THE ROLE OF CODE-SWITCHING IN ACHIEVING UNDERSTANDING: CHINESE SPEAKERS OF HUNGARIAN

THE ROLE OF CODE-SWITCHING
IN ACHIEVING UNDERSTANDING:
CHINESE SPEAKERS OF HUNGARIAN*

JULIET LANGMAN

1. Introduction

Research on communication strategies, within the interaction framework, focuses on identifying the types of strategies that second language learners use in order to ensure that their messages are getting across when there is some misunderstanding. Parallel research on foreigner talk focuses on those strategies that native speakers use in interactions with learners to ensure or facilitate communication (see, for example, Tarone 1977; Bialystok 1983; Bremer *et al.* 1993; Wesche 1994).

Tarone (1977) provides a typology of communicative strategies, comprised of five types: (a) avoidance (topic avoidance, message abandonment); (b) paraphrase (approximation, word coinage, circumlocution); (c) conscious transfer (literal translation, language switch); (d) appeal for assistance; and (e) mime. Several other typologies have been suggested by other researchers (see for example Váradi 1980; Faerch–Kasper 1980) all of which are quite similar in terms of the types of strategies they uncover.

In this paper I examine in detail one particular type of communication strategy, namely the use of code-switches. Tarone (1977) identifies the code-switch as a type of conscious transfer. Faerch and Kasper (1980) include code-switching (along with foreignizing and literal translation) as part of L1/L3 strategies, where the learner makes use of a language other than L2. They identify these strategies as a sub-type of achievement strategy, i.e. that type of communication strategy in which the learner opts to keep as opposed to abandon (reduction strategies) the communicative goal. These strategies are moreover considered to be non-cooperative strategies, as opposed to those in which the learner asks for help directly or indirectly (compensatory strategies).

Bremer *et al.* (1993) discuss the mechanics of the joint negotiation of meaning, and the ways in which the interlocutors must work to "create conditions that make shared interpretation possible" (Bremer *et al.* 1993, 180). They outline a number of joint strategies between the speakers, at the level of discourse: deciding to solve the miscommunication or not; resolution through collaboration, and collaboration through prevention. Code-switching falls into the category of resolution through collaboration when we look at the native speaker's code-switches as well as the learner's code-switches. Taking this perspective is somewhat in contrast to Faerch and Kasper's view that code-switching is a non-cooperative strategy.

One issue of interest to researchers in communication strategies is whether the proficiency level of the learner has an effect on the types of learner strategies chosen. It seems that learners begin with a preference for reduction strategies and later move to achievement strategies (see Tarone 1977). Moreover as learners advance they use increasingly more L2-based strategies (such as paraphrase). Hence we would expect to find more advanced speakers making more use of code-switching in the intermediate stage, as it is already a type of achievement strategy, with respect to the goal of passing on a message, but not yet an L2-based strategy.

A second central question in the discussion of communication strategies is the relationship between communication and language learning strategies, particularly in the case of adult immigrant second language learners. Related to this is the question of the degree to which particular strategies and processes are related directly to language learning as opposed to more general learning processes (Bialystok 1990). With respect to communication strategies, researchers have tried to make distinctions between long-term and short-term or on-the-spot strategies in terms of the degree to which the process is related to general cognitive processes which will then lead to language learning (cf. Bialystok 1990; Ellis 1985). We can see learner strategies as "long-term solutions to problems" and the communication strategies as "short-term" or on the spot solutions to problems (Ellis 1985, 181). Distinctions between long- and short-term strategies, as well as the degree to which communicative strategies are conscious are, however, difficult at best to determine on the basis of naturalistic and cross-sectional data. Moreover, Hatch (1978), among others, suggests that the very act of communication or interaction may be crucial in language learning, and thus we cannot clearly separate long- and short-term processes from surface data.[1]

[1] The distinction between short- and long-term processes is of course important in terms of how these processes interact with general cognitive function. Long-term processes can

These two questions are related to one another insofar as we think of learning as a joint negotiation and one in which the learner must be provided with input that is within the zone of proximal development. Thus, subjects who find interlocutors who can provide them with the right kind of feedback, can use interactions as learning opportunities as well. Here in particular we will examine the effectiveness of code-switching both for communicative and for eventual language learning purposes.

