (Fishman 1966: 11). As a result of that, they were less interested in being integrated into the US society, mainly for their committed loyalty toward Hungary that they left behind.

The immigrants who came to the US after the Revolution in 1956 were welcomed by particularly great sympathy as `Freedom Fighters` against the Soviets (Falk-Bánó 1988: 165), and this favorable attitude on the part of the host society as well as this group's avid interest in becoming American (Fishman 1966: 14) eased their assimilation.

As a result of these factors: the adverse political situation in Hungary and the positive attitude of the host society, especially in the case of the `Freedom Fighters`, and their high socio-cultural statuses in Hungary, these `later` waves of Hungarian-American immigrants could more easily integrate into American society, and they were more socio-economically mobile than their `earlier` fellows.

Clyne and Fernandez (2005: 11) claim that immigrant communities can be placed along a bi-polar continuum – ranging from the two extreme points of conforming and defiant communities – in terms of how successful are their efforts aimed at being integrated into the host society. According to Armstrong’s definition (1976) adopted by Fejős (2005), immigrant communities can also be characterized as Proletarian and mobilized diasporas in terms of their relatively high or low socio-economic status in the host society.

Adopting the theories of Clyne and Fernandez (2005) as well as that of Armstrong (1976) and Fejős (2005) for the characterization of Hungarian-American immigrant communities – depending on the date of migration (in the first wave: between 1870 and 1914, in the second wave: between 1921 and 1940, in the third wave: after World War II, and in the fourth wave: during and after the revolution of 1956), and on the reasons for immigration (primarily political or economic) – Hungarian-American immigrants can be positioned along a four-tailed continuum as follows: the first wave of Hungarian immigrants are tilted towards being a defiant and Proletarian type of a Diaspora with limited opportunities for integration, while the next three waves (between 1921 and 1940, after World War II, and during and after the revolution of 1956) can be rather characterized as conforming, mobilized Diasporas, having better opportunities for integration.

As for the present situation, the Hungarian-American community has a more favorable socio-economic status than the US national average. According to the American Community Service’s figures as of 2004, Hungarian-Americans are more highly qualified than the US average. 35.3% of Hungarian-Americans have MA or higher qualifications, while the

corresponding national figure is 24%. Although 16.1% of Americans have lower than high school qualifications, this rate in the Hungarian-American community is only 7.5%. The annual income per capita among Hungarian-Americans is USD 30,879 as compared to the national average of USD 24,020. The largest segment of Hungarian-Americans (44.5%) hold managerial or work as professional consultants, while the corresponding segment of the American population is significantly lower – 34.1%. Relying on these figures, it can be concluded that in terms of its socioeconomic and educational status, the present Hungarian-American community is a mobilized, socio-economically highly positioned one.

5.5. Hungarian-American immigrant communities: Language use patterns

Similar to other ethnic immigrant communities, the Hungarian-American immigrant communities are also subject to language shift, that is, to the gradual expansion of the use of English as opposed to Hungarian. The most striking decline in the use of Hungarian can be observed in such domains as work, as within the family as well as within ethnic Hungarian institutions. This gradual process eventually leads to the complete language loss of Hungarian typically completed by the third generation of Hungarian-Americans (Bartha 2002: 121). When examining the process of language shift in Hungarian-American communities, a chronological order, proceeding toward the most recent period will be applied.

In the early Hungarian-American communities (New Brunswick, New Jersey; McKeesport, Pennsylvania; and Bridgeport, Connecticut), people were living in close-knit communities together with Hungarian fellow workers close to steel mills and mines, where they worked as unskilled or semi-skilled workers. For example in Cleveland, and Delray, most of the Hungarian immigrants spoke Hungarian with their fellow workers (Papp 1981: 229, Bartha 1995/1996: 413). As they were employed as unskilled or semi-skilled workers in large steel mills and mines working in Hungarian clusters, together with their fellow Hungarians, they did not learn a lot of English and used mainly Hungarian at work and in the family, as well (Bartha 1995/1996: 413). Consequently, in terms of their Hungarian language shift and maintenance patterns, these early settlers were more, consciously or unconsciously, motivated to maintain their Hungarian culture and Hungarian language.

Prevalent language shift in the Hungarian-American communities started with the emergence of the first Hungarian-American second generation. This generation was born as American citizens, or they grew up in the US, and the majority of them were (near) native English speakers.

Although family life as well as the activities of the most important Hungarian communal organizations (fraternal insurance associations) and churches were conducted in Hungarian, and second-generation Hungarian-Americans went to Hungarian schools and could write and speak in Hungarian (Fishman 1966: 10, Papp 1981: 133), the use of Hungarian significantly declined in the second generation outside the boundaries of the family (Fishman 1966: 10). First-generation community leaders realized that the exclusive use of Hungarian would prompt fewer second

generation speakers to take part and an interest in Hungarian communal life, so threatened by the potential loss of Hungarian culture in the successive generations, they tried to meet the new linguistic and social needs of the second generation. That is why the traditional Hungarian community organization, the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association, established its first English speaking branch in Cleveland, Ohio in 1934 (Puskás 2000: 243).

World War II and the immediate post-war period further weakened the position of the Hungarian language among second-generation Hungarian-Americans but strengthened their American loyalty and identity (Fishman 1966: 12; Papp 1981: 135; Puskás 2000: 254) accelerating the process of language shift.

The decline of the Hungarian language, in the macro-social domains such as work, administration, etc., and in the peer communities such as school continued. Even though second-generation speakers learned Hungarian at home, they had a limited Hungarian competence, particularly, in terms of their Hungarian vocabulary which was confined to the household and other everyday activities (Kovács 1982: 21).

This tendency was infused by a redefined function of Hungarian within the family. Second-generation speakers start to use Hungarian less often at home, and almost exclusively English in their peer communities. The `reciprocal` type of communication, that is, children responding in English to their parents' Hungarian (Kontra 1990: 27), becomes prevalent especially when second-generation speakers start school and become more exposed to peer pressure.

We have seen that it is the second generation where the use of Hungarian significantly changes. In the Hungarian-American communities, we can see an accelerating process of shifting from Hungarian to English. The main and almost exclusive domain where Hungarian is used is within the family, and mostly with the parents, though children respond in English to their parents' Hungarian.

Today, 88.3% of the people professed to be of Hungarian-American ancestry (US Census Bureau 2000) use only English at home. As Papp Z. has pointed out based on his comprehensive sociological research conducted among present-day Hungarian-Americans, “the younger generations are increasingly unlikely to speak the language of their parents” (2008: 439). It reinforces the notion that with every intergenerational cleft, the use of the Hungarian language reduces pointing gradually toward language death.

A strong institutional background of ethnic communities usually fosters language maintenance efforts (Bartha 2002: 120), but the prevalence of English in the traditional ethnic Hungarian institutions could not be hampered by Hungarian ethnic organizations.

Since the very beginning, Hungarian-American communities have had their own ethnic institutions. The first Roman Catholic Church (St. Elizabeth) was built by Hungarians in Cleveland, Ohio in 1893 (Papp 1981: 116). The first two congregations of the Reformed Church were organized in 1891, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Papp 1981: 119).

Churches, fraternal associations, Hungarian summer and Sunday schools, and clubs have supported the maintenance efforts of Hungarian-Americans. The Reformed Church particularly has been an “avid supporter of Hungarian language instruction” (Papp 1981: 120). Between the

two world wars, churches in fifty-six cities offered Saturday or Sunday Hungarian language instruction and 68 churches conducted summer school classes (Papp 1981: 120).

Besides the church organizations, Hungarians also had their secular organizations. With a view to provide sickness benefits for their fellow Hungarians, the first and largest, the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association was founded in Hazleton, Pennsylvania, in 1886 (Papp 1981: 123). By the 1950s, this organization had lost its dominantly Hungarian character and was turned into the William Penn Insurance Association (Papp 1981: 123). Unlike Verhovay, the second largest secular organization, the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, founded in 1986 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, was more successful in retaining its Hungarian character. It sponsored Hungarian school camps, books and educational materials (Papp 1981: 124).

Early Hungarian settlers founded their own newspapers, of which two became dailies; *Szabadság* founded in 1891, in Cleveland, Ohio and *Amerikai Magyar Népszava*, in 1899, in New York City.

At present, of the Hungarian community organizations, only churches and clubs function, with the former usually offering mixed language services. Hungarian language media services are also on the decline. In the present situation, only Hungarian newspapers of national distribution are available, and there are only local Hungarian radio stations (Fenyvesi 2005: 278). However, with the prevalent use of the internet, more Hungarian-Americans have access to Hungarian language media.

In spite of the gradually narrowing scope of Hungarian-American communal activities, there are still regular events relating more or less closely to Hungarian culture, such as the annual

Hungarian balls in the Kennedy Center in Baltimore every year with the symphonic orchestra of Washington playing Strauss Waltzes, the “Radetzky” Marching song (Amerikai Magyar Értesítő 1994, No.2. p.17). The Los Angeles Hungarian-American community regularly organizes “Széchenyi” tea events to raise money for Hungarians, and they also chant Hungarian poems by Babits, Petőfi, and sing Strauss, Schubert songs regarded to be part of the shared cultural heritage of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (Amerikai Magyar Hírlap, 1999, March, p.5). When celebrating, Hungarian-Americans like indulging in Hungarian culinary rarities such as *Pick salami*, Easter ham, *beigli*, and *Tibi* chocolate (Amerikai Magyar Hírlap, 1999, March, p. 6).

It shows that the most time-resistant Hungarian ethnic core values are the mixture of residual culinary and dance folk traditions, the popular cultural elements of the common Austro-Hungarian heritage, as well as some literary traditions. These tendencies seem to reinforce Fejős’s observation (2005: 21) on the present American-Hungarian communities, which can be characterized by “the occasional, situational, and conscious affiliations to their symbolic ethnicity”.

In one of the oldest Hungarian settlements, in New Brunswick, New Jersey, though, there is a vigorous intellectual Hungarian community. The Hungarian Institute of Rutgers University has been helping learners of Hungarian and researchers of Hungarian culture since 1991. The American-Hungarian Foundation moved here in 1959, and the Hungarian Heritage Center has been organizing exhibits, and other cultural activities (Papp 2002: 82).

Despite the prominent case of New Brunswick, it can be concluded that the traditional Hungarian-American ethnic – religious and secular – institutions have been declining in terms of

their numbers and in terms of their significance in fostering Hungarian-American cultural traditions and the Hungarian language.

According to Smolicz's (1981) Core Values Theory, language maintenance efforts are more successful if language is regarded to be a fundamental component of a group's culture. If Hungarian constitutes a core value in Hungarian culture, it is more likely to be maintained in an immigrant setting. The role of the Hungarian language in expressing Hungarian ethnic affiliation has undergone some significant changes.

With regards to the value associated with Hungarian language, a significant difference can be observed in first- and second- (and third-)generation speakers. Fejős (1992: 77-78) observed that second- and third-generation Hungarian-Americans can express their ethnicity the most easily by the means of English.

Now, in the majority of Hungarian-American communities, Hungarian no longer plays a central role in expressing Hungarian ethnic identity (Bartha 2002: 132). For the American-born generations, language has become less important than the traditions regarded as authentically Hungarian symbols of Hungarian identity (Bartha 1995/96: 415).

The Hungarian language, though it remains to be regarded an important Hungarian asset, in the history of Hungarian-American immigrant communities, has become of secondary importance in comparison with some vestigial ethnic traditions commonly supposed as symbolizing authentic Hungarian culture and identity.

5.6. The Hungarian-American community in North Carolina: Sociolinguistic background

As there are no published studies regarding the sociolinguistic characteristics of the Hungarian-American community in North Carolina, I will partly rely on the US Census Bureau's figures as well as on Bolonyai's unpublished survey conducted in 2007 among 78 subjects in the Hungarian-American community in North Carolina, more precisely, in the Research Triangle, that is, in the area surrounded by the cities of Raleigh, Durham, and Cary, which for its good economic and job opportunities have attracted recently many Hungarian-Americans. This survey, for its fairly small-scale of data, cannot be regarded representative of the entire Hungarian-American community of North Carolina. However, it can be regarded representative of that particular segment of the Hungarian-American immigration community – which usually is made up by at most 10% of the entire Hungarian-American population (Papp Z. 2008: 448) – who regularly attend the Hungarian-American community's events and organizations, the most active members of the NC Hungarian Club, the particular target of my survey.

Bolonyai conducted an attitude and language use survey in a group of 78 Hungarian-Americans living in North Carolina. I have access to her survey data as I gave her assistance in processing and analyzing the data. The questionnaire consisted of three parts (see Appendix 2). In the first part, subjects were asked about their individual and sociolinguistic variables such as age, gender, generation, mother tongue, competence, ethnic identity, qualifications, and job.

In part 2, subjects were asked to express their opinions on three sets of statements. The first two sets consisted of 15 statements, and the statements examined the subjects' attitudes to Hungarian, and English. The third set of statements consisted of 10 statements on the act of code-switching.

In part 3, subjects were asked to answer questions on their language use tendencies, that is, which language, English or Hungarian, they use with certain people and in certain situations.

The aim of this survey was to find correlations between attitude to English and Hungarian language(s) and language uses (Hungarian, English and Code-switching), language use patterns, and how these are influenced by the sociolinguistic characteristics of subjects. As no other sources are available describing the sociolinguistic characteristics of this particular community, I will rely on this. As the comprehensive sociolinguistic description of this particular community is not the primary focus of my thesis, I will highlight only the most conspicuous characteristics of the community.

A comparatively low rate of Hungarians-Americans live in North-Carolina. In 2000, 16,100 people professed to be of Hungarian descent in the state of North Carolina (US Census), while the entire population of North Carolina is 9,222,414. An even more insignificant number of people, 940, claim to speak Hungarian. Although exact figures concerning the socio-economic status of North Carolina Hungarian-Americans are lacking, in the survey conducted by Bolonyai, the high proportion of professionals, is striking. Of the subjects, 64% hold an MA or a PhD; 28% a BA; and 8% a high school certificate.

Table 1: Qualifications

Responses	High School	BA	MA or PhD
N=78 (11 N/A)	5 (8%)	19 (28%)	43 (64%)

As Bolonyai's survey (2007) was conducted among those Hungarian-Americans who actively attend the Hungarian club's events, it can be observed that among those Hungarian-Americans in North Carolina, for whom attending the Hungarian-American community's events – including the Hungarian club – is important, the subjects have higher qualifications than the average in North Carolina. In comparison, in North Carolina, 22.5% of the population aged over 25 have BA or higher qualifications, slightly lower than the US average, 24.4% (US Census Bureau State and County Quick Facts 2008), while in the Hungarian-American community, it is 64%. Therefore, taking into consideration the strikingly high qualifications of this group of Hungarian-Americans, which is an important measure of the socio-economic status in the US, this group is a good example of a highly qualified, educationally prestigious immigrant community.

It is also important to note that in comparison with the average in the state of North Carolina as well as with the US average, this community seems to be an aging one. 20% of the Hungarian-American community is aged over 61, while only 12.4% of North Carolinians are, and the corresponding national figure in the US is 12.8%. The youngest segment of the Hungarian-American community is the smallest one, the subjects aged between 9 and 20 make up only 13% of the sample, while in North Carolina, the proportion of those aged under 18 is 24.3% as high as the US national average. The most numerous segment of the Hungarian-

American sample is made up by those aged between 21 and 40, 39%, followed by the age group of 41-60, 28%.

Table 2: Ages

Responses	61+	41 – 60	21 – 40	8 – 20
N=78 (11 N/A)	13 (20%)	19 (28%)	26 (39%)	9 (13%)

The aging structure of the community is also reflected by the proportion of first- and second-generation members. 78% of the subjects are first-generation Hungarian-Americans, while 22% belong to the second generation. This figure also shows that the vast majority of this community is made up by first-generation members. As the members of this community regularly attend the Hungarian-American events, because, for various reasons, they are interested in cherishing Hungarian traditions, it can be concluded that this interest among second-generation members considerably declines. Also, the majority of the second-generation members are young children or young adults, and they attend the Hungarian-American events mostly because their parents, the first-generation members, bring them with them. There are only few second-generation Hungarian-Americans who continue to attend the Hungarian-American community's events even if their parents do not. Also, there is a striking difference between the ages of first- and second-generation subjects. The majority of second-generation subjects (47%) are younger than 20 years, while the majority of first-generation subjects (40%) are aged between 21–40, which well reflects the parent-child relationship between first- and second-generation members.

Table 3: Age in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	61+	41–60	21–40	8–20
G1 (N=61, 11 N/A)	13 (26%)	16 (32%)	20 (40%)	1(2 %)
G2 (N=17)	0	3 (18%)	6 (35%)	8 (47%)

Generational difference in terms of claimed mother tongue, perceived Hungarian competence and ethnic identity is also conspicuous. In the second-generation group (G2), the proportion of those subjects who claim that Hungarian is their mother tongue (29%) significantly declines as compared to first-generation (G1) speakers (97%).

Table 4: Claimed mother tongues in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	Hungarian (claimed mother tongue)	Both English and Hungarian (claimed mother tongues)	English (claimed mother tongue)
G1 (N=61, 2 N/A)	57 (97%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)
G2 (N=17)	5 (29%)	12 (71%)	0

It can be seen in Table 4 that no G2 speaker claims English to be their mother tongue, the majority of them claim that both English and Hungarian are their mother tongues.

Hungarian competence also highly correlates with generational affiliation. No G2 speaker has claimed that their Hungarian competence is stronger, while the majority of G1 speakers (62%) claim that their Hungarian competence is stronger than their English one. It is noteworthy

that a slight majority of G2 speakers (53%) have stated that their English and Hungarian competences are equal.

Table 5: Perceived Hungarian and English competence in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	Hungarian stronger	Equal competence	English stronger
G1 (N=61)	38 (62%)	20 (33%)	3 (5%)
G2 (N=17)	0	9 (53%)	8 (47%)

Claimed Hungarian identity also significantly changes along generational affiliation. The majority of G1 speakers (71%) profess to have Hungarian identity, while only 35% of G2 speakers do. Noteworthy that the majority of G2 speakers (59%) claim to have Hungarian-American ethnic identity.

Table 6: Ethnic identity in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	Hungarian ethnic identity	Hungarian-American ethnic identity	American ethnic identity	Other
G1 (N=61, 1N/A)	43 (71%)	15 (25%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
G2 (N=17)	6 (35%)	10 (59%)	1 (6%)	0

Such sociolinguistic characteristics as qualification, profession are insignificant in terms of generational differences for the young age of G2 subjects.

Apparently, in terms of sociolinguistic characteristics, generational affiliation is the most determinant factor dividing this particular community into two clearly distinct ones: first- and second-generation groups.

The second part of the survey has examined the attitude of subjects to the English and Hungarian languages, and to code-switching.

The respondents have had 5 options for each statement (strongly agree / agree / neutral or does not know / does not agree / strongly disagree). As for quantifying data for the analysis of the attitude survey, I have applied the Likert scale and evaluated the responses as follows in descending order : strongly agree – 5 / agree – 4 / neutral or does not know – 3 / does not agree – 2 / strongly disagree – 1 /. The higher figure is attributed to the statements, the more positive is the attitude of the subjects to the statement reflecting its importance.

Having examined the responses to the 40 statements more closely, I have detected tendencies as follows. In the entire community, there is a strong commitment to speaking Hungarian, mostly because it is the language that helps to communicate with Hungarian relatives (“Knowing Hungarian is important to relate to my relatives” – 3.8). At the same time, Hungarian is also important because it is viewed as part of the national ethnic tradition (“Hungarian is a major part of my cultural heritage” – 3.7).

Table 7: Statements on attitude to Hungarian scoring above average (average score of the responses is 2.7) in descending order

Ranking of statements	Statements	Average means scores of responses
1	(S7): Knowing Hungarian is important to relate to my relatives.	3.8
2	(S1): Hungarian is a major part of my cultural heritage.	3.7
3	(S9): It is important for me to read and write in Hungarian.	3.6
4	(S15): Knowing English is important in order for me to be involved in the community.	3.6
5	(S11): Hungarians in NC should try to preserve their language.	3.4
6	(S14): Knowing English is more important for socio-economic advancement.	3.2
7	(S10): It is important to be bilingual in Hungarian and English.	2.9
8	(S6): Knowing Hungarian is important to raise children.	2.9
9	(S3): Knowing Hungarian makes me a more intelligent person.	2.8

English is also seen as important, mostly for enabling the subjects to relate to the host, American society (“Knowing English is important in order for me to be involved in the community” – 3.6) and also for ensuring socio-economic opportunities (“Knowing English is more important for socio-economic advancement” – 3.2).

Table 8: Statements on attitude to English above average (average score of the responses is 2.7) in descending order

Ranking of statements	Statements	Average means scores of responses
1	(S15) Knowing English is important in order for me to be involved in the community.	3.6
2	(S14) Knowing English is more important for socio-economic advancement.	3.2

Applying the distinction between the intrinsic, extrinsic, instrumental vs. integrative functions of language (Dörnyei and Clement 2001), Hungarian is more valued for its intrinsic value, as a means of affiliation on a larger scale with the Hungarian ethnic, cultural tradition, and on a smaller scale, with relatives, and close family members. However, English is valued for its extrinsic, instrumental function.

As for the different recurring patterns prompted by generational affiliation, we can see that G2 speakers have evaluated Hungarian more positively than G1 speakers as a cultural advantage in North Carolina (S2: “Knowing Hungarian in North Carolina is a cultural advantage” – G2: 2.8 > G1: 1.5) as well as for other pragmatic reasons (S3: “Hungarian makes me a more intelligent person” – G2: 3.3 > G1: 2.7).

On the other hand, for G1 speakers, Hungarian as the best means of self-expression is significantly more important than for their G2 fellows (S20: “I feel I can express best who I am when I speak Hungarian” – G1: 2.6 > G2: 1.1). G1 speakers also showed a more supportive

attitude to the statement claiming that (S12) “Hungarian should be the first language learned at home in Hungarian families living in North Carolina” ($G1: 2.5 > G2: 1.9$).

Table 9: Attitudes to the Hungarian language in G1 vs. G2 groups

Statements	Average means scores of responses given by G1 speakers	Average means scores of responses given by G2 speakers
(S2) Knowing Hungarian in North Carolina is a cultural advantage.	1.5	2.8
(S3) Knowing Hungarian makes me a more intelligent person.	2.7	3.3
(S12) Hungarian should be the first language learned at home in Hungarian families living in North Carolina.	2.5	1.9
(S20) I feel I can express best who I am when I speak Hungarian.	2.6	1.1

G1 members highly evaluate English as a means of being involved in the US society (“Knowing English is important in order for me to be involved in the community” – $G1: 3.7 > G2: 1.3$) and as that of socio-economic advancement (“Knowing English is more important for socio-economic advancement” – $G1: 3.5 > G2: 2.4$)

For G2 members, on the other hand, English is the best means of self-expression (“I feel I can best express who I am when I speak English” – $G2: 2 > G1: 1.2$)

As for code-switching, the most characteristic attitude in the entire sample is a neutral one, that is, subjects acknowledge that “It is common for Hungarians who live in North Carolina to mix Hungarian and English when they speak” – (2.8).

Table 10: Statements on attitude to code-switching in descending order

Ranking of statements	Statements	Average means scores of responses
1	(S31) It is common for Hungarians who live in North Carolina to mix Hungarian and English when they speak.	2.8
2	(S39) I have noticed that sometimes English influences the way I speak Hungarian.	2.7
3	(S34) I am proud of being bilingual and being able to mix Hungarian with English.	1.9
4	(S40) Sometimes I feel I can speak neither Hungarian nor English well.	1.8
5	(S32) I consider it advantageous to use Hungarian and English together when talking with bilingual Hungarians living in the US.	1.7
6	(S33) I appreciate both Hungarian and English and I feel I can best express who I am when I mix them together.	1.7
7	(S35) I feel mixing Hungarian with English is a creative and interesting way of speaking.	1.6
8	(S38) Contact with the American community in North Carolina is changing the Hungarian language spoken in this community.	1.6
9	(S36) I disapprove of people mixing Hungarian and English in the same	1.5

	conversation.	
10	(S37) People who mix two languages together sound uneducated, careless and lazy.	1.5

However, noticeably different patterns in the attitude to code-switching emerge along generational affiliation. For G2 speakers, code-switched language is the most highly valued as a means of expressing their bilingual identity (“I appreciate both Hungarian and English and I feel I can best express who I am when I mix them together” – G2: 2.5 > G1: 1.5). They do not only acknowledge the practice of code-switching as a means of expressing their bilingual identity, but they are also proud of it (“I am proud of being bilingual and being able to mix Hungarian with English” – G2: 2.5 > G1: 1.7)

The most obvious deviation in the attitude scores associated with code-switching between G2 and G1 speakers has been identified in the following statement: “Contact with the American community in North Carolina is changing the Hungarian language spoken in this community” (G1: 1.8 > G2: 0.9). This neutral statement, lacking any kind of positive or negative attitude to the act of code-switching, shows that G1 speaker are more aware of the act of code-switching as a linguistic interference between English and Hungarian resulting from the contact situation.