The particular focus of this study is the examination of code-switching, not between the native and second language, but rather between two foreign languages—in this case Hungarian and English. Moreover, this study focuses on the strategy of code-switching used by both Chinese subjects and their interlocutors who are both native Hungarian and second language Hungarian speakers. This type of analysis allows us to look at the effectiveness of switching codes between speakers who do not share a single code to the extent needed for effective communication, and who choose, on a number of situations, to opt for a second code, limited for both.

2. The study

2.1. The subjects

The five subjects for this paper are drawn from a set of subjects who were interviewed in March and April 1994. All of our subjects are engaged in business either through selling in the various open markets, or working as wholesalers for these small merchants.

The subjects of this research are representative of the Chinese population in Hungary. The majority of Chinese came to Hungary from Mainland China between 1989 and 1991 during the political changes in Eastern Europe. In mid-1991, an estimated 40–50 thousand Chinese lived in Hungary (Nyíri 1994, 53), and worked primarily in open market places and restaurants. Following legal changes backed by police actions, including forced deportation, however, the population decreased to 7–10 thousand. New laws have made it increasingly difficult for Chinese to stay in Hungary, the majority must now renew their visas on a monthly basis (Nyíri 1994, 53).

---

be conceived as ones that are potentially "process-initiating" and thus will be extended to other areas of language learning. Such initiating processes, according to Bialystok (1990), include overgeneralization and transfer. Short-term or situation-bound processes on the other hand are seen to serve more local communicative needs and include such strategies as circumlocution and paraphrase, language switch, appeal to authority, topic change and avoidance (Bialystok 1990).

The limited and insecure time perspective is a defining characteristic of life in Hungary for the majority of the Chinese. The majority of Chinese have left family in China and send money home on a regular basis. While a number claim that they would like to stay, without better immigration possibilities the majority have no plans for buying property or bringing dependents to Hungary.

One consequence of these restrictions is that the Chinese devote all of their time to work, and rarely if ever learn Hungarian in classroom situations; rather theirs is classic adult immigrant acquisition, in the context of the marketplace where the majority of them work.

The subjects' knowledge of Hungarian ranges from beginning to intermediate. A number of potential subjects were not interviewed as they considered their Hungarian inadequate, or did not understand what we wanted from them; that is, no initial communication and understanding could be established.

For all of the subjects, the primary and often only exposure to Hungarian is in the context of work in the markets, or in interactions with neighbors. The majority of the speakers claimed to speak Hungarian rarely. At the time of the research, one subject, KIN6, had begun formal language instruction and was at the time of the interview on Lesson 5 and in the fifth week of study. Rare free time and much of work time is spent in the company of other Chinese speakers and the need for Hungarian is limited. Official interactions with the police and immigration offices generally do not require interpreters, as they generally entail only the paying of fees.

Use of English as a strategy was pointed out during the interviews by a number of the subjects.[2] A number of other subjects, while they did not point it out explicitly, did in fact make use of this strategy. Table 1 gives an overview of the participants discussed in this paper.

The interviewers in this study consisted of the author, JUL, and two assistants, ZSU and VIK. While ZSU and VIK are native speakers of Hungarian with intermediate and beginning knowledge of English, respectively, JUL is a native speaker of English with intermediate knowledge of Hungarian.

---

[2] The use of English as a strategy in cross-language interaction is prevalent in many immigrant communities particularly in those areas where the language of the majority is not a widely-known language (see Langman 1989 for a discussion of the use of English among "Yugoslav" immigrants in the Netherlands). This is yet another of the many functions of English as a language of world communication. While not the focus of this paper, there is evidence of some interference from English in the word order of Hungarian sentences uttered by some of the subjects.

Table 1
List of subjects, their grammatical level and interlocutors

Subjects	DOB	Gramm. Level	Interviewer(s)
Kínai1 – male	1956	3	Zsuzsa, Juliet
Kínai3 – female	1955	2	Zsuzsa
Kínai6 – female	1959	2	Viktor, Juliet
Kínai8 – male	1961	1	Viktor
Kínai9 – female	1964	3	Viktor

2.2. Interview setting

The data are drawn from open-ended interviews focusing on the subject's arrival and experiences conducted by one or two interviewers. The interviews were conducted at the office in March and April of 1994, in the waiting room of the accounting office. The interviews were all roughly 30 minutes in length. An interview guide was used to cover the following topics:

- how, when and by what means the subject came to Hungary
- current situation in Hungary: where and with whom they live and work
- how a normal day is spent
- the best and the worst experiences in Hungary
- the best and the worst aspects of life in Hungary
- comparisons of life in Hungary with life in China
- how and when the subject learned Hungarian
- how well the subject speaks, reads, writes Hungarian
- future plans: staying in Hungary, returning to China, or moving on
- feelings about Gypsies gathered by the question: Have you ever seen the graffiti $C M \bar{O}$ 'Gypsy-Free Area'?[3]

Within the interview setting, two goals operated simultaneously, and thus affected the nature of the overall interaction; the first was to gather information on Hungarian language use and the second, more basic goal was to establish rapport between the interlocutors. These two sets of goals can be seen as goals of the interview setting on the one hand, and goals of communication on the other.

---

[3] This last question was drawn from the Budapest Sociolinguistic Survey and intended to be used for comparisons with responses by Hungarian subjects. In general the response to this question was that the subjects had not seen such graffiti, but that their general impressions of Gypsies was negative.

The interviews can be divided into two subsets in terms of participants; those in which JUL was present, versus those in which she was not. JUL's role was two-fold during the interviews at which she was present; these interviews served as a training session for the other interviewers, as well as a setting for gathering information from the Chinese subjects.[4]

The second difference that colored the nature of the interactions was the degree to which the subject knew and spoke English. The choice of strategy of switching to English on the part of the interviewer shows some of the ways in which the strategies of "gathering Hungarian language data" (implicit and partially explicit goal of interviewers) and gathering information (explicit goal), and maintaining rapport interact with one another.

3. Analysis

The interviews were all transcribed following the guidelines and using the CHILDES transcription and analysis system.[5] An earlier analysis established a rough level of proficiency in Hungarian for each of the speakers on the basis of verbal morphology (Langman forthcoming).

The subjects overall were grouped at four levels of proficiency. The group discussed here fell into Levels 1–3; that is the speaker in Level 4 (the most advanced) did not use code-switching strategies. The subjects in this paper were ranked as follows on the basis of their verbal morphology:

- Level 1: KIN8
- Level 2: KIN3, KIN6
- Level 3: KIN1, KIN9

See Appendix A for a list of criteria on the basis of which verbal morphology was analyzed.

---

[4] Where JUL was present additional elements having to do with how to conduct the interview, and how to distribute turns at talk were present in addition to the interviewer-interviewee dynamic. In these interviews a three-way turn-taking negotiation was present as opposed to the more simple two-way turn-taking system.

[5] We have used the CHILDES (Child Language Data Exchange System) programs and transcription system. The programs: CLAN (Child Language Analysis) are written by Leonid Spektor at Carnegie Mellon University with design assistance from Brian MacWhinney. For information on transcription conventions see MacWhinney (1991).

3.1. Analyzing distribution of use of Hungarian and English

A first step in the analysis is to determine an overall look at the use of the two codes by the interlocutors in each interview. Table 2 shows the distribution of use of English and Hungarian across the interviews for the subjects in terms of lexicon and number of turns. Minimal responses (e.g. *mhm*, *uhuh*, *hm*, *yes* and its Hungarian counterpart *IGEN*)[6] are not counted as turns in this analysis as with the exception of *yes* and *IGEN* they cannot be assigned a language and in all cases they mark attention, agreement or understanding, but do not affect the communication strategy related to code-switching.

Comparing the subjects, we see that with the exception of KIN1, who uses 58% English, all subjects use more Hungarian than English lexicon. While in Hungarian all speakers have roughly the same size lexicon, the percentage of Hungarian over English varies, lying at around 60/40 for KIN8 and KIN9, and around 70/30 for KIN3 and KIN6. In English, KIN3 and KIN6 have the smallest lexicon as well as the smallest proportion vis à vis Hungarian.

With respect to number of turns, we see that while all subjects have a higher percentage of Hungarian turns than English or mixed turns, KIN1 has the highest percentage of English turns (39%), while KIN3 (15%) and KIN6 (16%) have the smallest, corresponding with their smaller English lexicon. For mixed turns KIN8 has the largest number at 33%, with KIN1 having the smallest, at 7%, with the other three ranging between 21–24%. For all but KIN1, there is an almost equal amount of English and mixed turns, especially with KIN9 (23/24%) suggesting that English use is not strong, and/or that the attempt to speak Hungarian leads to mixed turns.