Table 11: Attitudes to code-switching in G1 vs. G2 groups

Statements	Average means scores of responses given by G1 speakers	Average means scores of responses given by G2 speakers
(S31) It is common for Hungarians who live in North Carolina to mix Hungarian and English when they speak.	2.9	2.4
(S32) I consider it advantageous to use Hungarian and English together when talking with bilingual Hungarians living in the US.	1.7	1.9
(S33) I appreciate both Hungarian and English and I feel I can best express who I am when I mix them together.	1.5	2.5
(S34) I am proud of being bilingual and being able to mix Hungarian with English.	1.7	2.5
(S35) I feel mixing Hungarian with English is a creative and interesting way of speaking.	1.5	1.8
(S36) I disapprove of people mixing Hungarian and English in the same conversation.	1.4	1.6
(S37) People who mix two languages together sound uneducated, careless and lazy.	1.5	1.8
(S38) Contact with the American community in North Carolina is changing the Hungarian language spoken in this community.	1.8	0.9
(S39) I have noticed that sometimes English influences the way I speak Hungarian.	2.7	2.4
(S40) Sometimes I feel I can speak neither Hungarian nor English well.	1.9	1.3

As for language use, participant-related (e.g. “In what language do you speak to your parents, children?”, etc), situation-related (e.g. “What language do you use when dreaming, cursing?”, etc.), and media-related (e.g. “What language do you use when watching TV, reading books?”, etc.) language use patterns have been examined. When quantifying the responses given to the questions in the language use part of the questionnaire, I have applied the Likert scale. Each language option (Hungarian / English / Mixed) has been evaluated on a scale of 4 (Never (as well as `no` answer) – 0 / rarely – 1 / sometimes – 2 / often – 3 / always – 4). So the responses to each question have ranged from 0 to 4 in terms of each language option. The higher score implies more frequent language use in the relevant language domain.

In the entire sample, there is a clear separation of participant-related language use patterns. In descending order of frequency, Hungarian is used when speaking to parents (3.3), Hungarian friends (3), siblings (2.6), spouses (2.2), children (1.9), and other relatives in the US (1.7). English, however, is used in descending order of frequency when speaking to neighbors (3.6), doctors (3.5), colleagues (clients / school mates) (3.4). The distribution of language domains shows that Hungarian is used mostly within the family and within the Hungarian-American community, therefore, it is the language of intra-communication, while English is used mostly with Americans, so it is the language of inter-communication.

Table 12: Participant-related language use tendencies

In what language do you speak ... ?	Hungarian	English	Mixed
to your parents	3.3	0.5	0.5
to your spouse	2.2	0.9	0.7
to your children	1.9	1	0.6
to your siblings	2.6	0.5	0.5
to other relatives in the US	1.7	0.9	0.6
to Hungarian friends in the US	3	0.8	0.9
to colleagues / clients / school mates	0.6	3.4	0.2
to neighbors	0.1	3.6	0.1
to your doctor	0.3	3.5	0.1

Having examined language usage tendencies, significant correlations between language use tendencies and generational affiliation have been found.

Hungarian is the most frequently used when speaking to parents both among G1 (3.4) and G2 (3.2) speakers. However, G2 speakers report comparatively more frequent use of English (2) and mixing (1.4) than G1 speakers (0.1, 0.3, respectively). A decline in the frequency of Hungarian use can be seen when speaking to your spouse (G1: 2.7 > G2: 0.5) and children (G1: 2.3 > G2: 0.6). Noteworthy, though, that we can see that G2 speakers report a more frequent use of English (G1: 1 > G2: 0.6 / G1: 1.2 > G2: 0.5) and the mixed language (G1: 0.9 > G2: 0.1 / G1: 0.8 > G2: 0.1). However, this set of data regarding speaking to your spouse and children should

be considered with reservations when comparing G1 and G2 language use patterns as one-third of G2 speakers are aged between 8 and 13.

Table 13: Participant-related language use in G1 vs. G2 groups

In what language do you speak to your ...?	Hungarian	English	Mixed
parents (G1)	3.4	0.1	0.3
parents (G2)	3.2	2	1.4
spouse (G1)	2.7	1	0.9
spouse (G2)	0.5	0.6	0.1
children (G1)	2.3	1.2	0.8
children (G2)	0.6	0.5	0.1
siblings (G1)	2.9	0.2	0.4
siblings (G2)	1.8	1.8	0.9
other relatives in the US (G1)	1.6	0.8	0.6
other relatives in the US (G2)	2.2	1.2	1
Hungarian friends in the US (G1)	3.1	0.6	0.9
Hungarian friends in the US (G2)	2.7	1.6	0.9
colleagues / clients / schoolmates (G1)	0.6	3.4	0.2
colleagues / clients / schoolmates (G2)	0.5	3.3	0.3
neighbors (G1)	0.1	3.7	0.1
neighbors (G2)	0.1	3.4	0.2

doctor (G1)	0.3	3.6	0.1
doctor (G2)	0.5	3.3	0.4

The most striking difference (*1.1*) in the frequency of Hungarian use between the two generations can be detected when speaking to siblings (G1: *2.9* > G2: *1.8*). This tendency is accompanied by a considerable rise in the frequency of English (G2: *0.8* > G1: *0.2*) and mixing (G2: *0.9* > G1: *0.4*) as well in the G2 group. We have also found that G1 speakers tend to use Hungarian more frequently with Hungarian friends in the US (*3.1*) than G2 speakers (*2.7*). However, the difference in the frequency is not comparatively significant.

Interesting, though, that when speaking to colleagues, school mates, friends, G1 and G2 speakers show the same speech patterns. They communicate mostly in English. It shows that in terms of their wider social network with the host society, there is no difference between G1 and G2 speakers.

As for function-related language use patterns, in the entire sample, among all functions, Hungarian used for counting shows the highest score (*2.7*), English is the most frequently used for discussing job-related issues (*1.9*), and mixing languages is the most prevalent when dreaming (*0.9*).

Table 14: Functional language use

What language do you use when ...?	Hungarian	English	Mixed
counting	2.7	1.4	0.6
praying	2.2	0.8	0.3
thinking about abstract problems	2.2	1.4	0.8
dreaming	2	1.4	0.9
thinking about personal issues	2.5	1.4	0.7
talking to yourself	2.4	1.4	0.6
cursing	1.8	1.1	0.4
telling a joke	2	1.6	0.6
expressing fear or anxiety	2.3	1.1	0.7
expressing anger	2.4	1.2	0.6
talking to your pet	1.9	0.9	0.5
discussing personal feelings	2.5	1.3	0.7
discussing job-related issues	1.7	1.9	0.7
discussing educational issues	2	1.7	0.8
discussing political issues	1.9	1.5	0.7

Interesting that when comparing function-related language use tendencies to participant-related tendencies, we can see a considerably higher rate of using Hungarian and a lower rate of using English than in the participant-related domain. Having examined function-related language

use more closely, we have found noticeable differences between language use tendencies and intergenerational affiliation.

G1 speakers in descending order of frequency use Hungarian for counting (3), personal thinking (2.8), discussing personal feelings (2.7), abstract thinking, self-talk, expressing anger (each 2.6). They use English for discussing job-related issues (2), discussing educational (1.7) and political issues (1.5). Mixed language use emerges when dreaming, in the case of abstract thinking (0.9 each), when expressing fear, discussing personal feelings and educational issues (0.8 each).

Among G2 speakers, the use of English is more prevalent than Hungarian especially for the following functions: telling a joke (2.8), counting and abstract thinking (2.6), personal thinking (2.5), and dreaming (2.3). They use Hungarian mostly for praying (1.9), talking to themselves, and expressing anger (1.8 each). Mixed language use emerges when dreaming (0.8), and counting (0.7).

Table 15: Functional language use in G1 vs. G2 groups

What language do you use when ...?	Hungarian	English	Mixed
counting (G1)	3	1.1	0.6
counting (G2)	1.6	2.6	0.7
praying (G1)	2.4	0.6	0.3
praying (G2)	1.9	1.8	0.6
abstract thinking (G1)	2.6	1.1	0.9
abstract thinking (G2)	0.7	2.6	0.4
dreaming (G1)	2.2	1.2	0.9
dreaming (G2)	1.4	2.3	0.8
personal thinking (G1)	2.8	1.1	0.7
personal thinking (G2)	1.5	2.5	0.5
talking to yourself (G1)	2.6	1.2	0.7
talking to yourself (G2)	1.8	2.2	0.6
cursing (G1)	1.9	0.9	0.4
cursing (G2)	1.3	1.9	0.3
telling a joke (G1)	2.4	1.3	0.6
telling a joke (G2)	0.9	2.8	0.6
expressing fear (G1)	2.5	0.8	0.8
expressing fear (G2)	1.6	2.2	0.5
expressing anger (G1)	2.6	1	0.6
expressing anger (G2)	1.8	2.2	0.6
discussing personal feelings (G1)	2.7	1.1	0.8
discussing personal feelings (G2)	1.5	2.1	0.6
discussing job-related	1.9	2	0.7

issues (G1)			
discussing job-related issues (G2)	0.8	1.9	0.5
discussing educational issues (G1)	2.2	1.7	0.8
discussing educational issues (G2)	1.3	2.1	0.6
discussing political issues (G1)	2.2	1.5	0.8
discussing political issues (G2)	0.8	1.4	0.3

With regard to media-related language use tendencies, a reversed tendency than in the situation-related language use patterns emerges. English is more frequently used for media (infotainment) purposes than Hungarian in both G1 and G2 groups. Hungarian is the most frequently used when speaking on the phone with Hungarians in the US (3.3). English is used for reading for work, for watching films, and listening to the radio (3.1 each).

Table 16: Media-related language use

What language do you use when ...?	Hungarian	English	Mixed
watching TV	0.8	3.1	***
reading books	2	2.7	***
reading the news	1.3	2.9	***
reading magazines	1.2	2.8	***
reading for work	0.7	3.1	***
watching films / DVDs	1.3	3.1	***
listening to the radio	0.8	3.1	***
listening to music	1.5	2.6	***
reading internet sites	1.7	2.7	0.2
exchanging emails with Hungarians in the US	2.6	1.2	0.4
writing notes (shopping lists, to do lists)	1.8	2.1	0.8
talking on the phone with Hungarians in the US	3.3	0.9	0.7
reading and writing recipes	1.7	2	0.5
writing birthday cards	1.9	2.2	0.5

Generational affiliation seems to be a determinant factor in terms of media-related language use patterns as well, as there is a marked decline in the use of Hungarian among G2 speakers in all media-related domains as compared to their G1 counterparts.

Table 17: Media-related language use in G1 vs. G2 groups

What language do you use when ...?	Hungarian	English	Mixed
reading books (G1)	2.2	2.5	N/A
reading books (G2)	1	3	N/A
reading internet sites (G1)	1.9	2.7	0.2
reading internet sites (G2)	1.2	2.8	0.2
exchanging emails with Hungarians in the US (G1)	2.8	1	0.3
exchanging emails with Hungarians in the US (G2)	1.8	1.8	0.7
writing notes (shopping lists, to do lists) (G1)	2.1	1.9	1
writing notes (shopping lists, to do lists) (G2)	0.9	2.6	0.2
talking on the phone with Hungarians in the US (G1)	3.4	0.6	0.7
talking on the phone with Hungarians in the US (G2)	2.6	1.6	0.9
writing birthday cards (G1)	2.2	2	0.5
writing birthday cards (G2)	1	2.6	0.5

In conclusion, the Hungarian-American community in North Carolina, more particularly in the Research Triangle, seems to be an educationally highly prestigious, aging community, where two subgroups along generational affiliation can be set up with regard to their sociolinguistic characteristics, language use patterns, and attitudes to language usage.

The second generation is markedly younger than the first generation. The majority of second-generation subjects (47%) are younger than 20 years, while the majority of first-generation subjects (40%) are aged between 21 and 40. The concept of mother tongue is also different for G1 and G2 speakers. Only 29% of G2 subjects claim Hungarian as their mother tongue as opposed to the overwhelming majority (97%) of G1 speakers. Parallel to other bilingual immigrant communities (Hlavac 2003; Yagmur and Akinci 2003; Gardner-Chloros, McEntee-Atalianis and Finnis 2005; Al-Sahafi and Barkhuizen 2006), the perceived competence of the heritage language, that is, Hungarian, also significantly declines among G2 speakers. While the majority of G1 speakers claim (62%) to have stronger Hungarian competence than English, no G2 speaker has stated so. Claimed ethnic identity is also highly influenced by generational affiliation. Most G1 speakers (71%) claim to have Hungarian identity, while the majority of G2 (59%) subjects profess to have dual, Hungarian-American identity.

Relying on the attitude and language use examination of G1 and G2 subjects, the concept of English, Hungarian, and code-switched languages as social and cognitive devices has shown significantly different patterns in the two groups of subjects. G1 speakers have a closer, more intimate affiliation with the Hungarian language as for them it is the language of self-expression as well as the desired home language. For them, Hungarian, the mother tongue “has to do with an internal sense of self (...) with relationships with one’s parents” (Tannenbaum 2003: 384). The attitude of G2 speakers to the Hungarian language, however, is emotionally more distant. They value Hungarian as part of their cultural heritage, but for them, “the new language – English – has gained the characteristics of a first language” (Tannenbaum 2003: 384). English is the language of self-expression, and they lean less towards agreeing with Hungarian being the first

language learned at home in Hungarian-English families. Hungarian, the parents' language therefore, seems to have "less emotional significance for G2 speakers" (Tannenbaum 2003: 384). G1 speakers, on the other hand, are aware of the socio-economic opportunities that the knowledge of English – as the language of communication with the host society – ensures for them, so they attribute a highly pragmatic value to it.

The overwhelmingly negative attitude to code-switching as "weird, ugly, incomprehensible" (King and Ganuza 2005: 190) is not typical in this community, and members of the community simply acknowledge using it. However, G1 speakers seem to have a more distant attitude to the act of code-switching. They are highly aware that code-switching is a result of the contact situation between Hungarian and English languages. For G2 speakers, code-switching is more closely associated with their bilingual sense of self, as they claim it is the best means of expressing their dual ethnic identity (Gardner-Chloros, McEntee-Atalianis and Finnis 2005).

There is a clear separation of domains in the community, Hungarian is predominantly used in the private domain, at home, with friends, and English is the public domain, used at work, school, and in the media. However, English penetrates the private domains of G2 speakers. Although Hungarian is claimed to be the home language, reciprocal language use, that is, G2 speakers responding in English to their parents' Hungarian emerges. The use of Hungarian and English among G1 and G2 members changes the most strikingly when speaking to siblings. While the majority of G1 speakers uses Hungarian with their siblings, most G2 speakers report using English and mixing – similarly when speaking to Hungarian-American friends – which

also reinforces the statement that for G2 bilingual speakers, code-switching is a common communicative device used with their Hungarian-American peers (Gardner-Chloros, McEntee-Atalianis and 2005).

The frequency of using Hungarian, English, or code-switching for different cognitive or expressive functions also reveals significantly different patterns among G1 and G2 speakers. While G1 speakers use Hungarian for all cognitive and expressive functions – interesting that counting and personal thinking, and discussing personal feelings are the most Hungarian-dominated functions – and English for only such cognitive functions that have a strong semantic dependence on the English-speaking wider society, e.g. for discussing job-related, educational, and political issues. It also reinforces the notion that for G1 speakers Hungarian has a stronger emotional connotation than for G2 speakers (Tannenbaum 2003: 384). Among G2 speakers, a reversed tendency can be observed, English is used both for expressive and cognitive functions. However, it is noteworthy that Hungarian is used the most frequently when praying, for talking to oneself, and expressing anger. It shows that Hungarian fulfils some vestigial function in some very intimate domains of the self. G2 speakers, therefore, retain a reduced but strong emotional affiliation to Hungarian.

Interesting that among both G1 and G2 speakers, code-switching emerges the most strikingly when dreaming.

We have seen that along generational affiliation in terms of sociolinguistic characteristics, language attitude and use tendencies, two distinct subgroups shape up in the Hungarian-American community. These cross-generationally different patterns seem to

determine how “these communities organize their bilingual resources and (re)negotiate meanings of code choice and code-switching in particular socio-political economies” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 14). Therefore, I claim that a community-specific socio-cognitive bilingual grammar can only be set up taking into consideration the significantly different sociolinguistic patterns emerging in these two subcommunities.

5.7. The NC Hungarian Club

According to Papp Z’s (2008) comprehensive study of all present-day Hungarian-American communities, three organizations function in North Carolina (2008: 312). Relying on my empirical observations, there are actually two active Hungarian-American organizations, one based in the Triangle area, the NC Hungarian Club, the particular subject of my research, and another one, `Meet up`, set up by two families living in Elkin, NC. There are also many Hungarians, having temporary jobs and working illegally, who prefer to stay away from any transparent Hungarian-American organization and not to expose themselves to any publicity.

When conducting this survey, the subjects have been selected mostly from among the members of the NC Hungarian Club. However, the two founding member families of the `Meet Up` organization, who usually participate in the events organized by the NC Hungarian Club as well, have also been interviewed.

The exact number of the NC Hungarian club members is difficult to define, however, the most active core of the club is made up by about 100 and 150 members. As there are no written sources reporting the history of the Hungarian club in North Carolina, I must rely on the oral accounts of members of this community. On the basis of the information provided by the subjects of the survey, I have learned that the Hungarian Club in North Carolina was founded by a close circle of friends with the aim of congregating with fellow Hungarians on a regular basis. (The exact date is unidentifiable.) These friends, the majority of whom left Hungary in 1956, met regularly and exchanged their accounts of and reasons for leaving their country of origin. Gradually, this ad-hoc group of friends grew into a Hungarian Club. However, at the beginning of the history of the club, reminiscing about the past still prevailed as the main theme of club events. As a result of that, the club was often criticized by younger Hungarians for attracting mainly the older generation and not being active enough.

Recently, though, parallel to the constantly growing number of Hungarians in the area as well as due to the club new management's success in addressing young Hungarian parents by offering more child-friendly activities, the number of Hungarians regularly visiting the club has been rising.

Club members meet on a monthly basis, recently, in a club house in Durham, NC, except when there are some special events such as the annual International State Fair, where various ethnic groups cook and sell their special dishes as well organize cultural exhibits about their countries, or the Hungarian picnic at the end of May.

In 2007, for example, at the International State Fair that I also attended, the Hungarian Club in North Carolina sold traditional Hungarian food such as stuffed cabbage, beef and chicken paprika, and different types of desserts, such as *krémes*, *rigó jancsi*, and *mézeskalács*. At the cultural stand, there were pictures of Budapest, the spas in Hajdúszoboszló, and Gyula, traditional embroideries, and a short country profile of Hungary. On this occasion, some club members – especially the older first-generational ones – wore traditional Hungarian folk costumes. Some women at the cultural stand wore their ball dresses, while at the culinary stand, sellers were wearing Hungarian embroidered shirts or traditional costumes from Transylvania. For this occasion, club members usually cook together, and the money they raise, goes to the club.

For the usual club meetings, members also prepare some food at home, usually some special Hungarian dishes that they place on one table. Food is an important source of the club's discourse, members often comment on the food and exchange recipes. It reinforces the notion that alike in other Hungarian-American organizations, in the Hungarian club in North Carolina, Hungarian food serves as the widest platform for embodying authentic Hungarian culture (Papp Z. 2008: 171).

At some meetings, club members commemorate the Hungarian historical or traditional holidays such as the anniversary of the 1956 Revolution, the Hungarian Fight for Freedom in 1848, Easter, Christmas, etc., but mostly the primary function of these social gatherings is to ensure members a regular basis for meeting other Hungarians and speaking Hungarian.

The use of Hungarian is prevalent in the club. The conversations are dominantly in Hungarian, though the children tend to speak among each other and respond to their parents in English.

Adopting Papp Z.'s typology of American-Hungarian organizations, the Hungarian club in North Carolina can be defined as an ethnically rather closed local organization (Papp Z. 2008: 434) with the primary interest of community preservation evolving around cultural events, traditions supposed to be authentically Hungarian (Papp Z. 2008: 435). In the Hungarian club of North Carolina, therefore, the efforts to maintain the Hungarian language through cherishing Hungarian traditions, or conversely, maintaining the Hungarian cultural heritage through the means of speaking Hungarian have become intertwined and mutually compliment one another.

Chapter 6: Method

6.1. Data collection

The data presented in this paper were collected via semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews conducted by the author and Ágnes Bolonyai in the Hungarian community of North Carolina in the course of 2007 and 2008.

In the course of the `semi-structured` interviews, which were informal dinner conversations at the home of Ágnes Bolonyai, there were narrative elicitation types of questions about the experience of being American-Hungarian in North Carolina. Such sociolinguistic interviews were conducted with 39 Hungarian-Americans. The interviewed subjects are either members of the North Carolina Hungarian Club or are closely affiliated to it. In the interviews, subjects took part individually, or together with their close family members, with their spouses or children. That is why altogether 28 interviews were conducted.

The minimum time length of the interviews was 45 minutes, but the longest interview lasted 4 hours. Prior to the interviews, all subjects were informed that the interviews would be recorded, and they all gave their consent to it. Altogether, the whole sample consists of 54 hours of recorded sociolinguistic interviews. The conversations were transcribed to provide a text of 2,174 pages (12-point Times New Roman, double-spaced).

Because of limitation of scope and length, my analysis mainly focuses on the interview data. However, the empirical observations I made during conducting the interviews as well as participating in the Hungarian Club's and other Hungarian events helped me gain a better understanding of the Club's group dynamics and its members' collective speech patterns.

In addition to the oral interviews, participants were asked to fill out a two-page questionnaire which contained survey types of questions inquiring about their sociolinguistic background such as age, qualification, profession, time spent since the date of immigration as well as about their Hungarian/English perceived competence, their attitude to Hungarian/English, code-switching, and also about their motivation (or the lack of it) to cherish Hungarian language and/or traditions. A copy of the original questionnaire can be found in the Appendix (No. 3) .

Those variables were included in the survey which in the light of previous studies (conducted by Bolonyai in 2007, whose results are discussed in Chapter 5) have turned out to have an impact on code-switching patterns. The questionnaire has been compiled by the author relying on earlier studies (Kondo Brown 2001; Hlavac 2003).

The responses given to the questionnaire have been analyzed according to the following categories: (1) Background sociolinguistic characteristics. The responses given to the questionnaire's questions included data regarding the subjects' sociolinguistic characteristics, such as sex, age, (declared) nationality, (declared) mother tongue, vintage (time of immigrating), intergenerational affiliation (first generation referred to as G1, second generation referred to as G2) parental background (parents' nationality), spouse's mother tongue, qualification, profession, competence (perceived, English and Hungarian oral and written), frequency of visits

to Hungary. The responses were quantified in percentages, and salient differences between G1 and G2 speakers were demonstrated in tables (see Section 7.3.1.).

In order to learn more about the subjects' language use patterns, in the second part of the questionnaire, they were asked about the following: the most intense language use with a Hungarian (a person living in Hungary) contact, participant-related language use patterns with parents, siblings, spouse, Hungarian-American friends, children, at work, and function-related language use patterns, i.e. what language they use when dreaming, counting, talking to oneself, praying, and cursing.

Three statements were provided as possible answers to choose from "I speak in Hungarian, in English, alternating and mixing the two languages". The responses given to this question have been quantified as follows: Hungarian – 1, English – 2, Alternating and mixing – 3. The responses given to each item were collected in Excel tables and are attached in the Appendix. The responses were quantified in percentages, and salient differences between G1 and G2 speakers were demonstrated in tables (see Sections 7.2.2., 7.2.3.).

In the third part of the questionnaire, there were questions inquiring about subjects' motivation for retaining Hungarian language and traditions as well as about what emotions they associate with speaking English and Hungarian; how they feel about code-switching; and about being an American-Hungarian.

In question 27 "What do you think of mixed language use?" subjects were asked to respond with one of four statements, reflecting their overt attitude to code-switching. Each `yes` response given to the statements was quantified as one. The responses given to the question were

then counted, and the statements were classified into four categories relying on the author's own interpretation as statement A ("I disapprove of code-switching.") reflecting a negative, purist attitude; statement B ("I don't mind code-switching, but I try not to mix languages.") reflecting a non-judgmental attitude but a lack of code-switching; statement C ("I don't mind code-switching, I also mix languages.") reflecting a non-judgmental attitude and the practice of code-switching; and statement D ("I find it natural among bilingual speakers.") reflecting a pragmatic attitude to code-switching (Section 7.2.4.).

In question 28, "Why do you go to the Hungarian club?" there were six statements provided as possible answers to choose from. Each `yes` response given to the statements was also quantified as one. The responses given to the question were then counted, and the statements were classified into five categories adopting Dörnyei and Clement's (2001: 400) seven-scaled classification of motivations for learning different target languages such as statement A ("I like speaking Hungarian.") reflecting an affective dimension; statement B ("I am interested in other Hungarians.") reflecting an integrative dimension; statement C ("Since we are Hungarians, we need to stick together.") reflecting ethnic affiliation; statement D ("I think it is important to cherish Hungarian traditions.") reflecting the dimension of cherishing heritage (language and traditions); and statement E ("I am most comfortable among Hungarian-Americans who live here.") reflecting the notion of bilingualism and biculturalism (Section 7.2.6.).

To question 31, "If you have (or if you had) children, is it important for you that they speak Hungarian?" six statements were listed as possible answers ("Yes, because ..."). In this part again, each `yes` response given to the statements was also quantified as one. The responses

given to the question were then counted, and the statements were classified into five categories adopting Dörnyei and Clement's (2001) seven-scaled classification of motivations for learning different target languages such as statement A ("We might move back to Hungary.") reflecting an instrumental/pragmatic dimension; statement B ("I think to be truly Hungarian one has to speak Hungarian.") reflecting language as identity; statement C ("Hungarian culture can only be transmitted in Hungarian.") reflecting language as culture; statement D ("It is important that they (children) can communicate with the relatives back home.") reflecting the dimension of 'significant others'; and statement E ("Their life is richer if they can speak Hungarian as well.") reflecting an affective dimension (Section 7.2.7.).

Question 31b inquires about the opposite of question 31a, that is the lack of interest in cherishing Hungarian language and passing traditions to children, "If you have (or if you had) children, is it important for you that they speak Hungarian?". Similarly, six statements were provided as possible answers to this question: "No, because ...".

Each 'no' response given to the statements was also quantified as one. The responses given to the question were then counted, and the statements were classified into five categories adopting Dörnyei and Clement's (2001) seven-scaled classification of motivations for learning different target languages such as statement A ("Hungarian can only be used in Hungary.") reflecting an instrumental/pragmatic dimension; statement B ("One does not need to speak Hungarian to be Hungarian.") reflecting language as identity; statement C ("Hungarian would only interfere with their ability to acquire English perfectly.") reflecting a conflict between Hungarian and English languages; statement D ("Sooner or later English will replace small

languages such as Hungarian.”) reflecting a pragmatic/instrumental dimension; and statement E (“I would want them to be fully integrated in the American society.”) reflecting an integrative dimension (Section 7.2.8.).

Questions 29 and 30 inquire about the emotions associated with speaking Hungarian and English. The following six options were provided as possible responses to the questions: “How do you feel when speaking Hungarian/English?”, I feel `proud`; `frustrated`; `uncomfortable`; `good`; `natural`; and `other`.

Alike in the previous subsection, each `yes` response given to the emotions was also quantified as one. The responses given to the question were then counted and presented in line graphs (Section 7.2.5.).

In question 32, subjects were asked to finish the following sentence: “Being a Hungarian-American ... “. Here the responses vary individually. However, in order to get comparable responses, they – relying on their underlying content – have been classified into four groups. Responses reflecting an overwhelmingly negative feeling have been attributed (1), responses expressing that being a Hungarian-American is better than being a Hungarian (or Slovakian)-Hungarian has been provided a (2), the ambivalent feeling has been attributed a (3), and the overwhelmingly positive feeling attached to being a Hungarian-American has been attributed a (4) (Section 7.2.9.).

6.2. Analysis

A similar portion (5 pages, written in 12-point, Times New Roman, double-spaced, approximately 7,200 characters with spaces or 1,100 words) of the transcript has been taken from each participant's interview. When selecting the text to be analyzed, the middle part of the interview as well as the one toward its end have been preferred. By the middle of the interview, subjects became comfortable with the interview situation and were open to speak about their immigrant experience. Toward the end of the interview, they became even more relaxed and some spontaneous conversations about varied topics started. As we were interested in subjects' spontaneous code-switching practices, their most possibly spontaneous language use and unconscious linguistic choices were of particular interest to us.

All instances of code-switching from the similar portion of text have been counted, and then analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively.

The aim of the qualitative analysis is to demonstrate that the community specific ranking of the sociopragmatic constraints of the optimality bilingual grammar proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) can be applied for analyzing the Hungarian-American bilingual community's code-switching patterns in North Carolina. For the discussion of the community specific ranking of the Optimality Theory, only the socio-pragmatically meaningful instances of code-switching – which can be interpreted as serving a particular sociopragmatic function in light of the given context – have been considered. Code-switched instances prompted by a lack of appropriate Hungarian competence have been excluded from the scope of my examination. As

G2 speakers' Hungarian competence is considerably weaker than their G1 fellows', their code-switching patterns have not been analyzed.

Sociopragmatically meaningful instances of code-switches have been classified into five categories fulfilling functions related to PERSPECTIVE, FAITH, SOLIDARITY, FACE, and POWER (Section 4.3.1.). These five functions are part of a comprehensive classification including all sociopragmatic functions attributed to code-switching in previous studies. The five-fold classification is, hence, based on the thorough research of relevant literature on code-switching (see Appendix 1).

The instances of code-switches fulfilling one or more of the five functions have been analyzed and quantified (Section 7.6.). The results have been classified in tables. According to premise of the Optimality Theory for analyzing bilingual grammar, the functions that code-switched instances fulfill also compete with each other in a community-specific ranking of constraints. Optimality Theory for analyzing bilingual grammar premises that the actual surface representation is always the one that the most optimally serves the sociopragmatic function – in competition with other candidates – instantiated by a particular situation. Therefore, representing the interaction of constraints in algorithmic tableaux, the community specific ranking of the sociopragmatic constraints governing the mechanism of code-switching can be set up. The five sociopragmatic functions mentioned above also act as constraints filtering the candidates competing for surface representation. That is why code-switched instances have also been examined as fulfilling various sociopragmatic functions filtered by a hierarchically ranked set of constraints. The interaction of the constraints has been demonstrated in algorithmic tableaux.

Computing the results of the interactions algorithmically, the specific ranking of the examined Hungarian-American community has been set up (Section 7.7.).

The objective of the quantitative sociolinguistic survey is to find statistically significant correlations between subjects' sociolinguistic characteristics, such as (English and Hungarian) language use patterns, attitudes to English, to Hungarian languages, to code-switching, and to being a Hungarian-American that could provide an explanation for the underlying factors influencing the mechanism of code-switching in this particular Hungarian-American community.

Relying on the results of previous sociolinguistic research conducted in Hungarian-American immigrant communities (Fishman 1966; Papp 1981; Kontra 1990; Bartha 1995/96; Fenyvesi 2005; Kovács 2005; Papp Z. 2008), sociolinguistic characteristics are expected to differ along the lines of intergenerational affiliation. Hence, the aim of this quantitative survey is to find those measurable (sociolinguistic, language use, attitude, motivational) variables which determine first- (G1) and second-generation (G2) speakers' notion of Hungarian and English languages and that of code-switching exerting considerable influence on their speech patterns as well.

All quantified data in the survey have been analyzed with the help of statistical software (*Jump* and *SPSS*) to provide a sociolinguistic analysis of the examined community (Section 7.3.) and to detect salient differences in G1 and G2 groups' sociolinguistic characteristics (Sections 7.3., 7.5.).

Originally, I set out to explore statistically significant correlations between the frequency of code-switched instances of G1 speakers and their sociolinguistic variables. However, since the

frequency of code-switched instances produced too sparsely distributed data, no statistically significant correlations have been found.

6.3. Participants

In the course of 2007 and 2008, 39 Hungarian-Americans were interviewed. When selecting the participants, Ágnes Bolonyai and I tried to rely on the results of a previous sociolinguistic survey conducted by Bolonyai in 2007 among 78 members of the Hungarian-American community in North Carolina (unpublished source). The subjects were selected with a view to getting a representative sample of the North Carolina Hungarian Club.

In the data, all subjects were assigned with a code referring to their generational affiliation (G1 or G2), to their gender (male – M or female – F), to how much time they have spent in the US since the date of their immigrating, and to their age at the time of the interview.

Table 18: The codes assigned to subjects

Codes	Generation	Gender	Time spent in the USA (years)	Age (at time of the interview)
1. G1M17,37	1	M	17	37
2. G1F17,48	1	F	17	48
3. G1F20,40	1	F	20	40
4. G1M22,55	1	M	22	55
5. G1F18,53	1	F	18	53
6. G1F59,82	1	F	59	82
7. G1M52,78	1	M	52	78
8. G1M27,50	1	M	27	50
9. G1M52,69	1	M	52	69
10. G1F48,65	1	F	48	65
11. G1F8,35	1	F	8	35
12. G1M61,88	1	M	61	88
13. G1F56,84	1	F	56	84
14. G1F22,42	1	F	22	42
15. G1F51,79	1	F	51	79
16. G1F36,63	1	F	36	63
17. G1M51,84	1	M	51	84
18. G1F54,80	1	F	54	80
19. G1M9,52	1	M	9	52
20. G1F9,46	1	F	9	46
21. G1F40,68	1	F	40	68
22. G1M42,65	1	M	42	65
23. G1F19,47	1	F	19	47
24. G1M19,47	1	M	19	47
25. G1F18,40	1	F	18	40

26. G1M13,39	1	M	19	39
27. G1M16,52	1	M	16	52
28. G1M12,44	1	M	12	44
29. G1F8,41	1	F	8	41
30. G2F24	2	F	N/A	24
31. G2M28	2	M	N/A	28
32. G2F17	2	F	N/A	17
33. G2F20	2	F	N/A	20
34. G2M38	2	M	N/A	38
35. G2F35	2	F	N/A	35
36. G2M21	2	M	N/A	21
37. G2F17	2	F	N/A	17
38. G2M22	2	M	N/A	22
39. G1F48,76⁴	1	F	48	76

The majority of the interviewees regularly attend the events of the Hungarian club in North Carolina or are closely affiliated to it. Also, there are some interviewees who are the founding members of another Hungarian club – ‘Meet-up’ – in Elkin, NC, but occasionally attend the ‘big’ Hungarian club in Durham, North Carolina. Most interviewees live in the Raleigh-Durham-Cary research triangle, North Carolina, two families (5 subjects) live in Elkin, three other in Greensboro, NC, and one subject lives in Fayetteville, NC. Of the subjects, 9 are second-, and 30 are first-generation speakers. A more elaborate profile of subjects can be found in Sections 7.3., 7.5.).

⁴ The text of the interview conducted with this subject has been lost.

6.4. Convention of typography, transcription, and translations

In the examples quoted, plain type is used to indicate American English (unless indicated otherwise), bold italicized type is used to highlight code-switched instances. The original quotes are indicated with quotation marks, and the English translations are either inserted in brackets below the original quotes. The translations provided are my translations, and I left the non-standard grammatical forms unchanged. With regard to transcribing the interviews, they have been transcribed with great detail since they are used for the qualitative analysis. However, as the transcriptions are of informal, semi-structured dinner conversations, words have been described as uttered by the subjects, e.g. *don't*, *can't*, etc. Incomprehensible parts in the transcribed text are marked with a capital `u` letter in red.

Chapter 7: Findings

7.1. Introduction

According to the framework of the Optimality Theoretical analysis of bilingual grammar, the code-switching mechanisms of all bi- and multilingual speech communities can be described as the result of a conflict between a monolingual and a code-switched candidate, and a linguistic input that has to go through a hierarchical ranking of five universal socio-cognitive constraints. Adopting the premise of optimality in bi- (or multi-)lingual speech, code-switched instances are the optimal linguistic choices, better candidates for “indexing and/or creating particular socio-pragmatic effects” (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 4) than their monolingual counterparts.

While the five constraints are supposed to be the same in any bi- and multilingual communities, the hierarchy according to which these constraints are ranked depends on an array of socio-cultural norms, the historical and structural context of the multilingual community in the macro social setting as well as on the communities’ collective speech practices (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming: 5).

As the ranking of constraints varies in different bilingual settings, there have been attempts at setting up community specific rankings. There have been hypotheses of the possible ranking of constraints in two different bi- multilingual settings. Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) hypothesize that the grammar of Hindi-Kashmiri-English code-switching follows

the order of {FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, FACE} >> POWER >> SOLIDARITY with FAITH, PERSPECTIVE, and FACE ranking equally.

They also set up a proposed ranking applicable in the Hungarian-American bilingual immigrant community in North Carolina, which is as follows: {FAITH, PERSPECTIVE} >> SOLIDARITY >> {FACE, POWER}

The aim of my analysis is to test the applicability of Bolonyai and Bhatt's proposed ranking on the Hungarian-American bilingual immigrant community in North Carolina. Bolonyai and Bhatt's model presupposes the existence of a community grammar, in the framework of which the socio-pragmatic conditions of optimality are shared. This community grammar sets the rankings of the constraints, which govern the socio-cognitive mechanism of code-switching. However, I claim that in the examined community, two sociolinguistically different communities emerge, first and second generations, which show strikingly different patterns in their Hungarian competence, attitude to and concept of the Hungarian language as well as in their language usage. Therefore, these two communities do not share one community grammar, so their code-switching mechanism cannot be described applying the same ranking of constraints within the same model of optimality.

I aim to demonstrate by pointing out significantly different patterns in first- and second-generation speakers' sociolinguistic characteristics, Hungarian competence, language use tendencies, the attitude to, and the concept of the Hungarian language how these two subcommunities differ and why their mechanism of code-switching cannot be governed by the same ranking of constraints.

7.2. The NC Hungarian club

We have already seen in Chapter 5 that in bilingual immigrant communities characteristic patterns in language usage, including code-switching, attitude to and concept of the minority language significantly change along each intergenerational cleft, more particularly between first- and second-generation speakers. As the aim of this study is to test the applicability of Bolonyai and Bhatt's bilingual grammar (forthcoming) on the Hungarian-American bilingual immigrant community, it is important to describe this particular community in terms of its sociolinguistic variables, language usage, and attitudes to languages, as well as in terms of how these influence, if yes, the community's code-switching tendencies. I claim that within the examined Hungarian-American community, more particularly, within the NC Hungarian club, two distinctively separable subcommunities emerge on which the same community grammar cannot be applied.

In the following, I will analyze the characteristics of these two subcommunities and aim to show along which characteristics are these two communities the most susceptible to differ and how these differences influence the meaning and function of code-switching in the two relevant communities. I attempt to highlight those statistically significant variables along which G1 and G2 groups differ. With a view to that, statistical tests *Jump* and *SPSS* have been run on the sample.

7.2.1. Sociolinguistic characteristics of the NC Hungarian club

In the following section, I first characterize the NC Hungarian Club in terms of its sociolinguistic characteristics, then I highlight those sociolinguistic characteristics which show statistically significant patterns in G1 and G2 groups. The quantitative findings rely on sociolinguistic data collected via questionnaires (see Appendix 3) by the author and Bolonyai in the course of sociolinguistic interviews in 2007 and 2008.

Of the subjects, 30⁵ (76%) are first- and 9 (24%) second-generation speakers. Second-generation speakers were either born in the USA, or they arrived in the USA before the age of 7, that is, they started school in the USA. The average age of the subjects is 50 years, which shows that it is an aging community. Taking into consideration the ages of G1 and G2 speakers, this figure is even more striking. The average age of G1 speakers is 58 years, while the average age of G2 speakers is 25 years.

This data reinforces the fact that the NC Hungarian Club is attended by older G1 members and by some young G2 members, mostly the children of G1 speakers. There are slightly more female (N=21) than male (N=18) subjects in the sample.

With regard to the educational and professional status of the club, it is a highly prestigious one as the vast majority of club members (74%) have BA or higher qualifications,

⁵ As some data are missing from the sample, in the statistical analyses, only 28 subjects are counted as first-generation speakers.

and only 26% have “only” a high school diploma. It must be noted though that the majority of G2 speakers are still studying, so their qualifications are hardly relevant in this respect.

The majority (41%) of the subjects have professional jobs, 28% of them are retired, though most of them also had highly qualified jobs, 18% are manual workers or students (mostly G2 subjects), and 13% work in the service sector.

The majority of the subjects (70%) profess to be of Hungarian-American ethnicity, and 24% claim to be of Hungarian. It is interesting to note that an overwhelming majority of G2 subjects (88%) profess to be of Hungarian-American ethnicity, and only one subject professes to be of Hungarian ethnicity.

Table 19: Declared ethnic identities in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – Other	2 – Hungarian	3 – American	4 – Hungarian-American
G1 (N=28)	1 (4%)	8 (28%)	1 (4%)	18 (64%)
G2 (N=9)	0	1 (12%)	0	8 (88%)

It is conspicuous that no G2 subject professes to be of American ethnicity. It shows that for the majority of G2 subjects the dual Hungarian-American ethnicity is the most relevant category.

Alike G2 subjects, the majority of G1 (64%) subjects also profess to be of Hungarian-American ethnicity, followed by Hungarian ethnicity (28%). Only one G1 subject professes to be of American ethnicity.

From the perspective of declared mother tongues, the following results have emerged: the majority of the subjects (68%) claim that Hungarian is their mother tongue, and only a slight minority claims both English and Hungarian (Only two-two subjects claim, respectively, English or other). As for generational affiliation, an interesting trend appears here. The overwhelming majority (78%) of G1 subjects claim that Hungarian is their mother tongue. Only 14% claim to have both English and Hungarian as their mother tongues. These percentages reflect a reversed trend than has been observed in terms of ethnicity.

Table 20: Declared mother tongues in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – Other	2 – Hungarian	3 – English	4 – Both
G1 (N=28, 2 N/A)	1 (4%)	22 (78)	1 (4%)	4 (14%)
G2 (N=9)	0	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)

Previously, it has been manifested that the majority of G1 subjects claim to be of dual, Hungarian-American ethnicity. However, as for mother tongue, only a slight minority (14%) claim that both English and Hungarian are their mother tongues. Presumably, the mother tongue is a more profound concept than ethnicity and cannot be replaced even in an immigrant setting.

On the other hand, G2 subjects seem to be more consistent with regard to their ethnicity and mother tongue compatibility. Their declared ethnic identity figures reflect similar percentages as their mother tongues. The majority (67%) in this group also claim to have two mother tongues, English and Hungarian. Therefore, this duality is prevalent not only in the concept of ethnic identity, but also in that of mother tongue. However, a fairly significant proportion claims to have English as their mother tongue (22%). At the same time, though, no G2 respondent professes to be only of American ethnicity.

In the questionnaire, respondents had three options to the perceived competence-related question: “Which language can you speak better: Hungarian, English, or equally?”

In the sample, equal Hungarian and English competence shows the highest percentage – 39% followed by stronger Hungarian (31%) and stronger English (29%). Competence has also turned out to show strikingly different patterns in G1 and G2 groups.

Table 21: Declared competences in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – Hungarian stronger	2 – English stronger	3 – Equal
G1 (N=29, 1 N/A)	12 (41%)	4 (14%)	13 (45%)
G2 (N=9)	0	7 (78%)	2 (12%)

G1 subjects claim in almost equal percentages to have equal competence (45%) or to have stronger Hungarian competence (41%). Only a slight minority states that they have stronger English competence (14%). However, an overwhelming majority of G2 subjects (78%) claim to have stronger English competence, and only a slight minority claim to have equal (12%). No G2 subject states that their Hungarian competence is stronger.

With regard to the date of immigrating to the USA, obviously only G1 subjects have been classified into four clusters.

Table 22: Date of immigrating to the USA – G1 group

Clusters	Subjects (N=29, 1 N/A)	Percentages
1 – After 1989	12	43%
2 – Between 1957 and 1989	8	29%
2 – After the Revolution of 1956 (in 1956 and 1957)	4	14%
3 – Before 1956	4	14%

The largest, though not significantly larger than the other two, group of people immigrated to the USA after 1989, followed by those emigrating between 1957 and 1989. This figure also reinforces the notion that the examined community is not a typical Hungarian-American `old-timer` but a new type of a community.

Similarly to the date of immigrating, G1 subjects have been classified into three clusters according to how old they were when they left Hungary:

Table 23: Age at the time of immigrating – G1 group

Clusters	Subjects (N=30)	Percentages
1 – Aged 13-20	8	26.5%
2 – Aged 21-30	14	47%
3 – Aged over 31	8	26.5%

The average age of immigrating from Hungary is 26 years, and the majority of the subjects were quite young, aged 20-30 years old, when they immigrated.

7.2.2. Interpersonal language use

In the following subsection, language use tendencies in such domains as in the family, at work, and in interpersonal relationships will be examined.

In the participant-related language use part of the questionnaire, subjects have been asked “What language do you use with your parents / children / spouses / siblings / Hungarian-American friends / at work?”. The responses to this question have been classified as follows: Hungarian (1), English (2), alternating and mixing (3).

The majority of subjects speak Hungarian (71%) with their parents. However, taking into consideration the generational affiliation of subjects, a more varied pattern emerges.

Table 24: Language use with parents in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – Hungarian	2 – English	3 – Alternating and mixing
G1 (N=24) (6 N/A)	23 (85%)	0	1 (3.7%)
G2 (N=9) (1 N/A)	2 (22%)	0	6 (67%)

All G1 subjects claim to speak exclusively Hungarian with their parents. The considerably high number of non-applicable responses might be due to the high number of deceased parents. As for the language use patterns with parents, in the G2 sample, an

overwhelming majority claim to use mixing and alternating as a means of communication with their parents.

When it comes to communicating with children, the majority of subjects use English (39%) followed by Hungarian (32%), and by alternating and mixing (29%). Noticeably different language use tendencies emerge in G1 and G2 groups.

Table 25: Language use with children in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – Hungarian	2 – English	3 – Alternating and mixing
G1 (N=26, 4 N/A)	8 (31%)	10 (38%)	8 (31%)
G2 (N=2, 7 N/A)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0

It can be inferred from the table above (25) that the majority of G1 parents use English (38%) when it comes to communicating with their children. They are closely followed by those who use either Hungarian (31%), or alternating and mixing (31%). As only one G2 subject has children, though there are two responses, G2 results are irrelevant here.

It is interesting, though, that in the previous sub section discussing language use patterns with parents, no G2 subject claims to speak English with their parents (see Table 24), while the majority of G1 speakers claim to use English with their children. It reinforces the assumption that children might feel obliged to comply with their parents' presumed preference for the use of Hungarian, but it does not correspond with their actual language use patterns. It might be explained by the fact that G1 speakers when it comes to communicating children would prefer to

use Hungarian, the language of intimacy for them (Tannenbaum 2003: 384). However, as the attribute of intimacy associated with Hungarian as a mother tongue is not shared by G2 speakers, actual language use patterns do not correspond with the parents' preference (Tannenbaum 2003: 382).

The majority of G1 subjects use Hungarian with their spouses. Due to the young age of G2 subjects (only one of them is married and claims to use English with his spouse), no emerging patterns could be observed, so G2 subjects have been excluded from the scope of examination. In the G1 sample, however, the following tendencies have been discerned:

Table 26: Language use with spouses in the G1 group

Responses	1 – Hungarian	2 – English	3 – Alternating and mixing
G1 (N=25, 5 N/A)	12 (48%)	6 (24%)	7 (28%)

The majority of G1 subjects use Hungarian with their spouses. This figure proportionately reflects the rate of homogeneous (unmixed) Hungarian-American marriages where the shared language of the spouses is Hungarian.

As for speaking with siblings, in this particular community, the overwhelming majority of subjects (67%) use Hungarian as a means of communication with their siblings, followed by English (20%), and by alternating and mixing (13%). However, examining language use tendencies in G1 and G2 groups, noticeably different tendencies can be observed.

Table 27: Language use with siblings in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – Hungarian	2 – English	3 – Alternating and mixing
G1 (N=21, 9N/A)	19 (86%)	2 (9%)	1 (5%)
G2 (N=8, 1N/A)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50%)	3 (37.5%)

The overwhelming majority of G1 subjects use Hungarian with their siblings. As opposed to G1 respondents, however, most G2 subjects use English. When it comes to alternating and mixing, no G1 subject claims to mix English and Hungarian when speaking with siblings. It might be due to the fact that, as opposed to G2 respondents, G1's siblings are less likely to live in an English-speaking environment, while G2 speakers are more likely to speak or at least understand both English and Hungarian.

In the whole sample, the largest proportion of subjects (61%) use Hungarian when speaking with Hungarian-American friends, followed by alternating and mixing (33%), and then by English (6%). The contrastive examination of G1 and G2 language use tendencies again reflects some underlying differences.

Table 28: Language use with Hungarian-American friends in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – Hungarian	2 – English	3 – Alternating and mixing
G1 (N=24, 6 N/A)	18 (67%)	1 (4%)	5 (19%)
G2 (N=6, 3 N/A)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)

Table 28 manifests that the overwhelming majority of G1 subjects (67%) use Hungarian with their Hungarian-American friends, while a slight majority of G2 subjects (33%) alternate English and Hungarian when speaking to their Hungarian-American friends. These different percentages demonstrate that for G1 speakers Hungarian is the language of communication with their peer fellows, while for G2 speakers, it is alternating and mixing. This duality in language use in the G2 group, therefore, appears as a means of expressing in-group affiliation with other G2 fellows.

As for language use at work, the responses in the G1 and G2 groups are almost identical. The majority of both groups (82 and 89% respectively) use no Hungarian at work. Nonetheless, it must be noted that for the low age of G2 respondents, their responses are hardly relevant here.

Table 29: Language use at work in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – No	2 – Yes
G1 (N=29, 1N/A)	24 (82%)	5 (18%)
G2 (N=9)	8 (89%)	1 (11%)

7.2.3. Functional language use

In the following sub section, functional language use has been examined. Subjects have been asked “In what language do you dream / count / talk to yourself / pray / and curse?”. Three options have been provided: in Hungarian (1), in English (2), in both (3).

As for dreaming, the majority of subjects (42%) claim to dream both in English and Hungarian, followed by English (31%), and by Hungarian (27%). When comparing the percentages in G1 and G2 groups, conspicuous differences emerge.

Table 30: Language use in dreams in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – In Hungarian	2 – In English	3 – In both
G1 (N=19, 11 N/A)	7 (37%)	4 (21%)	8 (42%)
G2 (N=7, 2 N/A)	0	4 (57%)	3 (43%)

The table above reflects that almost the same percentage of G1 and G2 speakers declare to dream in both languages (42 and 43% respectively). However, 37% of G1 speakers state that they dream in Hungarian followed by the lowest percentage of 21%, who claim to dream in English. The overwhelming majority of G2 speakers, though, state that they dream in English.