In terms of the interlocutor(s), we need to distinguish between those in which JUL is present (KIN1, KIN6) from those where she is not. In these two interactions, JUL uses close to one-third English lexicon, while ZSU and VIK use almost none (3% and 4%). Similarly, in terms of number of turns, JUL uses around 75% Hungarian turns, while ZSU and VIK use close to 100% (96% and 97%). These interactions have the highest degree of use of English for all interlocutors. The remaining three interviews show variable use of English. Both ZSU (KIN3) and VIK (KIN8) use around 25% English in terms of lexicon. In terms of number of turns however, ZSU (KIN3) uses only 12% English while VIK (KIN8) uses 30%. If we compare the use of English and Hungarian with these two subjects, we see that as KIN8 uses a far higher degree of English and especially mixed turns that can explain the corresponding higher use of English

---

[6] To distinguish Hungarian from English items, the Hungarian examples are presented in both capital letters and italics, while the English examples are in italics only.

Table 2
Use of English and Hungarian lexicon and number of turns

Subject	KIN1	ZSU	JUL	KIN3	ZSU	KIN6	VIK	JUL	KIN8	VIK	KIN9	VIK
Total Lexicon*	534	147	371	279	232	328	204	249	315	235	417	250
% Hungarian Lexicon	42%	97%	70%	73%	79%	70%	96%	73%	61%	77%	59%	89%
% English Lexicon	58%	3%	30%	27%	21%	30%	4%	27%	39%	23%	41%	11%
Total Turns	288	78	161	160	122	117	70	86	209	115	249	138
% Hungarian Turns	53%	96%	73%	72%	84%	63%	97%	76%	43%	65%	53%	80%
% English Turns	39%	1%	22%	15%	12%	16%	1%	17%	24%	30%	23%	12%
% Mixed Turns	7%	3%	5%	13%	3%	21%	1%	7%	33%	5%	24%	7%

* number of types

by VIK. Finally in the case of KIN9, we see a different pattern, with VIK using a small degree of English lexicon (11%) and turns (12%) in spite of KIN9's use of a higher degree of English. In comparing KIN8 and KIN9, the major difference seems to be in the degree of mixed turns. For the interlocutors, the percentage of mixed turns is small in all cases, the highest percentage being 7% (JUL with KIN6, and VIK with KIN9).

In summary, we see that the interview with KIN1 is weighted toward English (although still over 50% Hungarian), the interviews with KIN3 and KIN6 are weighted toward Hungarian, and the interviews with KIN8 and KIN9 are balanced between Hungarian and non-Hungarian, with KIN8 having a high degree of mixed utterances.

3.2. Analyzing types of code-switching

The second step in the analysis entails a detailed examination of the code-switched utterances. Code switching in this paper is broadly defined to include both those switches that occur within utterances, at morpheme, lexical or clause boundaries, as well as those that occur at sentence boundaries, as well as at speaker boundaries.[7]

---

[7] The issue of base language is not considered here as the primary aim of this study is to examine how code-switching acts as a communication strategy, and not in what ways particular syntactic or morphological rules may be violated. In addition, as a large number of the code-switches discussed here occur at the level of discourse and across speakers, syntactic level constraints are not relevant. Furthermore, it is likely that the code-switches operate as part of a converged system, rather than as switches into and out of a given base language. For a further discussion of this issue see Romaine (1989).

In the completed transcripts all instances of inter-sentential as well as cross-utterance and cross-speaker switches were marked. These instances were then characterized on the basis of the function the switch may serve from the perspective of communication strategy.

Code-switches found in the data are classified in three main types in terms of size and function of the code-switched element as follows:

(1) Single constituent switches. These are switches taking part at the lexical level, or small constituent level (no larger than the clause). These switches are further categorized as follows:

(a) lexical translation (of lexical item): e.g. *HARMINCHÁROM thirty-three* where the lexical item is uttered twice, once in each language by the same speaker.[8]

(b) lexical gap—where the entire utterance is in one language except for a given lexical item, e.g. *KÍNAI VAN EGY letter*. 'Chinese there is a letter'.

(c) borrowing—where the item is incorporated into the language used by the speaker.