For the function of counting, the majority of subjects rely on Hungarian (56%), followed by both English and Hungarian (31%), and finally by English (13%). In G1 and G2 groups, different tendencies have been observed.

Table 31: Language use for counting in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – In Hungarian	2 – In English	3 – In both
G1 (N=26, 4 N/A)	18 (67%)	2 (7.4%)	6 (22%)
G2 (N=9)	0	3 (33%)	6 (67%)

The overwhelming majority of G1 subjects (67%) count in Hungarian, a lower percentage (22%) in both languages, and a slight percentage (two subjects) declares that they count in English. For G1 speakers, counting, consequently, is closely related to the mother tongue.

Conversely, in the sample of G2 subjects, a markedly higher percentage claims to count both in English and Hungarian (67%) than in English (33%). No G2 subject counts in Hungarian. Apparently, counting is also closely related to G2 speakers' mother tongue, which is both English and Hungarian.

In terms of language use for talking to oneself, the following tendencies have been observed.

Table 31: Language use for talking to oneself in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – In Hungarian	2 – In English	3 – In both
G1 (N=24, 6 N/A)	7 (29%)	4 (17%)	13 (54%)
G2 (N=8, 1 N/A)	0	3 (40%)	5 (60%)

It can be observed from Table 31 that talking to oneself is related to both languages in the majority of both G1 and G2 speakers. However, while 17% (the lowest percentage) of G1 speakers claims to talk to themselves in English only, there is no corresponding percentage in G2 sample claiming to talk to themselves only in Hungarian.

In terms of language use for praying, the following tendencies have been observed.

Table 32: Language use for praying in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – In Hungarian	2 – In English	3 – In both
G1 (N=20, 10 N/A)	10 (50%)	5 (25%)	5 (25%)
G2 (N=9)	1 (11%)	5 (56%)	3 (33%)

It is interesting that praying seems to be primarily associated with the declared mother tongue of both groups followed by both languages. It is notable that almost the same percentage of G1 subjects (50%) claim to pray in Hungarian as G2 speakers in English (56%). This correlation seems to be in line with the assumption that the concept of praying is strongly associated with the notion of the mother tongue. Praying as a function, presumably, is associated more with the values that language use (Al-Sahafi and Barkhuizen 2006: 61) embodies, and less with the actual use of it. It is also noteworthy that while one third of G1 subjects (N=10) gave no response to the question “In what language do you pray?”, there was no missing data in the G2 group.

In terms of language use for cursing, the following tendencies have been observed.

Table 33: Language use for cursing in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	1 – In Hungarian	2 – In English	3 – In both
G1 (N=17, 13 N/A)	9 (52%)	3 (18%)	5 (30%)
G2 (N=9)	0	5 (56%)	4 (44%)

Cursing, similar to praying, also seems closely associated with declared mother tongues. It is interesting that while no G2 subject claims to curse only in Hungarian, a small proportion of

G1 (18%) speakers curses in English. Once again the high number of non-applicable data (13) in the G1 sample is also worth considering. It shows that cursing as a function might seem incompatible with the value-centered, purist attitude to the Hungarian mother tongue.

7.2.4. Attitudes to the act of code-switching

Question 27 of the survey, “What do you think of mixed language use?” investigates subjects’ attitude to code-switching. Respondents have been provided four optional responses: A) “I disapprove of it”; B) “I don’t mind it, but I try not to mix (them)”; C) “I don’t mind, I also mix (them)”; D) “I find it natural among bilingual speakers” (for the quantification and interpretation of the data, see Section 6.1.).

With a view to finding distinctive patterns in the attitude of first- and second-generation speakers to code-switching, the statistical results of their responses have been summarized in the following table:

Table 34: Attitudes to code-switching in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	Statement A (negative, purist)	Statement B (non- judgmental, but lack of use)	Statement C (non- judgmental, actual use)	Statement D (pragmatic)
G1 `yes` responses (N=38)	6 (16%)	16 (42%)	6 (16%)	10 (26%)
G2 `yes` responses (N=8)	0	5 (62%)	1 (12%)	3 (38%)

It can be deferred from Table 33 that the majority of both G1 (42%) and G2 subjects (62%) have a non-judgmental attitude to code-switching (“I don’t mind it”), however, they point out that they try to avoid it (“I try not to mix them”). One conspicuous difference already emerges in G1 and G2 groups. No G2 subject claims to disapprove of code-mixing, showing that G2 subjects have an overall more positive attitude to code-switching than the older generation. It is also worth to bear in mind that the highest number of responses given to option B (“I don’t mind it, but I try not to mix them.”) is followed by the responses to given to D (“I find it natural among bilingual speakers.”), which shows that the pragmatic attitude to code-switching regarding it a natural phenomenon among bilinguals is prevalent both among G1 and G2 speakers.

In sum, both G1 and G2 subjects have a similar attitude to code-switching, which is fundamentally non-judgmental and pragmatic. This finding goes in line with some earlier results gathered in the Greek Cypriot community in London (Gardner-Chloros, McEntee-Atalianis, and Finnis 2005: 70). While no G2 subject agrees with statement (A) disapproving of code-switching (“I disapprove of it.”), the same percentage of G1 responses (16%) are supportive of that statement as of statement (C) (“I don’t mind, I also mix them.”), which reflects a non-judgmental attitude and acknowledges the actual use of code-switching. It reinforces the previous assumption that G1 speakers have a more purist attitude to language, and code-switching might be viewed as some impure alteration of the `pure` Hungarian and English languages.

Nevertheless, among G2 speakers, no such attitude has emerged. This set of data also proves that G2 speakers have a more natural, pragmatic attitude to code-switching and to

bilingualism, and they tend to rely on code-switching as the most readily available means of expressing their bilingual perspectives (Gardner-Chloros, McEntee-Atalianis and Finnis 2005: 75).

Yet, the majority of both G1 and G2 subjects claim not to disapprove of code-switching, but they try to refrain from its use, which reflects some covert negative attitude to code-switching and the individual language user's responsibility in not cherishing it.

7.2.5. Emotional attitudes to the English and Hungarian languages

Questions 29 and 30 inquire about the emotions attached to speaking Hungarian and English, respectively. Six options have been provided to the question "How do you feel when speaking Hungarian / English?": 'proud'; 'frustrated'; 'uncomfortable'; 'good'; 'natural'; other (due to the low number of other responses, this has not been subject to further examination). For the quantification and interpretation of the data, see Section 6.1.

With a view to finding intergenerational differences, the responses given by G1 and G2 speakers have been compared. First, emotional attitudes to speaking Hungarian will be discussed.

Table 34: Emotional attitudes to speaking Hungarian from negative to positive in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	(B)Frustrated	(C)Uncomfortable	(E) Natural	(D)Good	(E) Proud
G1 `yes` responses (N=43)	0	0	20 (46%)	16 (38%)	7 (16%)
G2 `yes` responses (N=16)	2 (13%)	0	6 (37%)	4 (25%)	4 (25%)

Although the ranking of the different emotions associated with speaking Hungarian by G1 ((1) `natural`, (2) `good`, (3) `proud`) and G2 ((1) `natural`, (2-3) `good`, `proud`, (4) frustrated)) speakers is quite similar, G2 responses display a more homogeneous pattern, while in the G1 group; considerably more varied responses can be detected. The majority of both G1 (46%) and G2 (37%) speakers feel `natural` when speaking Hungarian followed by feeling `good` (G1: 38%; G2: 25%). However, in the G2 data, feeling `good` ranks equally with feeling `proud`. For G1 speakers, the feeling of `proud` is less significant. Although no G1 speaker feels `frustrated` when speaking Hungarian, some G2 speakers do, probably as a result of their being aware of their reduced Hungarian competence. Feeling `uncomfortable` has not emerged as a feeling attached to speaking Hungarian in either group.

In the following subsection, the emotional attitudes of G1 and G2 speakers to speaking English will be discussed.

Table 35: Emotional attitudes to speaking English from negative to positive in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	(B) Frustrated	(C) Uncomfortable	(E) Natural	(D) Good	(A) Proud
G1 `yes` responses (N=32)	1 (3%)	0	20 (63%)	9 (28%)	2 (6%)
G2 `yes` responses (N=10)	0	0	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	0

Similar to the emotions attached to speaking Hungarian (Table 34), the ranked order of emotions attached to speaking English is the same in G1 and G2 groups. Once again, it is noteworthy to observe that the overwhelming majority of G1 (63%) and G2 (80%) speakers feel `natural` when speaking English. The feeling of `natural` is followed by the feeling of `good` (G1: 28%; G2: 20%). The feeling of `proud` ranks the third (6%) in the G1 sample (no G2 subject claims to feel proud when speaking English), but it is less conspicuous than in terms of speaking Hungarian. G2 speakers do not feel `proud`, `frustrated`, or `uncomfortable` when speaking English. The data show that for both G1 and G2 speakers speaking English is `natural`, and overwhelmingly a good feeling is associated to it. Pride is less apparent in the G1 sample when it comes to speaking English than when speaking Hungarian. Although feeling `proud` and `good` have turned out to be almost equally characteristic of G2's emotional attitudes attached to speaking Hungarian, the feeling of `proud` does not emerge when speaking English. It is also noticeable that the emotional attitude of G2 speakers to English shows a significantly less varied, more heterogeneous picture than G1's attitude to Hungarian. This might bear evidence of the fact that G1 subjects have a more controversial attitude to Hungarian than G2 speakers have to

English. No G2 respondent feels `proud`, `frustrated` or `uncomfortable` when speaking English. A minority (only two respondents) claim to feel `good` when speaking English, but for the overwhelming majority (8 responses), speaking English feels `natural`.

7.2.6. Motivation for attending the NC Hungarian Club

In question 28 “Why do you go to the Hungarian club?” subjects have been provided 5 + 1 optional statements: A) “I like speaking Hungarian”; B) “I am interested in other Hungarians”; C) “Since we are Hungarians, we need to pull together”; D) “I think it is important to cherish Hungarian traditions”; E) “I am most comfortable among American-Hungarians who live here”; F) Other (Due to the low number of responses to statement F, it has been excluded from the scope of this examination.) For the quantification and interpretation of the data, see Section 6.1.

For the purpose of finding characteristic patterns with regards to motives in cherishing Hungarian traditions along intergenerational lines, the `yes` responses given to each statement in question 28 have been counted and contrasted in the G1 and G2 groups.

Table 36: Motives in attending the NC Hungarian Club in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	Statement A (Affective)	Statement B (Integrative)	Statement C (Ethnic affiliation)	Statement D (Heritage)	Statement E (Biculturalism)
G1 `yes` responses (N=77)	20 (26%)	17 (22%)	13 (17%)	18 (23%)	9 (12%)
G2 `yes` responses (N=19)	4 (21%)	5 (26%)	2 (11%)	5 (26%)	3 (16%)

Table 36 reflects that for G1 subjects the most important reason for attending the Hungarian club is of affective nature (26%) – they like speaking Hungarian (Statement A “I like speaking Hungarian.”). The heritage (23%) (Statement D “I think it is important to cherish Hungarian traditions.”) and the integrative (22%) (Statement B “I am interested in other Hungarians.”) aspects are also important for G1 speakers to attend the Hungarian Club, followed by ethnic affiliation (17%) (Statement C “Since we are Hungarians, we need to stick together.”), and biculturalism (12%) (Statement E “I am most comfortable among Hungarian-Americans who live here.”). For G2 speakers, though, the heritage (26%) and the integrative dimension (26%) of attending the Hungarian club are the most significant followed by the affective dimension (21%), biculturalism (16%), and ethnic affiliation (11%).

As a conclusion, the motivation for G1 respondents to attend the Hungarian Club is dominantly of affective nature. It reinforces the findings of previous studies that the attitude of G1 speakers to the culture and to the language of their home country is more of an emotional nature (Tannenbaum 2003: 384). Meanwhile, for G2 respondents, it is mainly associated with the heritage and integrative function of the language and culture of their parents.

7.2.7. Motivation for cherishing Hungarian language and passing on Hungarian traditions

Question 31a examines motivation for teaching Hungarian to children. It also reflects the underlying nature of the motives in passing on Hungarian language and traditions. Subjects could select from five plus one statements to question 31a “If you have (or if you had) children, is it important for you that they speak Hungarian?”: A) “We might move back to Hungary”; B) “I think to be truly Hungarian, one has to speak Hungarian”; C) “Hungarian culture can only be transmitted in Hungarian”; D) “It is important that they can communicate with the relatives back home”; E) “Their life is richer if they can speak Hungarian as well”; F) Other.

The responses given to the statements have been quantified and categorized according to the underlying motive reflected by the content of the sentences (see Section 6.1.). With a view to analyzing intergenerational differences, G1 and G2 motives have been contrasted.

Table 37: Motives in passing on the Hungarian language in the G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	Statement A (Instrumental/pragmatic)	Statement B (Language as identity)	Statement C (Language as culture)	Statement D (Significant others)	Statement E (Affective)
G1 `yes` responses (N=63)	6 (10%)	10 (16%)	12 (19%)	17 (27%)	18 (28%)
G2 `yes` responses (N=19)	0	4 (21%)	3 (16%)	4 (21%)	8 (42%)

Similarly to the previous data when questioned about motivation for attending the Hungarian Club (Table 36), the ranking of motives for both G1 and G2 subjects manifests the same pattern. Motivation of affective nature (Statement E “Their life is richer if they can speak Hungarian as well.” – 28% and 42% respectively) is the most dominant, while the instrumental / pragmatic value (Statement A “We might move back to Hungary.” – G1: 10%; G2: 0) associated to passing on the Hungarian language is the least relevant. Understandably, the instrumental, pragmatic value of a heritage language is of less significance when not used as a tool for social mobility in the country of the majority language (Poplack 1987: 90; Yagmur and Akinici 2003: 118; Yagmur 2004: 134).

Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that both G1 and G2 groups have a predominantly affective motive in cherishing Hungarian language and traditions, therefore, primarily a genuine interest in the heritage language and culture (Papapavlou and Pavlou 2001: 99).

It is interesting to note that in the G1 group language as identity ranks (Statement B “I think to be truly Hungarian one has to speak Hungarian.”) the last but one (16%) among the motives in cherishing Hungarian language. It reinforces the notion that this Hungarian-American immigrant community is in the phase of redefining the concept that language is essentially important for the expression of identity (Canagarajah 2008: 169). It seems that language is seen rather as a means of expressing and cherishing Hungarian culture than communicating in that language.

However, in the G2 group, language as identity (Statement B), slightly though, ranks (21%) before the language as culture motive (Statement C – 16%). Therefore, for them, the

Hungarian language is slightly more important as a means of expressing their identity than expressing their culture.

7.2.8. The lack of motivation for cherishing the Hungarian language and passing on Hungarian traditions

Question 31b examines the lack of motivation in teaching Hungarian to children. It also covertly reflects why subjects are not interested in passing on the Hungarian language and traditions to their children. Once again, subjects could select from five plus one statements to the question “If you have (or if you had) children, is it important for you that they speak Hungarian?”. The responses to this question all begin with “No, because ...” and have been categorized relying on the underlying motive reflected by the implicit content of the sentences (see more in Section 6.1.). The five plus one statements are as follows: A) “Hungarian can only be used in Hungary; B) “One does not need to speak Hungarian to be Hungarian”; C) “Hungarian would only interfere with their ability to acquire English perfectly”; D) “Sooner or later English will replace small languages such as Hungarian”; E) “I would want them to be fully integrated in the American society”; F) Other (not included in the statistical analyses).

Going along the line of highlighting intergenerational differences, G1 and G2 motives have been contrastively examined.

Table 38: The lack of motives in cherishing the Hungarian language in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	Statement A (Instrumental)	Statement B (Language as identity)	Statement C (Conflicting)	Statement D (Pragmatic)	Statement E (Integrative)
G1 `yes` responses (N=14)	5 (36%)	3 (22%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	4 (28%)
G2 `yes` responses (N=3)	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (33%)	1 (33%)

Once again, the tendencies observed in Table 38 manifest a considerably more homogeneous pattern in the G2 group than in G1. However, it has to be pointed out that a considerably low number of responses has been given to this question (in the G1 group 5 is the highest number in one cell, while in the G2 group it is 1.) By comparison, the highest number of positive responses in the previous section in the G1 and G2 groups are 18 and 8, respectively. (See Table 37). The low number of responses given to the question why it is not important to cherish the Hungarian language and traditions reflects that in fact it is important for both groups, for G2 speakers apparently even more so than for G1 speakers. This finding reinforces Yagmur and Akinci's (2003: 126) result that despite their reduced competence in and actual use of the heritage language, G2 speakers have a more positive attitude to cherishing the heritage language and traditions, mostly for the use of `self-identification`.

The largest segment of G1 (36%) speakers claim that cherishing the Hungarian language and traditions is not important for instrumental reasons, that is "Hungarian can only be used in Hungary" (Statement A).

The lack of Hungarian's integrative value (Statement E "I would want them to be fully integrated in the American society.") is ranked as the second most important argument against cherishing it in the G1 group (28%). However, in the G2 group, it is ranked equally (3%) with statements reflecting the language as identity (Statement B "One does not need to speak Hungarian to be Hungarian.") and the pragmatic-instrumental dimension (Statement D "Sooner or later English will replace small languages such as Hungarian.") of the Hungarian language.

Interestingly, while no G2 subject has agreed with statement C ("Hungarian would only interfere with their ability to acquire English perfectly.") highlighting the conflicting interrelation between Hungarian and English languages, one G1 respondent has. It provides slight evidence of previous findings that G2 respondents, unlike G1 respondents (Canagarajah 2008: 156), are less likely to consider Hungarian to be in conflict with English but rather to be in a complementary relation with it.

7.2.9. Attitudes to being a Hungarian-American

The final attitude-related question is of synthesizing nature and inquires about the overtly expressed attitude of the subjects to being a Hungarian-American. Subjects have been asked to finish the sentence "Being a Hungarian-American" in such a way that they feel the most appropriately describes this. No set responses have been provided. Therefore, the responses given are of qualitative nature. However, relying on the underlying content of the responses

given by the subjects, they have been classified into four groups. Responses reflecting an overwhelmingly negative feeling have been given the value of 1, responses expressing that being a Hungarian-American is better than being a Hungarian-Hungarian has been given the value of 2, the ambivalent feeling has been quantified as 3, and the overwhelmingly positive feeling attached to being a Hungarian-American has been quantified as 4.

Table 39: The classification of responses relying on their underlying content (some examples)

Responses expressing an overwhelmingly negative attitude (1)	Responses expressing a `better than being a Hungarian-Hungarian` attitude (2)	Responses expressing an ambivalent attitude (3)	Responses expressing an overwhelmingly positive attitude (4)
<p>“It is difficult because it is a foreign country and you are all alone.”</p> <p>“It is difficult because you are at home neither here nor there.”</p>	<p>“It is better than being a Hungarian in Slovakia.”</p> <p>“It is much easier than being a Hungarian-Hungarian.”</p>	<p>“It is not easy, but not difficult, either.”</p> <p>“It is good, but we are sorry that we cannot live at home. ”</p> <p>“It enriches you, but I will always be a Hungarian.”</p>	<p>“It is a cool thing.”</p> <p>“It is the way to be rich.”</p> <p>“I am proud of it.”</p>

With a view to finding intergenerational differences in the G1 and G2 groups, they have been contrastively analyzed.

Table 40: Attitudes to being a Hungarian-American in G1 vs. G2 groups

Responses	(1) Negative	(2) Better than ...	(3) Ambivalent	(4) Positive
G1 (N=27)	3 (11%)	14 (52%)	3 (11%)	7 (26%)
G2 (N=8)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (25%)

The order of the statements reflecting different attitudes to being a Hungarian-American is the same in both groups. The majority of both G1 (52%) and G2 (50%) subjects claim that being a Hungarian-American is better than being a Hungarian in Hungary, which is interesting considering that G2 subjects probably have less basis of comparison than G1 subjects as they did not spend a considerable amount of their adult life in Hungary. This attitude is followed by the overwhelmingly positive one (G1: 26%; G2: 25%), then by the equally ranking negative (G1: 11%; G2: 12.5%) and ambivalent attitudes (G1: 11%; G2: 12.5%).

Therefore, it can be concluded that in this particular community members have a positive attitude to being a Hungarian-American, mostly because it is perceived more favorably than being a Hungarian in Hungary (or in Slovakia).

7.3. Statistically significant correlations

As has been shown in the previous section (Section 7.2.), different patterns emerge in the sociolinguistic characteristics, language use tendencies, attitudes, and motivation factors of G1 and G2 groups. With a view to finding statistically significant correlations between

intergenerational affiliation and subjects' sociolinguistic characteristics, and code-switching tendencies, SPSS tests have been applied on the sample. Having run statistical tests on the data, some statistically significant correlations have been found, which – for the fairly small-scale sample – can only be regarded as representative of the examined NC Hungarian Club.

When more than two options (not only `yes` or `no`) have been provided to the items of the questionnaire, the responses given have been analyzed in cross tabulations. In such cases, the correlations between the examined variables have been regarded as statistically significant if the adjusted residual's value exceeds 2. The adjusted residual value is the standardized residual coefficient divided by the estimated standard error, and as such it shows the strength of correlations in cross tabulations.

However, when only two, `yes` or `no` options have been provided to the items of the questionnaire, the correlations between the examined variables have been analyzed as two-tailed correlations. The more the Pearson correlation coefficient (p-value) approaches 0, the more significant is the correlation. The Pearson correlation coefficient measures the strength of the linear relationship between two variables. The low p-value (less than 0.05 for example) means that there is evidence to reject the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypothesis, or that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables.

Having run the statistical SPSS tests, the following cross tabulations and linear correlations have turned to be statistically significantly different in the G1 and G2 groups.

As for the correlation between declared mother tongues and generational affiliation (see Table 41), the adjusted residual shows a value of 3.1, which reflects highly significant

correlation. The overall majority (78.6%) of G1 subjects claim that Hungarian is their mother tongue, followed by both English and Hungarian (14.3%). At the same time, a majority (66%) of G2 speakers state that both English and Hungarian are their mother tongues. This figure manifests that the notion of duality is more prevalent in G2 speakers' concept of mother tongue than in their G1 fellows'.

Table 41: Statistically significant correlations in declared mother tongues in the G1 vs. G2 groups

generation * 6. Mother tongue Cross tabulation							
		6. Mother tongue				Total	
		Hungarian	English	Hungarian-English	other		
Generation	1	Count	22	1	4	1	28
		% within generation	78.6%	3.6%	14.3%	3.6%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	3.1	-.9	-3.1	.6	
	2	Count	2	1	6	0	9
		% within generation	22.2%	11.1%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-3.1	.9	3.1	-.6	
Total	Count	24	2	10	1	37	
	% within generation	64.9%	5.4%	27.0%	2.7%	100.0%	

The correlation between intergenerational affiliation and competence (Table 42) has also turned out to be statistically significant at an adjusted residual value of 2.4. The same percentage (43%) of G1 subjects claim to speak Hungarian better and to speak Hungarian and English

equally. A majority (66.7%) of G2 speakers speak English better, and no one claims to speak Hungarian better. This proves that, in the G1 group, the heritage language competence considerably reduces.

Table 42: Statistically significant correlations in perceived competences in the G1 vs. G2 groups

generation * 7. Which language do you speak better? Cross tabulation						
		7. Which language do you speak better?			Total	
		in Hungarian	in English	equally		
generation	1	Count	12	4	12	28
		% within generation	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	2.4	-3.1	.5	
	2	Count	0	6	3	9
		% within generation	.0%	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-2.4	3.1	-.5	
Total	Count	12	10	15	37	
	% within generation	32.4%	27.0%	40.5%	100.0%	

It is interesting that the duality emerging with declared mother tongues in the G2 group is also characteristic of G2 speakers' perceived competence, though less considerably as only 33% (as opposed to 66.7%, see Table 41) of G2 subjects claim to have equal Hungarian and English competence. For G1 speakers, although better Hungarian (42.9%) and equal English and Hungarian competences (42.9%) are equally present, for the overwhelming majority (78.%, see

Table 41), Hungarian is the mother tongue. These figures reinforce the notion that the concept of mother tongue is not determined by relevant linguistic competence.

As for participant-related language use, language use with the parents and Hungarian-American friends have shown statistically significant correlations with intergenerational affiliation. Language use tendencies with parents show highly significant correlation with intergenerational affiliation at an adjusted residual value of 4.1 and 3.6 (Table 43). While 85% of first-generation speakers use Hungarian when speaking to their parents, only a minority, 22% of second-generation subjects do. The majority of second-generation (67%) speakers claim to mix and alternate English and Hungarian languages when speaking to their parents.

Table 43: Statistically significant correlations in language use tendencies with parents in the G1 vs. G2 groups

generation * 16. What language do you use with your parents? Cross tabulation								
		16. What language do you use with your parents?					Total	
		0	in Hungarian	mixing, alternating between the two languages	4	5		
generation	1	Count	1	23	1	0	2	27
		% within generation	3.7%	85.2%	3.7%	.0%	7.4%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	.6	3.6	-4.1	-1.8	.8	
	2	Count	0	2	6	1	0	9
		% within generation	.0%	22.2%	66.7%	11.1%	.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-.6	-3.6	4.1	1.8	-.8	

Total	Count	1	25	7	1	2	36
	% within generation	2.8%	69.4%	19.4%	2.8%	5.6%	100.0%

When speaking to Hungarian-American friends, language use tendencies also reflect statistically significantly different patterns in G1 and G2 groups at an adjusted residual value of 2.3. While the majority of G1 speakers (67%) use Hungarian with their fellow Hungarian-American friends, the majority of G2 subjects (22%) rely on mixing and alternating English and Hungarian as a means of communication.

Table 44: Statistically significant correlations in language use with Hungarian-American friends in the G1 vs. G2 groups

generation * 20. What language do you use with your Hungarian-American friends? Cross tabulation								
		20. What language do you use with your Hungarian-American friends?					Total	
		in English	in Hungarian	mixing, alternating between the two languages	4	5		
generation	1	Count	1	18	5	3	0	27
		% within generation	3.7%	66.7%	18.5%	11.1%	.0%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-.8	2.3	-.9	-.8	-1.8	
	2	Count	1	2	3	2	1	9
		% within generation	11.1%	22.2%	33.3%	22.2%	11.1%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	.8	-2.3	.9	.8	1.8	
Total	Count	2	20	8	5	1	36	
	% within	5.6%	55.6%	22.2%	13.9%	2.8%	100.0%	

	generation						
--	-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

The set of data in Table 44 reinforces the previous notion of duality prevalent in G2 speakers' concept of bilingualism. They use both languages with other Hungarian-American bilingual fellows as an intra-community device of communication.

As for function-related language use, counting shows very strong statistical correlation (at an adjusted residual value of 3.5 and 2.4) with intergenerational affiliation.

Table 45: Statistically significant correlations in counting in the G1 vs. G2 groups

generation * 26.B. In what language do you count to yourself? Cross tabulation							
		26.B. In what language do you count to yourself?				Total	
		in Hungarian	in English	he/she does not do the given activity	both in English and Hungarian		
generation	1	Count	18	2	1	6	27
		% within generation	66.7%	7.4%	3.7%	22.2%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	3.5	-1.9	.6	-2.4	
	2	Count	0	3	0	6	9
		% within generation	.0%	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
		Adjusted Residual	-3.5	1.9	-.6	2.4	
Total	Count	18	5	1	12	36	
	% within generation	50.0%	13.9%	2.8%	33.3%	100.0%	

While a majority of G1 speakers (67%) claim to count in Hungarian, the same proportion of G2 speakers (67%) count in both English and Hungarian. It seems that counting is closely related with the declared mother tongue.

Statistical tests have also been applied on the number of code-switched instances in G1 group with a view to finding significant correlations with subjects' sociolinguistic characteristics (G2 subjects have been excluded from this analysis for their reduced Hungarian competence). However, this type of data is too scattered to find any statistical correlation. Therefore, the number of code-switches have been clasped and classified into 4 groups.

Table 46: The frequency of code-switched instances in the G1 group

The frequency of code-switches	Number of subjects	Percentages of subjects (%)
None	4	14
1-5 instances	8	29
6-15 instances	7	25
More than 15 instances	9	32

Table 46 shows that the largest segment of G1 speakers (N=9, 32%) have code-switched more than 15 times, while the smallest segment of subjects (N=4, 14%) have never code-switched. Statistical tests have been run to find correlations between the frequency of code-switched instances and subjects' sociolinguistic characteristics, but for the scattered nature of the data, no statistically significant patterns have emerged.

7.4. Summary of the NC Hungarian Club's sociolinguistic characteristics

The objective of this part of the study has been to give a comprehensive sociolinguistic characterization of the NC Hungarian Club. On the basis of quantitative analyses, we have seen that G1 and G2 groups differ distinctively with regard to their sociolinguistic characteristics.

The results above show striking differences in the language use patterns of G1 and G2 speakers. Parallel to the results of previous studies, the findings discussed above reinforce the widely made observation that the use of the minority or heritage language markedly declines with the emergence of the second generation (Hlavac 2003: 17; Al-Sahafi & Barkhuizen 2006: 52). The most considerable decline can be detected in communication with parents, and within the peer community, with siblings (Papapavlou and Pavlou 2001: 102; Hlavac 2003: 22; Canagarajah 2008: 149) and Hungarian-American friends (Papapavlou and Pavlou 2001: 102). It can be discerned that G1 speakers, in an immigrant setting, use the most Hungarian with their Hungarian-American friends followed by their spouses, and they use considerably less Hungarian with their children. G2 interlocutors use fairly little Hungarian with their parents, siblings, and Hungarian-American friends, which shows that even the use of Hungarian restricted to the family and to the informal domain is gradually replaced by English (with siblings), by alternating between English and Hungarian (with Hungarian-American friends), and by mixing English and Hungarian (with parents). Due to the relatively young age of G2 respondents, some language use tendencies in different domains such as communicating with spouses, children, at work, have proven to be irrelevant.

Among the different language use tendencies, some strikingly different patterns have been found in the G1 vs. G2 groups. In the G1 group, Hungarian is the most prevalently used for the function of counting, and the least for the function of talking to oneself. In the G2 group, however, English is the most prevalent when dreaming. In the G2 group, though, Hungarian only emerges when it comes to praying.

Examining more closely the statistically significant correlations between the attitude to code-switching and intergenerational affiliation, it can be concluded that G1 speakers have an overall more controversial attitude to code-switching, which is determined by how `purist` an attitude G1 respondents have towards code-switching as well as by how extensively G1 subjects use code-switching as a means of communicating in their participant-related language use domains. This two-fold distinction between language seen as an abstract asset and as a pragmatic tool of communication well reflects the transitional bicultural, in-between two cultures, state of G1 members. Code-switching tendencies seem to depend on which extreme is more dominant in a particular situation on this scale of transitional bicultural continuum.

Overall, G2 speakers have a more positive attitude to code-switching. G2 speakers seem to have a more natural, pragmatic attitude to code-switching. They readily rely on it as a means of filling competence-related gaps in their speech or as a device for expressing their bicultural experience. Therefore, the two-fold distinction between a `purist` attitude to code-switching and its pragmatic use or the transitional continuum of the bicultural experience observed in the G1 group seems to be irrelevant in the G2 group. Still, traces of the `purist` attitude to code-

switching can be observed in the G2 group, too, but it seems to reflect more the parents' set of values associated with the Hungarian language and culture than G2 respondents' own.

In conclusion, G2 speakers have a more balanced, less controversial attitude to code-switching and to the bicultural experience and use code-switching either as a means of making up for linguistic gaps triggered by their lack of Hungarian competence or as a means of expressing their distinct bicultural identity.

To summarize, both for G1 and G2 speakers code-switching can be of functional as well as of complementary nature. In terms of G1 respondents, it depends on where speakers are situated in a particular situation in the transitional continuum of a pragmatic or a purist attitude to language use. Nevertheless, as for G2 speakers, it mostly depends on their Hungarian competence.

7.5. An Optimality Theoretical analysis of bilingual grammar of the Hungarian-American bilingual community in North Carolina

In order to test the applicability of Bolonyai and Bhatt's model, English-Hungarian code-switched instances from the transcribed texts of the author's data recorded in the Hungarian-American community by conducting sociolinguistic interviews have been analyzed. The analysis is based on a uniquely ample volume of English-Hungarian code-switched instances (54 hours of recorded sociolinguistic interviews with 39 Hungarian-Americans living in North Carolina).

These data provide evidence of the applicability of Bolonyai and Bhatt's (forthcoming) model on the Hungarian-American community specific mechanism of code-switching.

As the scope of Bolonyai and Bhatt's model covers only the sociopragmatically meaningful instances of code-switches but not the ones driven by lack of appropriate language competence, second-generation data have been excluded from this quantitative analysis. With regard to second-generation speakers, their reduced Hungarian competence – as compared to first-generation speakers – makes it difficult to appropriately differentiate between sociopragmatically meaningful code-switched instances and instances emerging due to reduced language competence. To be able to quantify uniformly code-switched instances, a matrix language and an embedded language (Myers-Scotton 1993, 1997) must be separable in the subjects' speech. However, second-generation speakers' Hungarian competence is so reduced as compared to first-generation speakers that it is more like a composite matrix language (Myers-Scotton 1998, 2000), in which the instances of code-switches cannot be distinguished from linguistic interference of the two language systems activated in their speech.

In the following example, I intend to illustrate that due to second-generation speakers' reduced Hungarian competence, the code-switched instance cannot be distinguished from elements of a composite matrix language.

Example [22]

- 1 G2F17 ”Igen, mert most látom, hogy ez tényleg, *so* jó beszélni magyarul,
2 nem kell azért úgy *embarrassed* lenni róla, vagy valami”

(`Yes, because now I can see that this is really, so it is good to speak in English, you don't have to be embarrassed about it or something`)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this extract, G2 speaker talks about the importance of speaking Hungarian. She speaks Hungarian, though, her use of analytical structures such as the overwhelming use of adjective plus infinitive structure (“jó beszélni magyarul”) (`it is good to speak in Hungarian`) and (“nem kell azért úgy *embarrassed* lenni róla”) (`you don't have to be so embarrassed about it`) as well as the use of a lexical calque in line 1, (“most látom”) (`now I can see`), which is the literal translation of the English equivalent, all shows that the Hungarian language the speaker uses is actually a composite English-Hungarian matrix one. The matrix structure of the language is English with some embedded Hungarian words. Therefore, the switch in line 2, to *embarrassed* cannot be interpreted as a socio-pragmatically meaningful switch, but rather as an attempt to fill in a limited Hungarian lexicon with an English equivalent. Also, the speaker uses the English preposition *about* with *embarrassed*, and not the Hungarian one, which would be *emiatt* (“because of it”).

In first-generation data as well, competence-related and sociopragmatically meaningful instances of code-switches have been differentiated and excluded from the scope of the examination. Also, code-switched instances of which a sociopragmatic function could not be defined or classified into one of the five main principles set by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) have been excluded from the scope of my investigation. Therefore, competence-related, sociopragmatically not meaningful or ambiguous instances of code-switches have not been analyzed.

The next example [23] serves as illustration of a sociopragmatically not meaningful code-switched instance, a code-switch prompted by the speaker's lexical gap. In this extract, the speaker describes the technical process of covering a table with some special material. In the first line, she switches to English when referring to the special material. Before switching, she repeats the Hungarian word "ilyen" meaning 'sort of' in English twice, which shows that she is hesitating and probably does not find the appropriate Hungarian word for it.

Example [22]

- 1 G1F17,48 "Nem ez egy ilyen *plastic*, ami ilyen *plastic coating*, amit
 2 rákensz, úgy megszárad, és olyan mint hogyha műanyag lenne"

(No, this is kind of plastic, which is kind of plastic coating that you spread on it, and then it gets dry and is like plastic.)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

The speaker's limited use of Hungarian in the American setting makes it difficult for her to recall the appropriate technical term in Hungarian, so she switches to English. The switch fills in a lexical gap with no other sociopragmatic meaning or intention. Instances of similar nature have been excluded from my investigation.

The next example [23] provides evidence of a code-switched instance triggered by the speaker's reduced Hungarian competence as well as restricted use of Hungarian. In this extract, the speaker tells how fortunate it was that he had nothing to eat because he could get an injection against yellow fever.

Example [23]

- 1 G1M52,65 „Jó, hogy nem ettem, nem volt időm, ..., próbáltam injekciót
2 kapjak a *yellow fever* tudod.”

(It was good that I did not eat, I had no time ... I tried to get an injection, yellow fever, you know`)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

Although the speaker in this example is a first-generation Hungarian, he has been living in the USA since he was 13 and now he is 65, and his Hungarian competence has been considerably reduced. When he wants to mention the name of the disease that he got an injection against, he switches to English (*yellow fever*, line 2). The switch on the one hand fills in a gap in the speaker's reduced Hungarian lexicon. On the other hand, the switch is also prompted by his reduced Hungarian competence. The structure of the Hungarian sentence is interfered by the English structure, and the ending term of the sentence, "tudod", ('you know') is also a term used widely in English, but less so in Hungarian. Therefore, the speaker's reduced Hungarian competence as well as his limited Hungarian lexicon prompt the speaker to switch to English. This switch, however, serves no other sociopragmatically meaningful function.

In the next example [24] provided below, the sociopragmatic function of the code-switch from Hungarian to English does not seem to have a meaningful sociopragmatic function, either.

Example [24]

1 G1M17,37 "... mert huszonnyolckor, huszonnyolc éves korodba száz

2 *pounddal overweight* vagy, az normális "

('... because at the age of twenty-eight, when you are twenty-eight, you are a hundred pound overweight, and that is normal')

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this extract, the speaker criticizes the way that average American women look when they are still young. To express the extent of their obesity, he switches to *pound* as a measure of their weight. As weight in the USA is measured in pounds, he switches to English. Probably the switch to the English *pound* triggers the English *overweight* term as well without giving extra meaning to the utterance. This particular instance, therefore, has been assessed as serving no meaningful sociopragmatic function.

Code-switches to proper nouns are also considered as serving no sociopragmatic function. In the next example [25], the speaker recalls how they settled down in North Carolina, and she switches to English to mention the name of the place where her son-in-law was offered a job.

Example [25]

- 1 G1F51,80 Hát negyvenöt évig éltünk New Yorkban, és a vejem ide kapott
2 a *Duke University*, egyik ... legfinomabb igaz?

(‘Well, we lived in New York for forty-five years, then my son-in-law was offered a job here at Duke University, one of the ... the most delicious, right?’)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

Borrowings have also been excluded from my investigation. In the example [26] below, the speaker mentions *cocktail* and *tv* as the very socio-cultural icons of American life. However, as these two words are well-established in Hungarian language as well, they are classified as borrowings and not as meaningful code-switches.

Example [26]

- 1 G1M52,65 Amíg nem veszítik el a *cocktailt*, meg a *tv*-t, amíg van pénz,
 2 és mivel gazdag az ország, beszavazol egy hülyét mindenki
 3 nemszenved miatta, mert van elég, ami terjed, mármint jólétben

(`As long as they do not lose cocktails and tvs, and there is money, and as the country is rich, you vote for a moron, nobody suffers from it, because there is enough that is spread, I mean in terms of prosperity`)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

The examples provided above serve as illustration of code-switched instances that have been excluded from the scope of my analysis, that is, they have not been included among the socio-pragmatically meaningful instances. All other instances have been analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively as well. In the table (47) below, all code-switched instances have been counted and classified. Although the direction of switching either from Hungarian to English, or from English to Hungarian is not per se significant, in the table provided below (47), they have been separately enumerated. Having counted the code-switched instances in the first-generation group, the following results have emerged:

Table 47: The total number of code-switched instances in the G1 group

Number of code-switches from Hungarian to English	Number of code-switches from English to Hungarian	Sociopragmatically meaningful instances (Total)	Sociopragmatically not meaningful instances (competence-related switches, lexical gap fillers, borrowings, etc) (Total)	Total number of code-switches
198	3	211	114	325

Besides counting all code-switched instances, the sociopragmatically meaningful ones have also been classified (Table 48) as fulfilling one (or more) of the five principles outlined by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming). The detailed interpretation of the five-fold classification of the socio-pragmatic functions fulfilled by code-switched instances has been provided in (Section 4.3.1.)

Table 48: The distribution of the sociopragmatically meaningful instances of code-switches in the G1 group

The number of Perspective-related instances	The number of Faith-related instances	The number of Solidarity-related instances	The number of Face-related instances	The number of Power-related instances
112	70	8	6	15

As can be seen in Table 48, the code-switched instances fulfilling the principle of Perspective have turned out to be the most numerous, followed by Faith, Solidarity, Face, and Power. With regard to the number of code-switched instances fulfilling given functions, it must be pointed out that the set of my data has been provided by sociolinguistic interviews. In the course of these interviews, subjects were asked to recount their experiences of being Hungarian-American immigrants pointing out the differences between Hungarian and American cultures in terms of education, relationships, the school system, attitude to work, etc. Hence, subjects constantly contrast their Hungarian and American lives by recalling their relevant experiences. In order to contrast American and Hungarian ways of life and their personal experience, subjects rely on the discourse-related functions that code-switches fulfill. As the principle of Perspective includes the most discourse-related subfunctions, as opposed to Face, Solidarity, and Power fulfilling sociopragmatic functions reflecting interpersonal relations, it is likely to be the most numerous in the sample. Faith is also an inherent part of bi- or multilingual speakers' discursive accounts of different experiences accumulated in different cultural settings. Instances of Faith-related code-switches index culture-bound notions, related to the subjects' different cultural

scripts – American and Hungarian –, prevalent and/or absent in different cultures. Therefore, Faith is also expected to be prevalent in the sociolinguistic interviews, actually, it has turned out to be the second most frequently occurring function in the examined set of data.

According to Bolonyai and Bhatt's proposed ranking (forthcoming) in the Hungarian-American set of data, Solidarity ranks below Faith and Perspective but above Face and Power, which equally rank as the lowest constraints. As for the principles subsuming the sociopragmatic functions of code-switches reflecting interpersonal relations (Face, Power, and Solidarity) rather than fulfilling discourse-related functions, fewer instances are expected to emerge. As the particular genre of my set of data is sociolinguistic interviews, few examples of face-related linguistic choices – face-saving or face-loss games between the subjects or in the setting of the sociolinguistic interviews – are expected.

Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming: 46) claim that the ranking of Solidarity, Power and Face and their interrelational position is more subject to the “socio-relational” context. As the socio-relational context depends on a given community's sociolinguistic characteristics, the ranking of Solidarity, Face and Power is susceptible to these community sociolinguistic variables, while the ranking of Perspective and Faith depends more on the discourse-related functions that code-switches are expected to fulfill in given context.

Therefore, in light of this, I claim that Perspective and Faith as the highest ranked constraints involve the `discourse-related` functions of code-switching, characteristic of bi- or multilingual speech communities. Solidarity, Face and Power, however, fall within the category

of `socio-relational` functions of code-switches with their interrelational ranking being susceptible to the given micro-linguistic and -social context of the code-switched utterance.

Hence, what remains to be examined is the hierarchical positioning of Perspective, Faith, Solidarity, Face, and Power as well as the operation of these supposedly ranked constraints in concrete situations.

7.5.1. The functions of Perspective-related code-switches

In the section below, I give a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the socio-pragmatic functions expressed or indexed by the instances of code-switching in the set of data. To illustrate the functions listed under the five principles set up by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming), examples taken from the data collected by the author is analyzed. The classification of the functions under the five principles acting as constraints as well relies on the comprehensive background research of previous studies on code-switching conducted by Bolonyai and the author (2007-2008). This comprehensive list of all functions can be found in Appendix 1.

In the examined set of data, the code-switched instances falling under the category of Perspective have turned out to be the most numerous (N=112) (see Table 48). The various sociopragmatic Perspective-related functions that have been found in the sample are listed below.

conversation she was reminiscing about as well as taking on the role of the participants of the conversation.

b) Contextualization cue

Example [28]

- 1 G1F42,22 ”Jaj, jöttem *visitbe*, egy családhoz, és amíg itt voltam, kaptam egy,
 2 elmentem, untam a *Beverly Hills-t*, meg a *wheel of fortune-t*,
 3 akkor még reggel”

(`Yeah, I came to visit, and while I was here, I got a, I went, I was tired of `Beverly Hills` and of the `Wheel of Fortune`, that time in the morning ...`)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

Auer (1995: 123) claims that “contextualization comprises all those activities by participants which make relevant/maintain/revise/cancel some aspects of context”, that is, contextual cues are such discourse elements that allow the speaker to provide extra (contextual) meaning to their utterance. In the example above [28], the code-switched instance serves as a

contextualization cue for highlighting the purpose of the speaker's coming to the USA. In the utterance above, the speaker recalls the circumstances of how she came to the USA. The Hungarian word *jöttem* ('I came') already establishes the direction of her journey, that is, to the USA. In the first line of the utterance, though, she switches to English to express that she came to visit somebody. By switching to English, she is able to place the story in the appropriate context, when she first came to the USA to visit, and with no intention of immigrating. The switch to English, therefore, contextualizes as well as highlights the original purpose of the speaker that is, simply visiting somebody rather than immigrating.

c) Positioning

Example [29]

- 1 G1M27,50 "A környezettől függ, tudod, például, hogyha, már nekem erre van
 2 egy tervem, például, ha januárban elmegyek Magyarországra,
 3 akkor meg fogom keresni a budapesti baptista templomot, és akkor
 4 ott fog megismerni, valószínű lesznek amerikaiak is, *so*, így, így, *I*
 5 *can hang out with the Americans.*"

(It depends on the environment, you know, for example, if I already have a plan for this, in January when I go to Hungary, I will look for the baptist church in Budapest where I will get to know, probably there will be Americans too, so, this way, this way I can hang out with the Americans.)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker talks about his intentions to visit Hungary in January. In the fifth line of this passage, when he mentions that while in Hungary he wants to visit a baptist church so that he could meet, *hang out with* some Americans, he switches to English. The purpose of this switch is to index that when he is Hungary, he hangs out with the Americans as someone belonging to them. He therefore takes on the position of an American visiting Hungary and expresses this position by switching to English.

d) **Contrasting**

Example [30]

- | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|
| 1 | I1 (Interviewer 1) | “Tudsz példát mondani? Gyereknevelésben, vagy az |
| 2 | | iskolában mi a különbség?” |

(`Can you come up with some examples? What are the main differences (in Hungary and the USA) in terms of bringing up children or in the school?`)

3 G1F16,40 “Nálunk meg nem csak a *have fun*, hanem hát valamit tanuljon is a
4 gyerek, meg fejlődjön, meg erősödjön meg ilyenek.”

(`Back (in Hungary), however, not only to have fun, but the children, well, have to learn something, to make progress, to get stronger, and things like that.`)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

Code-switching enables the speaker to “contrast an initial [...] point with a subsequent one” (Gardner-Chloros, Charles, and Cheshire 2000: 1332). In this utterance, the speaker contrasts the standard requirements of the school system in the USA to those of the Hungarian one. According to her, the main difference between the two systems lies in the fact that in the USA, she claims, the school is about *having fun*, as opposed to Hungary, where the children have to learn “valamit” (`something`) seriously and to improve and make progress. By placing “csak” (`only`) acting as a restrictive modifier of the subsequent noun, the speaker already makes an evaluation that the American school system is not as good as the Hungarian one as it is only about *having fun*. When setting in contrast the American system with the Hungarian one, she switches to English. The switch in this case, therefore, serves as a means of evaluative contrasting, opposing the two systems, highlighting their supposedly most striking difference.

e) **Emphasis**

Example [31]

- 1 G1F60,82 “... akkor volt egy óriási házuk a Hunnia filmgyárral szemben és
 2 ez, ott olyan gyümölcsfák voltak, hogy az *unbelievable*, olyan jó
 3 volt, nagyon finom volt minden, ...”

(... they had a huge house opposite the Hunnia filmstudio, and this, there were such fruit trees that is unbelievable, everything was so good, so delicious, ...)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

According to Auer (1984: 4), “participants switch languages to [...] give emphasis to what they are saying”. In the utterance above, the speaker is reminiscing about her past. As she feels nostalgic for the past, she recalls some fruit trees that she remembers were very good and gave delicious fruit. When she recalls the great quality of the fruit trees, she switches to English. The switch to English functions as an extra comment accentuating the discursive force of what has been previously said. The switch to English, therefore, as a post-modifying extra comment does not contain extra information but accentuates the high quality of the fruit trees, fulfilling the function of emphasis.

f) **Irony**

Example [32]

1 G1M51,78 “Ez mind az én *masterpiece-eim*.”

(‘These are all my masterpieces’.)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

During the interview, the speaker modestly shows the photographs taken by him to the two interviewers. In this utterance, when he presents his pictures, which he calls *my masterpieces*, he switches to English. By switching to English, he softens the actual meaning of the English word and indexes that he uses the word *masterpiece* – which is obviously an exaggeration – only ironically to refer to his pictures.

g) **Off-stage comment**

Example [33]

1 G1F82,60 “Most veszem észre, nincs fülbevalóm.”

(‘I have just realized that I have no earrings` .)

2 G1M78,51 “Az egészet újra kell csinálni.”

(‘The whole (interview) must be recorded again.’)

3 G1M78,51 “*Rewind the tape now*”.

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, one interviewee realizes that she was wearing no earrings while the interview was being recorded. Her husband makes a remark that the interview must be recorded again. Then he switches to English and commands the interviewer to *rewind the tape now*. As the language of the interview is Hungarian, by switching to English, he indicates that he makes a move away from the original frame of the interview and takes on a new role, the role of someone playfully instructing the interviewer. By switching to English the speaker indicates that the comment he makes is not part of the interview, but a comment off the record. Also as the comment is slightly sarcastic of his wife, the switch to English softens his sarcasm and indicates that his comment is definitely not part of the interview, only something funny off the record.

h) **Sarcasm**

Example [34]

- 1 G1M27,50 "Nem, mert, aki érdeklődésből kérdezi, annak elmondom, aki meg
 2 azért kérdezi, mert nem szereti, félti a kultúráját az idegenektől, hát
 3 azt meg sajnálom, mert azok általában nem tudják, hogy nem kell
 4 *passport* Texasba, tudod?"

(No, because if they ask me because they are interested, I tell them, but those who ask me because they do not like or are afraid of aliens, I feel sorry for them because they generally do not know that you do not need a passport to go to Texas, you know?)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this example, the speaker talks about how he feels when most Americans ask him where he is from, realizing that he is not American. He says that if he feels that people are really interested in where he is actually from, he is happy to tell them. However, when he says that if the person inquiring about his nationality has a hidden agenda either because they do not like

aliens, or they are afraid of them, he switches to a sarcastic note. He says that he feels sorry for these people as they do not know that they do not need a passport if they want to go to Texas. By this, he means that they are ignorant and that is why he does not mind even if he feels that these people only ask about his nationality because they realize that he is an `unliked alien`. By switching to the English word, *passport*, he indexes the sarcastic content of the comment he makes about these people.

i) **Interjections**

Example [35]

- 1 G1F60,82 ``*Oh, God!* Huszon, mit tudom én, négy, öt, valahogy így. De ott
 2 is mindig magyarokkal voltunk, mert ott is volt magyar klub,
 3 tudod, ez az!”