(i) English in Hungarian: *police, business, graffiti*,

(ii) Hungarian in English: *PIAC* 'market', *ÁFA* 'tax', *KFT* 'company', *PÁLINKA* 'brandy', *VÁR* 'castle'

(2) Large constituent code-switches. These encompass larger units of meaning than the lexical, but are still carried out within one turn and thus by one speaker. These were divided into two sub-groups depending on the nature of the information given in the second code:

(a) rephrasings: where the information is roughly the equivalent of that uttered previously. See Ex. 1 where ZSU repeats her question to KIN3 first in Hungarian then English.

Ex. 1. KIN3

*ZSU: ÉS LEGTÖBBET MILYEN NYELVEN BESZÉL ITT MA-
        GYARORSZÁGON? ÁLTALÁBAN NAPKÖZBEN MILYEN
        NYELVEN BESZÉL? LEGTÖBBET. The most of the day, what
        language do you speak? Chinese, English, Hungarian?

---

[8] I distinguish this from literal translation, in that both forms are present.

%eng: And most of the time which language do you speak here in Hun-
         gary? In general during the day what language do you speak?
         The most.

(See Appendix B for transcription conventions.)

(b) expansions: where the switch is followed by new or additional in-
    formation. Ex. 2 shows how KIN6 switches to English to give more
    information.

Ex. 2. KIN6

*KIN6:   TÁBLA VAN OTT ÍRNI SZERET VENNI ÉS UH MENNYI
         FORINT DARAB ÉS MENNYI FORINT KILÓ ÉS uh # we
         see that only to show that which one.

%eng: sign is there write+INF like+3S buy+INF and how many forint
         piece and how many forint kilo and

(2a) is seen as serving the function of ensuring understanding, while (2b)
involves more, that is the desire to impart information that cannot be given
in the language currently being used.

(3) Code-switch across turns. These types of code-switch take place across
speakers. These have been divided as follows:

(a) rephrasings—where one speaker rephrases the utterance of the other
    in the second code (or in some instances, rephrases his own utterance
    after an intervening utterance by another speaker)

(b) expansions—in this setting, these generally entail answers to ques-
    tions placed in one language, but responded to in the other.

(c) filling lexical gap—this entails those instances where another speaker
    fills a lexical gap either with or without the request of the speaker
    who created the gap.

A detailed discussion of how to determine which lexical items should be
coded as code-switches and which as borrowings, takes us beyond the scope of
this paper at present. In particular this is the case, as both types of non-native
lexical items may serve communication strategy functions equally, in spite of
the fact that one (borrowing) is an integrated part of the code, from the per-
spective of the speaker, while the other (code-switch) is not. Here, frequency
across the interviews and across speakers was one of the primary bases upon

Acta Linguistica Hungarica 43, 1995/1996

which code-switches were distinguished from borrowings. In addition, an examination of those items which native speakers use, in the interviews, as well as in other settings also informed the distinction. As all of these interviews entail the only interaction with the speakers, we coded according to the evidence in the interaction at each particular exchange.

Table 3 shows the distribution of single and large constituent switches across the interlocutors. Omitted from this table are those switches that entail proper names, of e.g. restaurants and schools. In addition, those switches that are pragmatic, or morphological in nature have also been omitted. Finally, a few unclear utterances have been omitted, as well as those switches that come hand in hand with a new question on the part of the interviewer. These last are seen as attempts on the part of the interviewers to keep the interaction in Hungarian, but do not serve as communication strategies, evidenced by the occasional need of the interviewers to switch back to English to get a response.

Table 3
Types of code-switching used as communicative strategies

INTERLOCUTORS	KIN1	ZSU	JUL	KIN3	ZSU	KIN6	VIK	JUL	KIN8	VIK	KIN9	VIK
TOTAL Single Constituent*	5/1	1/0	5/0	14/3	2/0	10/1	1/2	1/0	56/14	2/1	31/9	5/3
lexical trans.	1/0	–	3/0	1/1	1/0	1/1	1/2	–	3/3	1/1	6/3	4/3
lexical gap	3/0	–	–	5/2	–	9/0	–	–	18/1	–	20/1	–
borrowing	1/1	1/0	2/0	8/0	1/0	–	–	1/0	35/10	1/0	5/5	1/0
TOTAL Large Constituent[y]	15/0	0	5/0	5/5	3/2	7/5	4/2	1/1	7/3	6/0	18/3	–
rephrasing	2/0	–	3/0	2/3	3/0	1/1	4/1	1/1	2/1	6	2/1	–
expansion	13/0	–	2/0	3/2	0/2	6/4	0/1	–	5/2	–	16/2	–
TOTAL Cross speaker[y]	7/0	0/2	0/1	1/0	1/0	6/1	4/6	0/1	3/2	2/6	6/2	1/8
rephrasing	1/0	0/1	–	–	1/0	2/0	4/0	–	–	2/2	5/2	0/1
expansion	6/0	–	–	1/0	–	4/1	–	–	3/2	–	1/0	–
fill lex. gap	–	0/1	0/1	–	–	–	0/6	0/1	–	0/4	–	0/7