(`Oh, God! Twenty, I don't know, four, five, something like that. But we were always with the Hungarians, because there was a Hungarian club, too, you know, things like that!`)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

The utterance listed above is an example of code-switching serving as an interjection. An interjection is “a word, which indicates an emotional state or attitude such as delight, surprise, shock, and disgust, but which has no referential meaning” (Richards, Platt and Platt 1996: 186). In this utterance, the speaker switches to English to make an interjection. By doing so, she is able to give an additional expressive force to her interjection. This English interjection is also an example of linguistic routine.

j) **Conclusion**

Example [36]

1 G1F60,82 “Elrontott népség. *That’s for sure.*”

(It is a spoiled people. That’s for sure.)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this part of the interview, the speaker characterizes Americans. She makes a comment that they are a *spoiled people*, then she switches to English to conclude this and to end the argument. By switching to English, she manages to conclude the statement leaving no space for

disagreement. The switch to English enables her to give more weight to her concluding utterance as well as signaling that this is the end of her argument and she is absolutely positive about it.

k) **Topic change**

Example [37]

- | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|
| 1 | I2 (Interviewer 2) | “Women power.” |
| 2 | G1M23,50 | ” <i>I am so happy. So</i> a nagyapám felesége az |
| 3 | | Smoczer Mariska volt. Van egy olyan” |
- (I am so happy. So, my grandfather’s wife was Smoczer Mariska. There is such a ...
`)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

Code-switching may function as a means of topic shift when “the speaker marks a shift in topic with a shift in language, with no consistent link between topic and language” (Zentella 1997: 94). In this extract, the participants of the interview speak about an increasing number of American women taking their mother’s maiden names as their middle names. Interviewer two

makes a concluding remark by saying "Women power". The interviewee reacts to this concluding remark in English, then he switches to Hungarian to indicate that he wants to change topic. By switching to Hungarian, he separates the two halves of his utterance indicating a shift in topics. While in the first half, he responds to what has been previously said in English, then he starts speaking in Hungarian about his family. The switch to Hungarian in this example, therefore, serves as an indication that the speaker wants to introduce a new topic.

1) **Metalinguistic comment**

Example [38]

- 1 G1F48,65 "Szerintem sokkal egyszerűbb azt mondani, hogy *trunk*, mint
2 csomagtartó, nagyon nagyon csábító lerövidíteni, ha lehet"

(I think that it is much easier to say trunk than *csomagtartó*, it is very very tempting to shorten if it is possible.)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

The metalinguistic function of code-switching can be observed when "comments are made directly or indirectly about the languages involved" (Karras 1995: 59). In this utterance, the speaker makes a comment on her own code-switching strategies. She explains why she sometimes code-switches to English from Hungarian. She explains that one reason for her code-switching to English is linguistic economy, that is, she switches to English when the English word seems more 'economical' because it is shorter than its Hungarian equivalent. To illustrate her explanation, she cites the English word, *trunk*, as the shorter equivalent of the Hungarian 'csomagtartó'. The switch to English, hence, serves as a metalinguistic comment, a linguistic illustration to reinforce the point about her code-switching tendencies.

m) Identity

Example [39]

1 G1F51,80 "... ott születünk, ott nevelkedtünk, de *we are Americans*."

(... we were born there, we grew up there, but we are Americans.)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

De Fina claims that "among the strategies that have the greatest role in indexing ethnicity, language use appears to be the most important" (De Fina 2007: 379). The extract above shows how code-switching functions as the most economically and readily available discursive device of expressing identity. In this utterance, the speaker talks about her life, and she says that although she was born and grew up in Hungary, now she feels that she is an America. She begins her utterance in Hungarian, then she switches to English to say that they (together with her husband) are now Americans. The switch to English, therefore, accentuates the force of the statement that despite her Hungarian roots, now she identifies herself as an American.

n) **Clarification**

Example [40]

- 1 G1F51,79 "... mindig ott gyakoroltunk abban a gimnáziumban, abban a *high*
- 2 *schoolban*, ahol ő tanított, és nagyon sok szép emlék fűz hozzá,
- 3 ehhez a"

(... we would always have the rehearsals in that high school, in that high school, where she was teaching and I had a lot of nice memories of this`)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker recalls some experience related to a Hungarian-American folk dance group in which she participated. She recalls the high school where they held their rehearsals. In the first line of her utterance, though, she switches to English. When remembering the venue of the dance classes first she refers to it in Hungarian, then she switches to English to clarify it. The Hungarian term, “gimnázium”, which is the cultural translation of ‘high school’ does not have the same socio-cultural connotation as high school due to the underlying differences in the American and Hungarian educational systems. In Hungarian, “gimnázium” is a specific secondary grammar school while the English term ‘high school’ is a collective term of secondary schools in the USA. Therefore, the Hungarian term, ‘gimnázium’ would not convey the most appropriate meaning of the intended locution. Moreover, the switch to English places the utterance in the appropriate, the American, physical setting. Therefore, by switching to English, whose primary function is clarification, the speaker fulfils two additional sociopragmatic functions: she contextualizes the physical setting (Perspective-related function) and also specifies the socio-cultural notion of the ‘high school’ term (Faith-related function).

o) **Reiteration**

Example [41]

- 1 G1M52,70 ”... és hát elmentem a vécére, és mielőtt ki akarok jönni, hallom
 2 ám, hogy egy hapsi ööö már nem tudom mi a neve, mondja te, mit
 3 szóltok ehhez a magyarhoz, érted, *what do you think about this*
 4 *Hungarian?*”

(... and then I go to the restroom, and before I want to come out, I can hear a guy,
 er, I don't remember his name, say, 'what do you think of this Hungarian', you
 know, 'what do you think of this Hungarian?')

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker recalls an incident when he accidentally overheard a conversation of his American colleagues speaking about him. He recalls the particular sentence that he overheard in Hungarian, then he translates, reiterates the sentence in English. By repeating the Hungarian sentence in English, he actually recalls the incident quoting the original sentence. The speaker still seems emotionally involved when recalling this incident as he apparently has interpreted it as a threat to his supposedly well-established status in this group of American colleagues, despite the fact that he is not American but Hungarian.

p) **Narrative frame break, evaluation, coda**

Example [42]

1 G1F82,60 “De a lakás az itt van, meg *whatever*.”

(‘But the apartment is here, and whatever.’)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

Code-switching might fulfill the function of a narrative break, or coda when the speaker switches to another language “to depart from the narrative frame to evaluate some aspect of the story or to deliver the punch line, or ending” (Zentella 1997: 94). In this utterance, the speaker is asked about where she feels her actual home is. She begins by saying in Hungarian that she has her apartment here, and then she switches to English to end the sentence by saying *whatever*. By switching to English she indicates – without giving any other cues – that she wants to put an end to this issue even though she cannot really give an appropriate response to the question. Feeling slightly uncomfortable by the question, she switches to English, to conclude the sentence. This code-switched instance, therefore, serves as an indication of delivering an ending to her utterance, or as its narrative coda.

In this utterance, the speaker highlights one significant difference between American and Hungarian speech practices deriving from the various cultural connotations of some common set linguistic expressions. She – as a Hungarian – finds particularly strange the fact that Americans always start a conversation by saying `hi, how are you`. She is particularly surprised by this as in the Hungarian cultural script, this question entails actual interest, while in the USA, it rather serves as a way of greeting or starting a conversation than expressing real interest in how the other person is. To illustrate this – for Hungarians – surprising element of American manners, she switches to English to say *hi, how are you*. As the Hungarian connotation of this utterance is significantly different than the American-English one, in order to optimize the culture specific connotation, the faithful interpretiveness of this utterance, she switches to English.

b) Filling in a semantic gap

Example [44]

- | | | |
|---|---------|--|
| 1 | G1F8,35 | ”... Van egy, ööö, Theonak van most egy új munkatársa, aki tíz |
| 2 | | évvel ezelőtt feltalált egy kis ketyerét, így fogom nevezni, mert |
| 3 | | nem tudom igazából, <i>page keeper</i> , ő <i>page keepernek</i> nevezi” |

(... Now, Theo has a new colleague, who ten years ago invented a gadget, I will call it like this because I do not really know its name, page keeper, he calls it a page keeper.)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker talks about something that an acquaintance of hers invented. As in the Hungarian vocabulary no appropriate term exists for this invention, or she is not familiar with it, she fills in this semantic gap first by resorting to the English name of `this gadget`. Then she switches to English to specify this invention and to express this specificity with the greatest economy. Hence, in this case, the switch to English serves the function of filling in this particular semantic gap.

c) Linguistic routines

Example [45]

- 1 G1M52,70 ”angolul beszélek. *So*, mikor álmodok róla, éppen úgy a
- 2 bátyáimról, *so* itten nagy cserélődés van ...”.

(‘I speak English. So, when I dream of him, as well as of my brothers, so there is a huge change here ...’)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, *so* appears to be repeated twice in the speakers’s short account without fulfilling any particular sociopragmatic function. It is simply a linguistic routine probably so prevalent in the speaker’s English language that he keeps importing it to his Hungarian speech mode presumably even without being fully aware of it.

d) **Clichés**

Example [46]

1 G1M51,84 “És kényelmesen, jól élünk. *God bless America.*”

(And we live well and comfortably. God bless America.)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker makes an evaluative comment on their standard of living in the USA. He claims that they live well and comfortably. Then, he continues to express his gratefulness to the USA in English for enabling him and his family to live well and comfortably. When uttering the cliché of *God bless America*, he switches to English as the literal Hungarian translation of this set idiom would not have the same connotation. Therefore, the switch to English optimizes the connotation of this particular English idiomatic expression.

e) **Professional or technical terms**

Example [47]

- | | | |
|---|--------------|--|
| 1 | G1M61(47),88 | ”És a nép tényleg részt vett, úgy, mint máma, óriási |
| 2 | | mértékben az <i>investmentben</i> .” |

(`And the people really took a great part, like today, in investment.`)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker recalls his memories of being a stockbroker. He compares the extent of investment in the past to the present situation. When uttering the word *investment*,

he switches to English. As he was working as a stockbroker in the USA, he used all the business-related technical and professional terms in English. Presumably, his Hungarian semantic competence is not as strong as his English one. Therefore, it is easier for the speaker to cite business-related technical terms in English.

7.5.3. The functions of Solidarity-related code-switches

The various sociopragmatic Solidarity-related functions that have been found in the sample are listed in the following subsection. All examples come from the author's own data.

a) We-code

Example [48]

- 1 G1M23,50 "Ó, mi azt használtuk, *when we did not want other people to*
- 2 *understand, we switched to another language in a grocery store or*
- 3 *other places.*"

(‘Oh, we did that, when we did not want other people to understand, we switched to another language in a grocery store or other places.’)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker recalls his experience of talking Hungarian with his Hungarian-American family members with the aim of excluding Americans from their conversation. In this interview, the speaker’s daughter is also present. As a second generation Hungarian-American she speaks and understands Hungarian, but she uses English predominantly even when speaking to her father. The father, in respect of his daughter’s common language use patterns and her weaker Hungarian competence, switches to English. Also, by switching to English, the speaker provides his daughter the opportunity to participate with her optimal linguistic competence and as a member of the family in the conversation that is about her family. Although the ‘we-code’, the default language of the interview is Hungarian, in this instance, the ‘we-code’ of the family, English becomes more important, that is why the speaker switches to English and continues this utterance in English.

b) Solidarity

Example [49]

1 G1F63,36 ”*I was just talking to* Béla, Béla bácsi *and he was*, magyarul

2 beszélek, mert magyarul akarjátok hallani”

(I was just talking to Béla, Béla bácsi and he was, I speak Hungarian, because you want to hear it in Hungarian.)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

This utterance serves as an example of how solidarity is created with the help of code-switching fulfilling the changing requirements of inter-personal relations in a situation. The speaker recalls an episode of her life in English. This is a family event and her son – who as a second-generation Hungarian-American speaks Hungarian, but his English competence is much stronger – is also present at the interview, so in an act of solidarity with her son, she speaks in English. However, she realizes that the main frame of this conversation is an interview, whose `default` language with the two native Hungarian interviewers is Hungarian, she switches back to Hungarian. She also explains this by saying that `you want to hear it in Hungarian`. Her solidarity with the two interviewers overwrites her solidarity with her son. The switch to Hungarian, hence, shows that switching serves as a means of expressing solidarity in line with the inter-personal requirements of the situation.

7.5.4. The functions of Face-related code-switches

The various sociopragmatic Face-related functions that have been found in the sample are listed in the following subsection. All examples come from data collected by the author.

a) **Mitigating face threat**

Example [50]

1 G1F60,82 “Hát a G.... ügyesebb, mint te?”

(‘Well, G..... is more able than you?’)

2 G1M51,78 “Uh, egy *crude force* kell hozzá.”

(‘Uh, you need crude force for this.’)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker is asked to open a bottle of wine that he cannot open. The bottle is actually opened by a younger man who is also present at the interview. The wife of the

speaker makes a sarcastic comment pulling her husband's leg over the fact that the younger guy acts more competently in this situation than her husband. The speaker is embarrassed and feels that his face as a competent husband – who is able to open any bottle of wine – is threatened by his failure to open this particular bottle of wine. When he comments on the situation, he switches to English to express that he is aware that his face of a competent husband has been threatened in the situation by his wife's comment in front of all the other participants of the situation. He tries to come up with an explanation for his failure and he makes a sarcastic comment in English that *you need crude force* for this act. The switch to English enables the speaker to take a distant position from the embarrassing situation and to take on the position of the sarcastic observer. This shift in his perspectives also allows him to leave his face of a competent husband threatened by his wife's sarcastic remark. By doing this, he is able to mitigate the face threatening effect of her wife's sarcastic remark.

b) Negative politeness: freedom from imposition

Example [51]

1 G1M51,78 “Köszönöm, *no*, nagyon finom, de elég volt.”

(‘No, thanks. It was very delicious, but it was enough.’)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker politely but clearly refuses to take more food offered by the hostess. As in Hungarian culture, not to accept food offered by a host or a hostess is often regarded as some slight violation of the Hungarian code of conduct, the speaker switches to English to say *no*, to accentuate the force of his utterance that he wants to be freed from this imposition.

7.5.5. The functions of Power-related code-switches

The various sociopragmatic Power-related functions that have been found in the sample are listed below. All examples have been collected by the author.

a) **Making evaluative or validating comments**

Example [52]

1 G1F36,63 "De nem Sacher volt, sokkal jobb, mint a Sacher. *But it was very*

2 *good.*”

(‘But it wasn’t *Sacher*, it was much better than *Sacher*. But it was very good.’)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker comments on the quality of a cake. She claims that it was not a *Sacher* cake, but it was much better. Switching to English to make a final evaluative comment on the quality of the cake enables the speaker to accentuate the force of the evaluative comment. When switching to English, the speaker also indicates her shift into the position of an expert – she is actually famous in the Hungarian-American community for her great cakes and pastries. As such, she feels to have more vested competence to make such an evaluative comment. The switch to English also functions as a narrative coda putting an end to the utterance as well as signaling that the evaluative comment is not intended to be subject to further discussion.

7.5.6. The interaction of constraints

In this section, I provide a qualitative analysis of the interaction between the five principle acting as constraints in particular contexts. The process of the conflict between the five sociopragmatic constraints is illustrated in tableaux. In these tableaux, the constraints that are

violated by the examined code-switched or monolingual candidates are indicated with asterisks. The constraints are arranged in the order following the hierarchy proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) with the highest ranked constraint placed in the left side of the tableaux and the lowest at the extreme right of the tableaux. The candidates undergo the array of the five hierarchically arranged constraints, and if they violate one particular constraint, it is marked with an asterisk. Violating the highest ranked constraint is lethal, marked with exclamation marks, which means that the surface realization of the violating candidate is disqualified.

As the Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual grammar does not make a distinction in terms of the direction of switching, switches from Hungarian to English as well as from English to Hungarian are equally considered for analysis. However, it must be pointed out that as the unmarked linguistic choice in the examined bilingual speech community is Hungarian, the overwhelming majority of code-switches are from Hungarian to English.

In the examined speech community including G1 speakers, there is a common understanding of the meaning-making role of code-switching in either direction. With that in mind, each instance of code-switching is evaluated individually in the light of the given situation and that of all background information relevant for the evaluation of the sociopragmatic functions fulfilled by these instances of code-switching.

As has been previously pointed out that there is a considerable difference in the level of competence of G1 and G2 speakers. G2 speakers have a considerably lower level of Hungarian than their G1 counterparts. Therefore, the code-switched instances of G2 speakers are prompted by their low level of Hungarian competence rather than by the speakers' need to index the

sociopragmatic meaning of the utterances. As the code-switches prompted by the lack of adequate competence in a language are not included in the framework of the Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual grammar, the code-switched instances of G2 subjects are excluded from the scope of my examination. Also, in the previous subsection it has also been pointed out that the notion of the English and Hungarian languages is so different for G1 and G2 speakers that they do not share the same set of sociopragmatic constraints governing their code-switching tendencies.

In the section below, I provide examples to demonstrate how the five constraints interact with each other in the examined set of data. The most frequently occurring function is examined first. To illustrate the interaction between Perspective and the other four constraints, example [53] has been analyzed.

Example [53] – The interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY

- 1 G1F42,22 ”Jaj, jöttem *visitbe*, egy családhoz, és amíg itt voltam,
2 kaptam egy ...”

(`Yeah, I came to visit a family, and while I was here, I got one ...`)

(source: the author’s own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance, the speaker remembers the first time she came to the USA. When recalling the circumstances, she switches to English to say that she came to visit somebody. The switch to *visit* contextualizes the original purpose of her coming to the USA. By switching to English in the middle of a Hungarian sentence, she accentuates the fact that she originally came to the USA visiting somebody and not with the purpose of immigrating. As Hungarian is the unmarked language of the interview, the language of solidarity, by switching to English, she moves away from the language of Solidarity, violating the constraint of Solidarity. Apparently, the need for the switch to English as a contextualization cue seems to be stronger than complying with the constraint of Solidarity. Therefore, it shows that Perspective is a higher ranked constraint than Solidarity. Faith, Face and Power are not relevant in this utterance. The interaction of the constraints in this utterance is illustrated in Tableau 10.

Tableau 10: The interaction of PERSPECTIVE and SOLIDARITY (PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY)

Candidates	PERSPECTIVE	FAITH	SOLIDARITY	FACE	POWER
a. □ ⇒ Hun to Eng: “Jaj, jöttem <i>visitbe</i> , egy családhoz, és amíg itt voltam, kaptam egy”			*(unmarked language)		
b. Mono Hun: `Jaj, jöttem látogatóba egy családhoz, és amíg itt voltam, kaptam egy` (‘Yeah, I came to visit a family, and while I was here, I got one ...’)	*! (contextualization cue)				

It can be seen from Tableau 10 that there is an interaction between two linguistic inputs, two candidates. The monolingual candidate fulfils the function of Solidarity, while the code-switched candidate fulfils the function of Perspective. As only one surface representation is possible, the more optimal candidate will be the actual linguistic output. The tableau shows that the monolingual candidate fulfils the function of Solidarity as the unmarked language of the interview is Hungarian but violates the function of Perspective as it does not fulfill the function of contextualizing the story. The code-switched candidate, however, fulfils the function of Perspective, contextualizing the purpose of the speaker's coming to the USA, but it violates the constraint of Solidarity, as it moves away from the unmarked language of the interview. As the actual output is the code-switched one, it can be inferred that Perspective is a higher ranked constraint than Solidarity. According to the Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual grammar, the violation of a higher ranked constraint is lethal, indicated by an asterisk, so Solidarity is marked with an asterisk in the tableau.

Example [54] – The interaction of SOLIDARITY and POWER, and FACE

1 G2M27,50 "Szeretem a történelmet. Gyűjtöm a fiamnak az

2 információt. Ő szereti a történelmet."

(I like history. I gather the information for my son. He is keen on history.)

...

3 I1 "Mi az értelme? Mért fontos, hogy tudjuk a történelmünket?"

(`What's the point in it? Why is it important to know our history?`)

4 G1M27,50 "Minden fontos."

(`Everything is important.`)

5 I1 "Miért?"

(`Why?`)

6 G1M27,50 "Mert akkor jobb a a ..."

(`Because then it is better the the ...`)

7 G2F24 "I just can't believe that you said that you are gathering that

8 for Daniel. I am so offended."

9 G1M27,50 "Everybody who is interested."

10 G2F24 "I am so offended, so offended."

11 G1M27,50 "*Everybody who is interested. Well, you never showed a*

12 *whole lot of interest.*"

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

In this utterance speaker G1M27,50 is speaking about the importance of collecting all the historical records of his descendants for his son. He makes this statement in Hungarian. However, speaker G2F24, his daughter, who is a second-generation Hungarian-American, makes an English comment on this. She, as his daughter, feels offended by her father's remark that he collects all the family records for his son without mentioning his daughter. The daughter feels that she is excluded from this and gives voice to her disappointment in English. For her English – although she understands and speaks some Hungarian – is the default language of communication. When her father reacts to her remark, he switches from Hungarian to English. He feels that his face as a good father is threatened by his daughter's remark, so he tries to come up with an explanation defending his case by saying that the family records are for everybody interested. His daughter is not satisfied with this explanation and repeats how offended she is. The father wants to end this embarrassing argument going on in front of the two interviewers and reproaches his daughter for not showing too much of an interest in the family's history. It is interesting that he makes the final statement in English, which is the language of solidarity with his daughter, and not in Hungarian, which is his stronger language, the father's mother tongue. The switch to Hungarian would enable the father to gain back his role of an authoritative father, topping the argument, as well as mitigating the threat against his face as a competent father. Therefore, the switch to Hungarian would optimally fulfil the function of Power, topping the argument, and that of Face, mitigating the face threat. However, he tops the argument in English, which fulfils the function of Solidarity as English is the `we-code` with his daughter. Therefore, expressing solidarity with his daughter is a stronger socio-pragmatic need for the father than expressing his authority.

Tableau 11: The interaction of SOLIDARITY, POWER, and FACE (SOLIDARITY >> FACE, POWER)

Candidates	PERSPECTIVE	FAITH	SOLIDARITY	FACE	POWER
a. □ ⇒ Mono Eng: “Everybody who is interested. Well, you never showed a whole lot of interest.”				*	*
b. Eng to Hun: `Mindenki, aki érdeklődik. Hát, te sosem mutattál túl nagy érdeklődést.`			*!(his daughter’s default language)		

It can be seen in Tableau 11 that there are two candidates competing for surface realization: the monolingual English candidate and the switch to Hungarian. The monolingual candidate optimally fulfils the function of Solidarity, while the switch to Hungarian fulfils that of Power and Face. According to the Optimality Theory for analyzing bilingual grammar, the actual surface representation is the most successful candidate, the one that the most optimally fulfills the sociopragmatic function instantiated by the situation. Relying on this logical premise, the monolingual English candidate is the actual surface representation, so the function that it actually fulfills is a higher ranked constraint than the one that its competing Hungarian candidate fulfills (Face, Power). As the monolingual candidate fulfils the function of Solidarity, while the switch to Hungarian fulfills the function of Power, in this particular interaction, Solidarity outranks Power and Face. Solidarity is a higher ranked constraint, while Face and Power are not in conflict, so they are equally ranked. Perspective and Faith are not activated in this situation.

Solidarity. As the default language of the interview is Hungarian, and the shared mother tongue of the four participants is also Hungarian, the switch to English is a move away from the `we-code` of this situation. Nevertheless, as the greatest semantic specificity is ensured by the switch to English, and the main socio-pragmatic aim of the speaker is to inform the other participants of the situation about this gadget, she switches to English. First, she hesitates, she tries to give the Hungarian equivalent of this thing, in compliance with Solidarity, that's why she says `I am going to call it this gadget` ("így fogom nevezni"), but then she resorts to the English switch as an option which expresses the thing with the greatest economy.

Tableau 12: The interaction of FAITH and SOLIDARITY (FAITH >> SOLIDARITY)

Candidates	PERSPECTIVE	FAITH	SOLIDARITY	FACE	POWER
<p>a. □⇒ Hun to Eng: `feltalált egy kis ketyerét, így fogom nevezni, mert nem tudom igazából, <i>page keeper</i>, ő <i>page keepernek</i> nevezi`</p> <p>(He invented a gadget, I will call it like this because I do not really know its name, page keeper, he calls it a page keeper.)</p>			*		
<p>b. Mono Hun: `feltalált egy kis ketyerét, így fogom nevezni, mert nem tudom igazából, oldalszámláló, oldalszámlálónak</p>		*!			

nevezi `					
----------	--	--	--	--	--

It can be seen from Tableau 12 that in this situation two candidates compete for surface realization: the monolingual Hungarian one and the switch to English. The monolingual Hungarian candidate fulfils the constraint of Solidarity, as it is the default language of the interview, the `we-code` of the participants. The switch to English, however, fulfils the constraint of Faith, as it expresses meaning with the greatest specificity. As the actual surface representation is the switch to English, it is the more optimal choice for surface representation. Relying on the OT logical premise, no successful candidate, the surface representation, can violate a higher ranked constraint, so Faith must outrank Solidarity.

Example [56] – The interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE

- 1 G1F8,35 ”elkezd egy beszélgetést, nekem mindig az az érzésem,
2 hogy *hi, how are you, hi, how are you*, ez olyan először
3 olyan nagyon furcsának gondoltam, hogy mit érdeklődik ez
4 ...”

(and they start a conversation, I always have the feeling that this hi, how are you, hi, how are you, first I found this so strange, why they would want to enquire ... `)

(source: the author's own data collected in 2008-2009)

We have seen already that in this utterance, the speaker highlights one significant difference between American and Hungarian speech practices. She cites one common set linguistic expression *hi, how are you* as a typical example, as according to her it well illustrates the different cultural connotations embedded in the American-English and Hungarian languages. In Hungarian, `hi, how are you` (”szia, hogy vagy?”) usually expresses genuine interest, to which a detailed response is acceptable. For Americans, though, it is rather a way of greeting or starting a conversation than expressing real interest in how the other person is, and no detailed responses are expected. When illustrating the striking difference between American and Hungarian speech patterns, she switches to English to quote this characteristic example. By switching to English, she fulfils the function of Faith, as the switch to English the most optimally expresses the culture specific connotation of the American term. The Hungarian equivalent could not fulfil this function for its different underlying connotation. The switch to English fulfils another function as well, that of Perspective, as it is a quotation from Americans, expressing their voice. The switch to English, hence, fulfils the function of Faith and Perspective. However, as Hungarian is the default language of the interview, the `we-code` shared by the participants of the interview, it violates the constraint of Solidarity.

Tableau 13: The interaction of FAITH and PERSPECTIVE (and SOLIDARITY)

(FAITH = PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY)

Candidates	PERSPECTIVE	FAITH	SOLIDARITY	FACE	POWER
a. □ ⇒ Eng to Hun: ”elkezd egy beszélgetést, nekem mindig az az érzésem, hogy <i>hi, how are you, hi, how are you</i> , ez olyan először olyan nagyon furcsának gondoltam, hogy mit érdeklődik ez ...”			*		
b. Mono Hun: `elkezd egy beszélgetést, nekem mindig az az érzésem, hogy szia, hogy vagy, szia, hogy vagy, ez olyan először olyan nagyon furcsának gondoltam, hogy mit érdeklődik ez ...` `and they start a conversation, I always have the feeling that this hi, how are you, hi, how are you, first I found this so strange, why they would want to enquire ...`	*!	*!			

It can be seen in Tableau 13 that the two competing candidates are the monolingual Hungarian one and the switch to English. The monolingual Hungarian fulfils the constraint of Solidarity but violates that of Perspective and Faith. The switch to English fulfils the constraints of Faith and Perspective but violates Solidarity. As the actual surface representation is the switch to English, it must be the more succesful candidate fulfilling a higher ranked constraint. Consequently, Faith and Perspective outrank Solidarity, while they are not in contrast with each other, so they are equally ranked. Face and Power are not activated in this situation.

Relying on the examples provided above, the algorithmic ranking of the constraints can be set up as follows:

PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY [Example 53]

SOLIDARITY >> FACE = POWER [Example 54]

FAITH >> SOLIDARITY [Example 55]

FAITH = PERSPECTIVE >> SOLIDARITY [Example 56]

From the algorithmic representation above, it can be concluded that FAITH and PERSPECTIVE are ranked above SOLIDARITY, while SOLIDARITY ranks above FACE and POWER. As no evidence has been found for a conflict in the interaction of FAITH, and PERSPECTIVE, or in that of FACE and POWER, they are ranked equally.

Therefore, my findings reinforce Bolonyai and Bhatt's (forthcoming) ranking of constraints in the Hungarian-English community grammar, which is as follows:

{FAITH, PERSPECTIVE} >> {SOLIDARITY} >> {FACE, POWER}

7.6. Limitations of the study

The examined group in the sample represents only a narrow segment of the Hungarian-American community living in North Carolina. The subjects of the sociolinguistic interviews were mostly the most proactive members of the Hungarian club in North Carolina. Other Hungarians, for example, those who work with no legal documents in the USA, understandably, did not want to expose themselves by giving interviews. However, for a more profound understanding of this community, a more varied sample of subjects would be required.

The method of data collection also limited the scope of this study. As the linguistic corpus was provided by sociolinguistic interviews, the number of sociopragmatic functions that code-switching fulfills – reflecting interpersonal dynamics between people taking different social positions – has been scarce. As the interviews were dinner conversations, semi-structured interviews, the most prevalent sociopragmatic functions – with a few exceptions – that the instances of code-switching fulfilled have been discourse-related ones. It would be interesting to examine how code-switching serves the function of assigning different social positions in interpersonal dynamics in a more `natural`, `spontaneous`, or `less guided` setting. More analyses of that kind could provide invaluable data to understand the true nature of code-switching.

As the Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual grammar discusses the meaning-making functions of code-switching, instances of code-switching prompted by lack of relevant competence have been excluded from the scope of this study. A more comprehensive framework

including competence-related instances of code-switches as well could significantly expand on our understanding of the mechanism of code-switching.

Chapter 8: Overall summary

In this study, I set out (Chapters 1, 2) to test the applicability of Bolonyai and Bhatt's (forthcoming) Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual grammar on the Hungarian-American immigrant community living in North Carolina and to analyze the sociolinguistic characteristics of the examined community with a view to describe the socio-cognitive dimension, which instantiates the community's bilingual grammar.

First, I have examined the meaning-making function of code-switching from various theoretical perspectives (Chapter 3). Then, the theoretical framework of the Optimality Theory for the analysis of bilingual grammar has been discussed (Chapter 4) with special emphasis on the interaction of sociopragmatic constraints governing the meaning-making mechanism of code-switching.

My own research has focused on the examined Hungarian-American immigrant community's, more particularly on the North Carolina Hungarian Club's, collective code-switching patterns and on the sociopragmatic functions they fulfill individually (Section 7.6.) and in interaction with the others (Section 7.7.). The interaction of the constraints has been represented in algorithmic tableaux.

As I also set out to define the examined Hungarian-American community in its appropriate socio-cognitive dimension, a thorough description has been provided placing the examined community in its relevant socio-historical-cultural macro- (Chapter 5) and micro-context (Sections 7.2., 7.3.).

Relying on statistically significant correlations in the community's sociolinguistic characteristics (Section 7.4.), two sociolinguistically distinct subcommunities have emerged in the examined community along the lines of intergenerational affiliation – first- and second-generation speakers. In light of the sociolinguistic data, I have argued that the community-specific ranking proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) cannot be applied for describing both first-, and second-generation speakers' collective code-switching patterns as they form two sociolinguistically distinct groups. Therefore, the socio-cognitive notion of Optimality cannot be shared by the two subcommunities, and, thus, the community specific ranking governing the interaction of constraints cannot be shared, either.

We have seen that Hungarian language competence as well as language use significantly declines in the second generation (Section 7.3.). Also, I have demonstrated (Section 7.3.) that second-generation speakers have a more pragmatic attitude to cherishing the Hungarian language as well as to the act of code-switching. As a result of their declined Hungarian competence, I have shown that for second-generation speakers code-switching serves the function of complementing their reduced Hungarian competence (Section 7.6.). As instances of code-switching prompted by the lack of Hungarian competence have been excluded from Bolonyai and Bhatt's model (forthcoming), they have also been excluded from my investigation. Therefore, the qualitative analysis of code-switching patterns – with a view to testing the ranking of constraints governing the interaction of code-switching proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) – has been conducted only in the first-generation group.

Relying on the results of the sociolinguistic analysis, the examined Hungarian-American immigrant community (Section 7.2., 7.3.) has been characterized as an aging community of high

socio-economic status in the host society. The importance and the practice of cherishing the Hungarian language and culture are shared among members, mostly because the culture of their mother tongue is seen as some prestigious cultural heritage. They are keen on attending Hungarian cultural events and organizations mainly because they can meet their fellow Hungarians. At the same time, there is a pragmatic attitude to the English language as a means of becoming fully integrated in the host society. Hungarian language use is prevalent in G1 group, however, their children, G2 members tend to use Hungarian only with their parents. This community is in the phase of gradual language loss, where the first generation makes all the efforts to pass on Hungarian language and traditions to their children, but with the exception of some families who can afford to spend half a year in the USA and half a year in Hungary, these efforts are hardly efficient. Second-generation speakers preserve some traces of their Hungarian cultural and linguistic heritage, but language is not central in expressing their identity and is least likely to be passed on to their children. Rather, they view bilingualism and biculturalism as the most appropriate means of expressing their identity. That is the reason why they have a more natural, less judgmental attitude to code-switching than their G1 counterparts.

Having analyzed the code-switching practices of G1 speakers, I have demonstrated that the sociopragmatic functions related to Perspective-taking is the most prevalent followed by Faith-related functions (Section 7.6.). As the genre of the examined corpus was semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews (Chapter 6), subjects relied on the act of code-switching mostly to fulfill various discourse-related functions. As Perspective and Faith include the most numerous discourse-related functions, they emerged the most frequently in the corpus. The other three functions Solidarity, Face, and Power emerged less frequently as these functions reflect the

dynamics of interpersonal relations. However, the frame of the interviews – mainly dinner conversations – is a least appropriate context to stimulate interpersonal dynamics.

I have examined how the sociopragmatic constraints governing the sociopragmatic meaning-making mechanism of code-switching interact with one another (Section 7.7.). The algorithmic representation of the interaction of the sociopragmatic constraints has reinforced Bolonyai and Bhatt's (forthcoming) proposed ranking applicable on Hungarian-English code-switching.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

As a result of the qualitative analysis of the transcribed data, it has been demonstrated that the ranking of constraints proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming) can be applied for describing the linguistic mechanism underlying the emergence of socio-pragmatically meaningful instances of code-switches in the Hungarian-American immigrant community in North Carolina. It has also been shown that the ranking of constraints cannot be the same in the G1 and G2 groups of community members. For the better understanding of the different bilingual experience in G1 and G2 groups, and its most overt linguistic manifestation, the use of code-switching, a quantitative analysis has also been implemented.

Having examined more closely the different salient sociolinguistic variables in G1 and G2 groups, I can conclude that G1 speakers have an overall more controversial attitude to code-switching. This controversial attitude is determined by how purist attitude G1 respondents have towards code-switching. This two-fold distinction between language seen as an abstract asset and as a pragmatic tool of communication well reflects the transitional bicultural, in-between-two-cultures state of G1 members. Code-switching tendencies seem to depend on which extreme is more dominant in a particular situation on this scale of transitional bicultural continuum.

Overall, G2 speakers have a more positive attitude to code-switching. In the G2 group, Hungarian competence determines the most their code-switching patterns. Higher Hungarian competence results in fewer instances of code-switches. Altogether, G2 speakers seem to have a more natural, pragmatic attitude to code-switching. They readily rely on it as a means of filling

competence-related gaps in their speech or as a device for expressing their bicultural experience. Therefore, this two-fold distinction between the purist attitude to code-switching and its pragmatic use or the transitional continuum of the bicultural experience observed in the G1 group seems to be irrelevant in the G2 group. Still, traces of the purist attitude to code-switching can be observed in the G2 sample, too, but it seems to reflect more the parents' set of values associated with the Hungarian language and culture than G2 respondents' own. In conclusion, G2 speakers have a more balanced, less controversial attitude to code-switching and to the bicultural experience, and use code-switching either as a means of making up for linguistic gaps triggered by their lack of Hungarian competence or as a means of expressing their distinct bicultural identity.

To summarize, both for G1 and G2 speakers code-switching can be of functional as well as of complementary nature. In terms of G1 speakers, the practice of code-switching is mostly determined by G1 speakers' attitude to languages, whether they have a more pragmatic or purist attitude to languages, more particularly to Hungarian. Nevertheless, in terms of G2 speakers, the practice of code-switching mostly depends on their Hungarian competence.

Thoroughly analyzing G1's code-switching practices, the discourse-related sociopragmatic functions of code-switching (Perspective- and Faith-related switches) have turned out to be the most prevalent, partly, because of the specific genre of sociolinguistic interviews, and partly because code-switching serves as the most readily available discursive device enabling G1 speakers to reflect upon the multiple aspects of their socio-cognitive reality

embedded in the two or more socio-cultural-linguistic backgrounds instantiated by their immigrant experience.

References

- Alfonzetti, G. (1998). The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation. Language Interaction and Identity*, 180-214. London, New York: Routledge.
- Al-Sahafi, M.A. & Barkhuizen, G. (2006). Language use in an immigrant context: The case of Arabic in Auckland, *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 12 (1): 51-69.
- Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. (2000). Codes, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9 (1-2): 28-31.
- American Community Service Figures (2007) (internet site)
- Amerikai Magyar Értesítő (1994), XXX, (2) Baltimore, USA.
- Amerikai Magyar Hírlap (1999), South California.
- Antaki, Ch. & Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an achievement. In: Antaki, Ch. & Widdicombe, S. (eds.) *Identities in Talk*, 1-14. London: Sage Publications.
- Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. New York: Edward Arnold.
- Armstrong, J.A. (1976). Mobilized and Proletarian diasporas. *American Political Science Review*, 70, 2:393-408.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing company.
- Auer, P. (1988). A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In: Heller (ed.) *Code-switching, Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 187-213. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.). *One Speaker, Two languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (1998). Introduction. Bilingual conversation revisited. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation*, 1-24. London and New York: Routledge
- Auer, P. (1999). From code-switching via language mixing to used lects, *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 3 (4): 309-332.
- Auer, P. (2005). A postscript: Code-switching and social identity, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37: 403-410.
- Backus, A. (1996). *Two in one: bilingual speech of Turkish-Dutch immigrants in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

- Backus, A. (2000). Insertional code-switching in an immigrant language. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 3 (2), 103-105.
- Backus, A. (2001). The role of semantic specificity in insertional code-switching: Evidence from Dutch-Turkish. In: Jacobson, R. (ed.), *Code-switching worldwide*, 125-154. Berlin: Mouton.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. In: Holquist, M. (ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bani-Shoraka, H. (2005). *Language Choice and Code-Switching in the Azerbaijani Community in Tehran: A conversation analytic approach to bilingual practices*. Dissertation. Uppsala University: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Bartha, Cs. (1995/96). Social and linguistic characteristics of immigrant language shift: The case of Hungarian in Detroit, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 43 (3-4): 405-431.
- Bartha, Cs. (2002). Nyelvhasználat, nyelvmegtartás, nyelvcseré amerikai közösségekben. In Kovács, N. & Szarka, L. (eds.) *Tér és terep, Tanulmányok az etnicitás kérdésköréből*, 111-136. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Bauer, E.B., Hall, J.K. & Kruth, K. (2002). The pragmatic role of code-switching in play contexts, *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6 (1): 53-74.
- Baynham, M. & De Fina, A. (eds.) (2005). *Dislocations / Relocations. Narratives of Displacement*. Manchester, UK & Northampton MA: St. Jerome Publishing
- Bentahila, A. & Davies, E.E. (1982). The Syntax of Arabic-French Code-switching. *Lingua*, 59: 301-330.
- Bentahila, A. & Davies, E.E. (1998). Code-switching: An unequal partnership. In: Jacobson, R. (ed.) *Code-switching Worldwide. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 106*, 25-49. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bhatt, R.M. (1997). Code-switching, constraints, and optimal grammars, *Lingua*, 102: 223-251.
- Bhatt, R.M. (2006). *In Other Words: Code-switching, Identity, Representation and Third Space*. Ms. University of Illinois.
- Bhatt, R.M. (2008). In other words: Language mixing, identity representations, and third space. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12 (2): 177-200.
- Blom, J. & Gumperz, J.J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In Gumperz & Hymes (eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*, 407-434. Oxford: Basil

- Blackwell.
- Blommaert, J. (1992). Code-switching and the exclusivity of social identities: some data from Campus Kiswahili, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13 (1-2): 57-70.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). Situating language rights: English and Swahili in Tansania revisited, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9 (3): 390-417.
- Bolonyai, Á. (2005). Who was the best: Power, knowledge and rationality in bilingual girls' code choices, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9 (1): 3-27.
- Bolonyai, Á. & Bhatt, R.M. (forthcoming). Code-switching and the optimal grammar of bilingual language use. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*.
- Callahan, L. (2004). *Spanish/English Code-switching in a Written Corpus*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (1995). Functions of code-switching in ESL classrooms; socializing bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 16 (3): 173-195.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (1995). The political economy of code choice in a "revolutionary society": Tamil-English bilingualism in Jaffna, Sri Lanka, *Language in Society*, 24:187-212.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (2008). Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12 (2): 143-176.
- Chan, B. (2004). Beyond "contextualization": code-switching as a textualization cue. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 23 (7): 7-27.
- Chen, K.H.Y. (2005). The social distinctiveness of two code-mixing styles in Hong Kong. In: Cohen, James; McAlister, Kara T; Rolstad, Kellie and Maccode-switchingwan, Jeff (eds.) ISB4: *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 527-542. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Clyne, M. (1991). *Community Languages: the Australian Experience*. Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M. & Fernandez, S. (2005). Period of residence as a factor in language maintenance: Hungarian-English bilingualism in Australia as a case study, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 150:1-18.
- Cromdal, J. & Aronsson, K. (2000). Footing in bilingual play. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4, 43-457.
- Cromdal, J. (2004). Building bilingual oppositions: code-switching in children's disputes. *Language in Society*, 33 (1): 33-58.

- Davies, B. & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The social construction of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 20: 43-63.
- De Fina, A. (2007). Code-switching and the construction of ethnic identity. *Language in Society*, 36 (3): 371-392.
- Dörnyei, Z. & Clément, R. (2001). Motivational characteristics of learning different target languages: Results of a nationwide survey. In: Dörnyei, Z. & Schmidt, R. (eds.). *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*, 399-433. Manoa: University of Hawaii.
- Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic Variation As Social Practice*. Blackwell.
- Elster, J. (1983). *Sour Grapes*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Elster, J. (1986). *Rational Choice*. New York: New York University Press.
- Ervin, S.M. (1964). An analysis of the interaction of language, topic, and listener. *American Anthropologist*: 86-102.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. & Reyes, I. (2005). Child code-switching and adult content contrasts. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9 (1): 85-102.
- Esdahl, T. (2003). Language choice as a power resource in bilingual adolescents' conversations in the Danish *Folkeskole*. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 24 (1-2): 76-89.
- Falk-Bánó, K. (1988). Characteristics of language shift in two American Hungarian bilingual communities, *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 24: 161-170.
- Fejős, Z. (1992). Magyar gyökerek Amerikában, *Valóság*, 35 (4): 72-82.
- Fejős, Z. (2005). Diaszpóra és az „amerikai magyarok – háttér egy fogalom alkalmazhatóságához, In *Tanulmányok a diaszpóráról*, Kovács, N. (ed.). Budapest: Gondolat.
- Fenyvesi, A. (1995). Language contact and language death in an immigrant language: The case of Hungarian. In: *Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3, Fall: 1-117. University of Pittsburgh.
- Fenyvesi, A. (2005). Hungarian in the USA. Fenyvesi, A. (ed.). *Hungarian Language Contact Outside Hungary. Studies on Hungarian as a Minority Language*, 265-318. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fishman, J. (1966). *Hungarian Language Maintenance in the US*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Multilingual matters.
- Franceschini, R. (1998). Code-switching and the notion of code in linguistics. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in*

- Conversation*, 51-72. Routledge: London and New York.
- Gafaranga, J. (1999). Language choice as a significant aspect of talk organization, *Text*, 19: 201-225.
- Gafaranga, J. (2005). Demythologizing language alternation studies: conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37: 281-300
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift. Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gal, S. (1988). The political economy of code choice. In: Heller, M. (ed.) *Code-switching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic perspectives*, 245-264. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, P., Charles, R., & Cheshire, J. (2000). Parallel patterns? A comparison of monolingual speech and bilingual discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32: 1305-41.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. & Finnis, K. (2003). Code-switching, gender and politeness: A study in the London Greek-Cypriot community, *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 4 (2): 505-532.
- Gardner-Chloros, P., McEntee-Atalianis, L., & Finnis, K. (2005). Language attitudes and use in transplanted setting: Greek Cypriots in London, *International Journal of Multilingualism* 2 (2): 52-80.
- Garrett, P.B. (2005). What a language is good for: language socialization, language shift, and the persistence of code-specific genres in St. Lucia. *Language in Society*, 34 (3): 327-361.
- Genesee, F., Boivin, I. & Nicoladis, E. (1996). Talking with strangers: a study of bilingual children's communicative competence. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 17: 427-442.
- Giles, H. (ed.) (1977). *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Giles, H. & Powesland, P.F. (1975). *Speech Styles and Social Evaluation*. London: Academic Press.
- Giles, H. & Scherer, K.R. & Taylor, D.M. (1979). Speech markers in social interaction. In: Scherer, K.R. & Giles, H. *Social Markers in Speech*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goddard, C. (ed.) (2006). Ethnopragmatics: a new paradigm, In: Goddard C. (ed.) *Ethnopragmatics: Understanding Discourse in Cultural Context*, 1-30. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1979). Footing, *Semiotica*, 25 (1-2): 29.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life With Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1995). A psycholinguistic approach to code-switching: the recognition of guest words by bilinguals. In: Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.) *One Speaker, Two Languages. Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 259-275. Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. & Hymes, D. (eds.) (1986). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Halmari, H. & Smith, W. (1994). Code-switching and register shift: Evidence from Finnish-English child bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21: 427-445.
- Hamers, J.F. & Blanc M.H.A. (1989). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heller, M. (ed.) (1988a). *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (1988b). Strategic ambiguity: code-switching in the management of conflict. In Heller, M. (ed.). *Code-switching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 77-96. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (1992). The politics of code-switching and language choice. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13 (1-2): 123-141.
- Heller, M. (1995). Code-switching and the politics of language. In: Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.). *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 158-174. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hlavac, J. (2003). *Second-generation Speech: Lexicon, Code-switching, and Morpho-syntax of Croatian-English Bilinguals*. Peter Lang: Bern.
- Jacobson, R. (ed.) (1990). *Code-switching as a Worldwide Phenomenon*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Jacobson, R. (ed.) (1998). *Code-switching Worldwide. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 106*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jacobson, R. (ed.) (2001). *Code-switching Worldwide II. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 126*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaffe, A. (2007). Code-switching and stances; Issues in interpretation. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*,

- 6(1): 53-77.
- Jorgensen, J.N. (1998). Children`s acquisition of code-switching for power yielding. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation. Language Interaction and Identity*, 237-258. London, New York: Routledge.
- Karras, J. (1995). Greek-English code-switching. *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics*, 17: 57-63.
- King, K. & Ganuza, N. (2005). Language, identity, education, and transmigration: Chilean adolescents in Sweden. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 4(3): 179-199.
- Kondo-Brown, K. (2001). Bilingual heritage students` language contact and motivation. In: Dörnyei, Z. & Schmidt, R. (eds.). *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*, 433-461. Manoa: University of Hawaii.
- Kontra, M. (1990). *Fejezetek a South Bend-i magyar nyelvhasználatból*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézete.
- Kovács, I. (2005). Katonalevelek – Nyelvtudás, identitástudat. Amerikai magyarok második generációja az amerikai hadseregben a második világháború idején. Kovács, N. (ed.) *Tanulmányok a diaszpóráról*. Budapest: Gondolat.
- Kovács, M. (2001). *Code-switching and Language Shift in Australian Finnish in Comparison with Australian Hungarian*. Turku: Abo Akademi University Press.
- Koven, M.E.J. (1998). Two languages in the self/ the self in two languages: French-Portuguese bilinguals` verbal enactments and the experiences of self in narrative discourse, *Ethos*, 26: 410-455.
- Kulick, D. & Stroud, C. (1990). Code-switching in Gapun: Social and linguistic aspects of language use in a language shifting community. Verhaar, J.W.M. (ed.) *Melanesian Pidgin and Tok Pisin*, 205-234. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kwan-Terry, A. (1992). Code-switching and code-mixing: the case of a child learning English and Chinese simultaneously. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13 (3): 243-259.
- Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. *Language in the Inner City*, 345-396. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Langenhove L.V. & Harré, R. (1999). Introducing positioning theory, In: Harré, R. & Langenhove, L.V. (eds.) *Positioning theory*, 14-32. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.
- Lanvers, U. (2001). Language alternation in infant bilinguals: A developmental approach to code-switching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5: 437-464.
- Lanza, E. (1997). *Language Mixing in Infant Bilingualism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Lin, A. (1990). *Teaching in Two Tongues: Language Alternation in Foreign Language Classrooms*. Research Report, 3. City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
- Lin, A. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic dominance, resistance and code-switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8:48-84.
- Marti, L. (2006). Indirectness and politeness in Turkish-German bilingual and Turkish monolingual requests, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38: 1836-1869.
- Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Code-switching in the classroom. In: Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.). *One speaker, Two Languages. Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 90-113. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maschler, Y. (1998). On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation. Language Interaction and Identity*, 125-149. London, New York: Routledge.
- McClure, E. (1998). The relationship between form and function in written national language – English Code-switching: Evidence from Mexico, Spain, and Bulgaria. Jacobson, R. (ed.) *Code-switching Worldwide*, 125-150. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McClure, E. & McClure, M. (1988). Macro- and micro-sociolinguistic dimensions of code-switching. In: Heller, M. (ed.) *Code-switching. Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*, 25-51. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Meeuwis, M. & Blommaert, J. (1994). Review article: The `Markedness Model` and the absence of society: Remarks on code-switching, *Multilingua*, 13 (4): 387-423.
- Meeuwis, M. & Blommaert, J. (1998). A monolectal view of code-switching. Layered code-switching among Zairians in Belgium. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation. Language Interaction and Identity*, 76-98. London, New York: Routledge.
- Migge, B. (2007). Code-switching and social identities in the Eastern Maroon community of Suriname and French Guiana, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11 (1): 53-73.
- Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.) (1995). *One Speaker, Two Languages. Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Milroy, L. & Wei, L. (1995). A social network approach to code-switching. In: Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.) *One Speaker, Two Languages. Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 136-157. Cambridge University Press.