* in single constituent columns the first number in the series (1/1) refers to an English word used in Hungarian, i.e. a switch to English, while the second refers to a Hungarian word used in an English frame, i.e. a switch to Hungarian.

[y] in large constituent and cross-speaker switches, in the series (1/1) the first number refers to a switch from Hungarian to English, and the second refers to switches from English to Hungarian.

Acta Linguistica Hungarica 43, 1995/1996

The interaction with KIN1 is characterized by the shifts to English on the part of KIN1 in order to carry on a discussion. In addition, the switches by the interlocutors also move in the direction of English (in the case of JUL) with the exception of the cross-speaker turns where the interlocutors use the switch to Hungarian 21 times (JUL 12, ZSU 9) when asking a new question. Cross-speaker turns are divided according to language of preference, with KIN1 using English and JUL and ZSU supplying lexical items and phrases in Hungarian. In the case of the interview with KIN1 all instances of lexical gaps are gaps in Hungarian, and all borrowings are borrowings into Hungarian, with the exception of *PIAC* used by KIN1 in the English utterance *go to PIAC*. Ex. 3 shows an example of a typical interaction with KIN1. KIN1 pulls the discussion to English, while the interviewers try to pull it back to Hungarian.

Ex. 3. KIN1

*ZSU:	ÉS MI VOLT AZ ELSŐ BENYOMÁS MAGYARORSZÁG-RÓL?	1
%eng:	and what was your first impression of Hungary?	
*KIN:	EZ <NEM ÉRTEM> [>1], EZ(T) <NEM ÉRTEM> [>2].	2
%eng:	I don't understand that, I don't understand that.	
*JUL:	<BENYOMÁS> [<1].	3
%eng:	impression	
*ZSU:	<AZ ELSŐ> [<2].	4
%eng:	the first	
*KIN:	ELSŐ +...	5
%eng:	first	
*ZSU:	ELSŐ VÉLEMÉNYE, AMIKOR ELŐSZÖR JÖTT, MIT GONDOLT A MAGYAR, MAGYARORSZÁGRÓL?	6
%eng:	first opinion, when you came the first time, what did you think about Hungary?	
*KIN:	what <the > [>] first impression?	7
*ZSU:	<xxx jó volt> [<].	8
%eng:	was it good	
*JUL:	mhm. <BENYOMÁS, first impression > [>].	9
*KIN:	<ah the first thing xxx> [<]. aha. It's ah ah you know um, when do we first came here #, I feel the Hungarian, the Hungarian people very friendly...	10

In this example, KIN1 first marks his lack of understanding (2) leading ZSU and JUL together to rephrase in 3–6. In 7 KIN1 switches to English to rephrase the question, which overlaps with a further rephrasing to ZSU in 8. In 9 JUL offers a lexical translation of the key word leading to KIN1's full response

Acta Linguistica Hungarica 43, 1995/1996

in 10. Here the lexical translation in 9 can be seen as a language teaching device, which was not necessary to the understanding of the question in 1, as KIN1 has already rephrased it correctly in 7.

The interview with KIN3 is markedly different from that of KIN1. While KIN1 uses predominantly large constituent switches, and all but one switch moves to English, KIN3 uses predominantly single constituent switches (and especially borrowings, which are arguably not switches at all). In addition, she switches back and forth between Hungarian and English a few times, especially in the course of telling a story about a car accident. Particular words seem to trigger switches from one language to the other in this case. ZSU for her part, also uses switches to English, particularly in rephrasing questions, and switches to Hungarian to accommodate her poor English.

Ex. 4 shows an extract from a story KIN3 tells predominantly in English, with a switch to Hungarian triggered by EMBER.

Ex. 4. KIN3

*KIN:	ÉS NEHÉZ BESZÉL MOST uh uh RENDŐRSÉG police.	1
%eng:	and difficult speak now police	
*KIN:	NEM JÓ um &KÍN KÍNAI situation not NEM OLYAN	
%eng:	Not good Chinese not very	
	JÓ KÍNAI.	
	good Chinese.	
*ZSU:	mhm.	2
*KIN:	NEM TUD MÉRT.	3
%eng:	Not know+3S why.	
*ZSU:	mhm.	
*KIN:	you we, we meet some problem.	4
*ZSU:	mhm.	
*KIN:	yes. um for example in xxx you have accident. My car parking in the parking. The other park. The other car touch my <my> [>] +/.	5
*ZSU:	<yes.> [<]	6
*KIN:	+, car yes. &an and the Hungary EMBER	7
%eng:	person	
*ZSU:	yes.	8
*KIN:	A MAGYAR EMBER SOK <drink> [>] +/.	9
%eng:	the Hungarian person a lot	
*ZSU:	<IVOTT> [<]	10
%eng:	drank	

> *KIN: PÁLINKA. IGEN IGEN. Touched my car, I said this
>   no not good, I will ask uh police...   11
> %eng: brandy. Yes yes.

In 1 KIN3 begins with a lexical translation of *police*. Thereafter she uses *situation* to fill a lexical gap. In 4 she switches to English to give a concrete example, a story of a car accident. In 7 she fills a lexical gap in English with *EMBER*, which also leads to a switch to Hungarian beginning with a rephrasing in 9 and moving on to an expansion with *SOK drink PÁLINKA*. Here too she fills a lexical gap with *drink*, which ZSU fills in 10. Then in 11 after acknowledging ZSU's understanding/help with *IGEN IGEN* she switches back to English to continue her story.

Characteristic of KIN6 is the presence of lexical gaps in KIN6's speech, followed by the filling of those gaps by JUL or VIK. Here, as with KIN3 we see near equal amounts of rephrasings and expansions into both English and Hungarian on the part of KIN6, with JUL using rephrasings in English to ensure understanding. The majority of JUL's cross-speaker rephrasings constitute rephrasings of VIK's questions; thus it is similar to the within speaker rephrasings carried out by one interviewer. Ex. 5 shows how the interlocutors work together to fill gaps.

Ex. 5. KIN6

> *JUL: SZERETSZ SZERET[9] MAGYARORSZÁG?   1
> %eng: do you like, do you like Hungary?
> *KIN: IGEN # HODMODA[10] MAGYAR EMBER NAGYON
> %eng: yes   how to say   Hungarian person   very
>   KEDVES # friendly.   2
>   sweet
> *JUL: BARÁTSÁGOS.   3
> %eng: friendly.
> *VIK: BARÁTSÁGOS.   4
> %eng: friendly.

In line 2 KIN6 responds using a possible lexical translation. We cannot, in fact, say that she intends it as a lexical translation, as it is inaccurate. JUL and VIK in any event proceed to fill what they perceive as a lexical gap.

---

[9] Here JUL corrects herself by moving from the informal 'tu' form to the formal 'vous' form of the verb. Nonetheless her utterance is still ungrammatical as the object marker *-t* is missing from *Magyarország*.

[10] *hodmoda* is an idiosyncratic form of *hogy mondjam* 'how do I say'.

Acta Linguistica Hungarica 43, 1995/1996

Characteristic of KIN8 is the high number of borrowings and lexical gaps, particularly in Hungarian and also in English. What is striking about KIN8, in fact, is that he has a number of set phrases that have been incorporated as lexical items into his Hungarian (which have here been counted as borrowings). They include: *business* (16 times), *make (a) business* (6 times), *make (a) company* (4 times), *young people* (4 times), and *country* (4 times).

In Ex. 6 KIN8 uses a mixed utterance full of set phrases.

Ex. 6. KIN8

*KIN: mm um young people, young people MINDEN SZERETI make
         a NAGY business. VAN SOK PÉNZ ÉS business JÓ, make a
         NAGY company. And make a bosser.

%eng: mm um young people, young people every likes make a big busi-
         ness. there is a lot of money and business good, make a big com-
         pany. And make a bosser.