- Montes-Alcala, C. (2001). Written code-switching: powerful bilingual images. In: Jacobson (ed.). *Code-switching Worldwide II. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 126.*, 193-219. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Moyer, M.G. (1998). Bilingual conversation strategies in Gibraltar. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation. Language Interaction and Identity*, 215-234. London, New York: Routledge.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44: 115-36
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). Code-switching as indexal of social negotiations. In: Heller, M. (ed.) *Code-switching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 151-186. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1990). Code-switching and borrowing: interpersonal macrolevel meaning. In Jacobson, R. (ed.). *Code-switching as a Worldwide Phenomenon*, 85-110. New York: Peter Lang.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1990). Elite closure as boundary maintenance: The case of Africa. In: Weinsten, B. (ed.). *Language Policy and Development*, 25-42. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1992). Comparing code-switching and borrowing, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13: 19-39.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a [1997]). *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structures in Code-switching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Social Motivations for Code-switching: Evidence from Africa*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). A theoretical introduction to the Markedness Model. In: Myers-Scotton, C. (ed.), *Codes and Consequences: Choosing Linguistic Varieties*, 18-38. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2000). The matrix language frame model: Development and responses. In: Jacobson, R. (ed.). *Code-switching Worldwide*, 2: 23-58.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices. An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.
- Myers-Scotton, C. & Bolonyai, Á. (2001). Calculating speakers: code-switching in a rational choice model, *Language in Society*, 30 (1): 1-28.
- Myers-Scotton, C. & Jake, J. (1995). Matching lemmas in a bilingual competence and production model, *Linguistics*, 33: 981-1024.
- Nicoladis, E. & Genesee, F. (1996). A longitudinal study of pragmatic differentiation in young bilingual children.

- Language Learning*, 43: 439-464.
- Nishimura, M. (1997). *Japanese / English Code-switching: Syntax and Pragmatics*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In: Duranti, A., & Goodwin, C. (eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, 335-358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panayiotou, A. (2004). Switching codes, switching code: bilinguals' emotional responses in English and Greek, *Journal of Multicultural and Multilingual Development*, 25 (2-3): 24-139.
- Pandey, A. (1995). The pragmatics of code alternation in Nigerian English, *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*. 25 (1): 75-117.
- Pandit, I. (1986). *Hindi-English Code-Switching, Mixed Hind- English*. Delhi: Data Book Center
- Papapavlou, A. & Pavlou, P. (2001). The interplay of language use and language maintenance and the cultural identity of Greek Cypriots in the UK, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11 (1): 92-113.
- Papp, S.M. (1981). *Hungarian Americans and Their Communities of Cleveland*. Cleveland: Cleveland State University.
- Papp Z.A., (ed.) (2008). *Beszédből világ. Elemzések, adatok amerikai magyarokról*. Magyar Külügyi Intézet: Budapest.
- Paugh, A. (2005). Multilingual play in Dominica: Children's code-switching, role play, and agency in Dominica, West Indies, *Language in Society*, Vol. 34 (1): 63-86.
- Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and Multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfaff, C. (2001). 'Kanakan in Alemmansitan'. *Zaimoglu's Representation of Migrant Language*. Manuscript. Berlin: Freie Universitaet.
- Poplack, S. (1987). Language status and language accommodation along a linguistic border. *Georgetown University Round Table*, 90-118.
- Poplack, S. (1988). Contrasting patterns of code-switching in two communities. In: Heller, M. (ed.). *Code-switching*, 215-244. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Prince, A. & Smolensky, P. (1993). *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*. Manuscript, University of Colorado and Rutgers University.
- Prince, A. & Smolensky, P. (2004). *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*.

- Massachusetts, USA: Blackwell.
- Puskás, J. (2000). *Ties that Bind, Ties that Divide*. New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Pütz, M. (ed.) (1997). *Language Choices. Conditions, Constraints, and Consequences*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ramat, A.G. (1995). Code-switching in the context of direct/standard language relations. In: Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.). *One Speaker, Two Languages. Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 45-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing, Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, B. (1998). Language crossing and the redefinition of reality, In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation. Language Interaction and Identity*, 290-317. London, New York: Routledge.
- Rampton, B. (2007). Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the UK, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5): 584-607.
- Riberio, B.T. (2006). Footing, positioning, voice. Are we talking about the same things? In: De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D., & Bamberg, M. (eds.). *Discourse and Identity*, 48-82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1996). (eds.). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Longman.
- Rindler Schjerve, R. (1998). Code-switching as an indicator for language shift? Evidence from Sardinian-Italian bilingualism. In: Jacobson, R. (ed.) *Code-switching Worldwide*, 221-247. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford, U.K. and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sanchez, R. (1983). *Chicano Discourse: Socio-historic Perspectives*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Sebba, M. & Wootton, T. (1998). We, then and identity. Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation. Language Interaction and Identity*, 262-286. London, New York: Routledge.
- Siebenhaar, B. (2006). Code choice and code-switching in Swiss-German Internet Relay Chat rooms, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10 (4): 481-506.
- Sík, E. & Tóth, J. (eds.) (2000). *Diskurzusok a vándorlásról*. Nemzetközi Migrációs és Menekültügyi Kutatóközpont.
- Simon, D-L. (2001). The foreign language classroom. In Jacobson, R. (ed.) *Code-switching Worldwide II. Trends in*

- Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 126*, 311-341. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Smolicz, J. (1981). Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4: 75-90.
- Smolicz, J. (1984). Multiculturalism and an overreaching framework of values: some educational responses for ethnically plural societies, *European Journal of Education*, 19 (1): 11-23.
- Spradley, J.P. (1979). *Ethnographic Interview*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stavans, A. (2003). Bilinguals as narrators: A comparison of bilingual Hebrew and English narratives, *Narrative Inquiry*, 13 (1): 151-191.
- Stroud, Ch. (1992). The problem of intention and meaning in code-switching, *Text*, 12: 127-155.
- Stroud, Ch. (1998). Perspectives on cultural variability of discourse and some implications for code-switching. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation. Language Interaction and Identity*, 321–348. London, New York: Routledge.
- Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis, T., & Mesthrie, R. (eds.) (2004). *A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Syed, Z. (2001). Notions of self in foreign language learning: a qualitative analysis. In Dörnyei, Z. & Schmidt, R. (eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*. Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.
- Szyczynska, M. (1999). Apologizing in English, Polish and Hungarian: Different languages, different strategies, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31: 1053-1065.
- Tabouret-Keller, A. (1995). Conclusion: code-switching research as a theoretical challenge. In Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. *One Speaker, Two Languages. Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 344-355. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tannenbaum, M. (2003). The multifaceted aspects of language maintenance: A new measure for its assessment in immigrant families, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6 (5): 374-393.
- Torras, M-C. & Gafaranga, J. (2002). Social identities and language alternation in non-formal institutional bilingual talk: Trilingual encounters in Barcelona, *Language in Society*, 31: 527-548.
- US Census Bureau Figures (2000) (internet site)
- US Census Bureau State and County Quick Figures (2008) (internet site)
- Valdés-Fallis, G. (1976). Code-switching in Bilingual Chicano Poetry. *Hispania*, 59:877-886.

- Wei, L. (1994). *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Language Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Wei, L. (1995). Code-switching, preference marking and politeness in bilingual cross-generational talk: Examples from a Chinese community in Britain, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 16: 197-214.
- Wei, L. (1998). The `why` and `how` questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In: Auer, P. (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation*, 156-176. London and New York: Routledge
- Wei, L. (2005). "How can you tell?" Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37: 375-389.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9 (1): 5-20.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1994). Emotion, language and `cultural scripts`. In: Sh. Kitayama and H.R. Markus (eds.) *Emotion and Culture: Empirical Studies of Mutual Influence*, 130-198. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2006). *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, A. (2005). Fighting words and challenging expectations, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37:317-328
- Winland, D. (2002). The politics of desire and disdain: Croatian identity between home and homeland. *American Ethnologist*, 29 (3):693-718.
- Woolard, K.A. (1988). Code-switching and comedy in Catalonia. In: Heller, M. (ed.) *Code-switching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 53-76. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Woolard, K.A. (1989). *Double talk, Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Zentella, A.C. (1981). *Ta bien*, you could answer me en *cualquier idioma*: Puerto Rican codeswitching in bilingual classrooms. In Duran, R. (ed). *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior*, 109-32. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Zentella, A.C. (1997). *Growing Up Bilingual. Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Yagmur, K. (2004). Language maintenance patterns of Turkish immigrant communities in Australia and western Europe: the impact of majority attitudes on ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 165: 121-142.

Yagmur, K. & Akinci, M.A. (2003). Language use, choice, maintenance, and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish speakers in France: intergenerational differences, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 164: 107-128.

Appendixes

Appendix 1: Comprehensive list of socio-pragmatic functions of code-switching classified as one of the five principles proposed by Bolonyai and Bhatt (forthcoming)

Faith (16 entries)	Power (26 entries)	Solidarity (23 entries)	Face (21 entries)	Perspective (53 entries)
anger or frustration (Grosjean 1982; Halmari & Smith 1994; Canagarajah 1995; Cromdal & Aronsson 2000; Pavlenko 2005)	authority (Lin 1990; Canagarajah 1995)	addressee specification (Gumperz 1982; Grosjean 1982; Callahan 2004)	anger or frustration (Grosjean 1982; Halmari & Smith 1994; Canagarajah 1995; Cromdal & Aronsson 2000; Pavlenko 2005)	activity-based (in child language: Kwan-Terry 1992; Auer 1995; Kovács 2001)
cultural logic (Lin 1996)	avoiding face-threatening acts (Gal 1979; Gumperz 1982; Heller 1988b; Canagarajah 1995; Zentella 1997)	affiliation	“shifting authorship” for less direct attacks (Stroud 1998)	back-channel signals (Rindler Schjerve 1998)
culture-specific connotations (Backus 1996)	control, resistance (Gal 1979; Gumperz 1982; Woolard 1988; Heller 1988b; Zentella 1997; Canagarajah 1995)	appeal (Zentella 1997)	apologies (Bolonyai & Myers-Scotton 2001)	clarification (Pandey 1995; Zentella 1997; Montes-Alclala 2001; Callahan 2004)
cultural script (Wierzbicka 1994, 2006)	difference (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	confidentiality (Grosjean 1982)	compliments (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	conclusions (Rindler Schjerve 1998)
emotional script (Pavlenko 2005)	discipline (Canagarajah 1995)	connection (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	cursing (Garrett 2005)	contextualization cue (Gumperz 1982; Li Wei 1994; Auer 1995)
filling in semantic/pragmatic gaps (McClure & McClure 1988)	divergence (Auer 1998)	convergence (Giles, Scherer & Taylor 1979)	dampening directness (Gardner-Chloros & Finnis 2003)	contrasting (Pandit 1986; Gardner-Chloros, Charles & Cheshire 2000)
ideological meanings	elite closure	default language	disapproval (Pandit	crossing (Rampton

(Pfaff 2001)	(Myers-Scotton 1990)	(Meeuwis & Bloomaert 1998)	1986)	1995)
idiomatic expressions (Montes-Alcala 2001)	escalating arguments (Gal 1979; Gumperz 1982; Heller 1988b; Canagarajah 1995; Zentella 1997)	decrease in social distance (Myers-Scotton 1993, Canagarajah 1995)	dis-preferred actions (in child CS) (Milroy & Wei 1995)	differences in concepts and values (in child CS) (Ervin-Tripp & Reyes 2005)
internal satisfaction (Pavlenko 2005)	exclusion (Grosjean 1982; Saville-Troike 1982; Myers-Scotton 1993; Canagarajah 1995)	deference (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	gossiping (Garrett 2005)	discourse markers (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)
<i>le mot juste</i> (Myers-Scotton & Jake 1995; Gardner-Chloros et al. 2000)	expert knowledge (Bolonyai 2005)	emotional involvement (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	insulting (Garrett 2005)	double-voicing (Gumperz 1982; Auer 1984)
linguistic routines or clichés (Montes-Alcala 2001)	formality (Canagarajah 1995)	inclusion (Canagarajah 1995)	managing multiple face goals (Bolonyai & Myers-Scotton 2001)	elaboration (Lin 1990; Pandey 1995; Callahan 2004)
poetic (Appel & Muysken 1987); expressive (Appel & Muysken 1987; Karras 1995)	increasing status, social distance (Myers-Scotton 1993; Canagarajah 1995; Rindler Schjerve 1998)	inequality (Bentahila & Davies 1998)	mitigating face threat (Heller 1988; Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai 2001)	emphasis (Auer 1984; McClure & McClure 1988; Pandey 1995; Rindler Schjerve 1998; Montes-Alcala 2001; Callahan 2004)
professional and technical terms (Gardner-Chloros 1991)	independence (Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai 2001)	informality (Canagarajah 1995)	mitigating requests (Zentella 1997)	ethnic alignment and identification (Zentella 1997; Jacobson 1998; Callahan 2004)
recontextualization cue (Gumperz 1982; Auer 1984)	indexing leadership (Bauer, Hall & Kruth 2002) and power relations (Cromdal 2004)	intimacy (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	negative politeness (distance, restraint, autonomy, freedom for imposition) (Bolonyai & Bhatt	explanation (Canagarajah 1995)

			forthcoming)	
religious invocations (Callahan 2004)	inequality (Bentahila & Davies 1998)	joking (Garrett 2005)	politeness (Wei 1994, Auer 1995)	footing (Goffman 1979; Auer 1998; Zentella 1997)
stylistic embroidery (Valdés-Fallis 1976; Callahan 2004)	leadership (in child's playing activity) (Bauer, Hall, & Kruth 2002)	making parenthetical, informal asides and off-stage comments (Kwan-Terry 1992; Halmari & Smith 1994; Lin 1996; Montes-Alclala 2001)	positive politeness (appreciation, approval, liking, connection) (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	framing (Goffman 1974; Romaine 1995)
	making evaluative or validating comments (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	mitigating requests, conflict talk (Canagarajah 1995; Zentella 1997)	preferred choice (Rindler Schjerve 1998)	hesitation (Rindler Schjerve 1998)
	objectivization (Gal 1979; Gumperz 1982; Heller 1988b; Canagarajah 1995; Zentella 1997)	shared ethnicity/solidarity (Gumperz 1982; Poplack 1988; Woolard 1988; Myers-Scotton 1993; Zentella 1997)	requests (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	identity (Gumperz 1982; Myers-Scotton 1988; Sebba and Wootton 1998; Simon 2001; Myers-Scotton 2006; De Fina 2007)
	power displaying (in child CS) (Ervin-Tripp & Reyes 2005)	similarity (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	scolding (Garrett 2005)	interferences (Rindler Schjerve 1998)
	power indexing (Woolard 1988; Heller 1995)	solidarity (Grosjean 1982; Poplack 1987; Woolard 1988; Heller 1995)	strategic ambiguity (Gumperz 1982; Heller 1988b; Woolard 1988)	interjections (Gumperz 1982; McClure & McClure 1988; Rindler Schjerve 1998; Callahan 2004)
	power negotiating (Gal 1988; Heller 1988, 1992; Callahan 2004)	speech accommodation, topic or listener accommodation (Rindler Schjerve 1998)	thanks (Bolonyai & Bhatt forthcoming)	irony (Pandey 1995)
	power relations, resistance, dominance,	`true` emotion/positive affect (Pavlenko		linguistic routines or clichés (Montes-

	empowerment (Bolonyai and Bhatt forthcoming)	2005)		Alcala 2001)
	power-wielding (Auer 1998; Jorgensen 1998; Wei 1998; Esdahl 2003)	we-code (Gumperz 1982)		membership categorization device (Auer 1984, 1995; Torras & Gafaranga 2002)
	symbolic domination (Heller 1995)			metalinguistic comments (Zentella 1981; Appel & Muysken 1987; Karras 1995; Kovács 2001)
	they code (Gumperz 1982)			metaphorical switching (Blom and Gumperz 1972)
	topping the argument (Gal 1979)			multi-perspective point of view (Gardner-Chloros, Charles & Cheshire 2000)
				narrative frame break – evaluation or coda (Zentella 1997)
				negotiating interpersonal relationships (Myers-Scotton 1988, 1990; Callahan 2004)
				new vs. given information (Myers-Scotton 1993; Callahan 2004)
				on-stage/off-stage comments (Halmari & Smith 1994)
				parentheses (Pandit 1986; Montes-Alcala 2001)
				person switching (in child CS) (Lanvers 2001; Bauer, Hall &

				Kruth 2002)
				perspectivized voices (Bakhtin 1981)
				physical setting (in child CS) (Jorgensen 1998)
				positionings (Langenhove & Harré 1999)
				quotations (Grosjean 1982; Gumperz 1982; McClure & McClure 1988; Auer 1995; Zentella 1997; Montes-Alclala 2001; Callahan 2004)
				realignment (Zentella 1997)
				referential (Appel & Muysken 1987; Karras 1995; Callahan 2004)
				reformulation (Alfonzetti 1998)
				reiteration (Gumperz 1982; McClure & McClure 1988; Auer 1995; Rindler Schjerve 1998; Kovács 2001)
				repair (Milroy & Wei 1995; Alfonzetti 1998)
				repetition (Lin 1990; Callahan 2004)
				role-shift (Canagarajah 1995; Pandey 1995; Zentella 1997; Callahan 2004; Ervin-Tripp 2005)
				sarcasm (Pandey

				1995; McClure 1998)
				self-talk (Garrett 2005)
				shift of key/tone (Auer 1995)
				side-comments (McClure & McClure 1988; Auer 1995; Kovács 2001)
				situational switching (Blom and Gumperz 1972; Callahan 2004)
				stances (Ochs 1992)
				storytelling (Alfonzetti 1998; Garrett 2005)
				topic change (Auer 1995; Pandey 1995; Ramat 1995; Zentella 1997; Rindler Schjerve 1998; Kovács 2001; Callahan 2004)
				topic-comment structure (Auer 1995; Nishimura 1997; Kovács 2001)
				turns initiative (Auer 1984)

Appendix 2: Sociolinguistic questionnaire compiled by Ágnes Bolonyai for her survey conducted among 78 Hungarian-Americans living in North Carolina in 2007 (unpublished data)

Name:

Age (cc. if over 40):

Gender: ___ male ___ female

Occupation:

Education: ___ high school ___ college ___ graduate school ___ other ()

Mother tongue: ___ Hungarian ___ English ___ both Hungarian & English ___ ()

Where were you born?

Where were your parents born?

I've lived in the United States for ___ years.

How would you identify yourself? ___ Hungarian ___ American
 ___ Hungarian-American ___ other ()

Which language do you consider to be the one speak best?

___ Hungarian ___ English ___ equally both

Language Attitudes Questionnaire

This questionnaire asks questions about your feelings and opinions related to speaking Hungarian and English. There are no right or wrong answers, so feel free to state what you really think.

All information you give me in this questionnaire will be treated confidentially. Your identity will be protected and your name will not be disclosed to anyone, nor will it appear in the study.

Thank you for your time and helping me with this study!

Section 1

Please read the following statements.

To what extent do you agree with them?

Please mark your choice by selecting ONE of the following:

SD = strongly disagree

D = disagree

NU = neutral / undecided

A = agree

SA = strongly agree

Statements	SD	D	NU	A	SA
S1 Hungarian is a major part of my cultural heritage.					
S2 Knowing Hungarian in North Carolina is a cultural advantage.					
S3 Knowing Hungarian makes me a more intelligent person.					
S4 Knowing Hungarian is necessary for my job / schooling.					
S5 Knowing Hungarian is important to make friends.					
S6 Knowing Hungarian is important to raise children.					

S7 Knowing Hungarian is important to relate to my relatives.					
S8 Knowing Hungarian helps me to earn more money.					
S9 It is important for me to read and write in Hungarian.					
S10 It is important to be bilingual in Hungarian and English.					
S11 Hungarians in NC should try to preserve their language.					
S12 Hungarian should be the first language learned at home in Hungarian families living in North Carolina.					
S13 English should be the first language learned at home in Hungarian families living in North Carolina.					
S14 Knowing English is more important for socio-economic advancement.					
S15 Knowing English is important in order for me to					

be involved in the community.					
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Section 2

Please read the following statements.

To what extent do you agree with them?

Please mark your choice by selecting ONE of the following:

SD = strongly disagree

D = disagree

NU = neutral / undecided

A = agree

SA = strongly agree

Statements	SD	D	NU	A	SA
S16 I like speaking Hungarian.					
S17 I feel Hungarian is a beautiful language.					
S18 I feel Hungarian is less sophisticated than English.					
S19 I am proud of my Hungarian heritage.					
S20 I feel I can express best who I am when I speak Hungarian.					
S21 I feel when Hungarians living in America speak English amongst themselves, they deny their Hungarian					

heritage.					
S22 I think Hungarians should marry fellow Hungarians.					
S23 I think one can marry an American and still maintain one`s Hungarian heritage.					
S24 I feel English is a beautiful language.					
S25 I like speaking English.					
S26 I feel I can best express who I am when I speak English.					
S27 I feel English is less complex than Hungarian.					
S28 I am proud of being a Hungarian-American.					
S29 I do not consider myself an American.					
S30 Sometimes I feel I am in-between cultures: I do not belong neither here nor there.					

Section 3

Please read the following statements.

To what extent do you agree with them?

Please mark your choice by selecting ONE of the following:

SD = strongly disagree

D = disagree

NU = neutral / undecided

A = agree

SA = strongly agree

Statements	SD	D	NU	A	SA
S31 It is common for Hungarians who live in North Carolina to mix Hungarian and English when they speak.					
S32 I consider it advantageous to use Hungarian and English together when talking with bilingual Hungarians living in the US.					
S33 I appreciate both Hungarian and English and I feel I can best express who I am when I mix them together.					
S34 I am proud of being bilingual and being able to mix Hungarian					

with English.					
S35 I feel mixing Hungarian with English is a creative and interesting way of speaking.					
S36 I disapprove of people mixing Hungarian and English in the same conversation.					
S37 People who mix two languages together sound uneducated, careless and lazy.					
S38 Contact with the American community in North Carolina is changing the Hungarian language spoken in this community.					
S39 I have noticed that sometimes English influences the way I speak Hungarian.					
S40 Sometimes I feel I can speak neither Hungarian nor English well.					

Language Use Questionnaire

What language do you speak to whom when and how often? Again, please keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers.

Section 1

Which language do you speak to the following people?

Please indicate your answer by choosing ONE of the following for each option:

Hungarian, English, Hungarian mixed with English

A = always

O = often

S = sometimes

R = rarely

N = never

	H	U	N	G		*	E	N	G	L		*	M	I	X	E	D	
to ...	A	O	S	R	N	*	A	O	S	R	N	*	A	O	S	R	N	
your parents						*						*						
your spouse						*						*						
your children						*						*						
your siblings						*						*						
other Hun relatives in the US						*						*						
Hun friends in the US						*						*						
colleagues/clients/school mates						*						*						
neighbors						*						*						
your doctor						*						*						

Section 2

Which language do you use for the following?

Please note that questions 8 through 15 refer to conversations you would have with fellow bilingual Hungarian-Americans (friends, family members).

Please indicate your answer by choosing ONE of the following for each option:

Hungarian, English, Hungarian mixed with English

A = always

O = often

S = sometimes

R = rarely

N = never

	H	U	N	G		*	E	N	G	L		*	M	I	X	E	D
	A	O	S	R	N	*	A	O	S	R	N	*	A	O	S	R	N
counting						*						*					
praying						*						*					
thinking about abstract problems						*						*					
in your dreams						*						*					
thinking about personal issues						*						*					
talking to yourself						*						*					
cursing (if at all)						*						*					
telling a joke						*						*					
expressing fear or						*						*					

anxiety																		
expressing anger						*						*						
talking to your pet						*						*						
discussing personal feelings						*						*						
discussing job-related matters						*						*						
discussing educational issues						*						*						
discussing politics						*						*						

Section 3

Which language do you use when you do the following?

Please indicate your answer by choosing ONE of the following for each option:

Hungarian, English, Hungarian mixed with English

A = always

O = often

S = sometimes

R = rarely

N = never

	H	U	N	G		*	E	N	G	L		*	M	I	X	E	D
	A	O	S	R	N	*	A	O	S	R	N	*	A	O	S	R	N
watch TV						*						*					
read books						*						*					
read the news						*						*					
read magazines						*						*					
read for work						*						*					
watch films/DVD						*						*					
listen to the radio						*						*					
listen to music						*						*					
read internet sites						*						*					
exchange emails with Huns						*						*					

in US																		
write notes (shopping list, to do list)						*							*					
talk on the phone with Huns in US						*							*					
read and write recipes						*							*					
write birthday cards						*							*					