In such utterances of KIN8, it is difficult to determine which language serves as the frame or matrix into which elements can be inserted. Here, we can say that across the interaction Hungarian is more often the intended frame, but the success of staying within it is quite limited. Moreover, here, the overall fluid manner in which KIN8 speaks, as well as the frequency of a number of set phrases have led us to count them as borrowings as opposed to code-switches. Similarly, he has borrowings from Hungarian in English which he uses consistently, such as *MUNKA* 'work' as in *MOST MUNKA, MOST the MUNKA is uh make company, profit.*

For his part VIK relies on rephrasing questions in English in attempts to make himself understood. In addition, he supplies lexical items in Hungarian.

Ex. 7. VIK supplies KIN8 with some vocabulary

*KIN: so MEGYÜNK maybe other MÁSIK country.   1
%eng: go+1P   other
*VIK: MÁSIK ORSZÁG.   2
%eng: other country.
*KIN: ORSZÁG.   3
*VIK: ORSZÁG.   4
*KIN: MÁSIK ORSZÁG is SZERETI ÉS VAN   business ÉS.   5
%eng: other   country   is like+3S   and there is business and.
...

```
*KIN:    EZ uh business NEM JÓ, ITT ÉL NINCSEN business        6
         EZ finish MEGYÜNK VISSZA KÍNA AZ KÖRÜBELÜL
         MÁSIK business JÓ   country.
%eng:    This uh business not good, here live no business
         this finish go+1P      back    China that's about
         another business good country.
```

After VIK offers a lexical item in Hungarian *ORSZÁG*, KIN8 picks it up in 5. Later, however, (here marked as line 6), KIN8 returns to his form of *ORSZÁG*, namely the English word *country*. With a few exceptions, such as when KIN8 asks for a rephrasing in English, we cannot see his use of code-switching as a communication strategy; it is rather an integral part of his particular interlanguage.

At the outset of the interview KIN9 repeatedly responds in English, to which VIK repeatedly (7 times) urges *MAGYARUL!* 'Hungarian!' Throughout she jokes about his demands saying as in Ex. 8.

Ex. 8. KIN9

```
*KIN:    JÓ MAGYARUL DE NEM TUDOM HOGY MIT MOND A
         MAGYAR. Please try to to teach one or two word I can maybe
         use, make a sentence.

%eng:    ok Hungarian but I don't know how what say the Hungarian.
```

As the interview progresses, KIN9 moves more into Hungarian, and switches her strategy to using the interview as a language learning opportunity, for which she uses code-switching to draw language teaching from VIK.

Ex. 9. KIN9 and VIK

```
*KIN:    NA ÉN NAGYON SZERETI AZ A climate. How to say
%eng:    well I    very much like+3S    that's the
         climate.                                                 1
*VIK:    mhm.                                                      2
*KIN:    climate.                                                  3
*VIK:    climate, KLÍMA KLÍMA. IDŐ<JÁRÁS.> [>]                     4
%eng:              climate climate. Weather.
*KIN:                                  <KLÍMA aha> [<].            5
*VIK:    IDŐJÁRÁS.                                                 6
```

```
*KIN:     IDŐ,     IGEN IDŐJÁRÁS NAGYON SZERETI.
%eng:     &weath, yes    weather       very much like+3S.
          TETSZIK IDŐJÁRÁS.                                      7
          I like       weather.
*VIK:     IDŐJÁRÁS <JELENTÉS weather> [>] report.                8
*KIN:                     <IDŐJÁRÁS IDŐJÁRÁS.> [<] Weather yeah.  9
*VIK:     IDŐJÁRÁS.                                               10
*KIN:     IDŐJÁRÁS. EZ   TUDOM.                                   11
%eng:     Weather.    This I know.
```

In 1 KIN9 asks for help with a lexical item, *climate*. In 3 she repeats the lexical item, yielding a lexical translation from VIK in 4, which she verifies by repeating in 5. Then in 6, VIK begins a new sequence by introducing the related word, *IDŐJÁRÁS*, which KIN9 uses actively in 7, to which VIK, apparently for his own practice in English, produces a lexical translation in 8. This KIN9 again repeats for herself as a lexical translation in 9. In 10 and 11 they again repeat each other, and then KIN9 ends the interchange with *EZ TUDOM*.

4. Discussion: A question of style or level of language competence?

At the start of this paper I asked the questions

(a) whether different types of communication strategies, and in this case more specifically, different types of code-switching phenomena are related to different levels of proficiency; and

(b) whether communication strategies are the same as some long-term language learning strategies.

In terms of the degree of proficiency of the speaker and type of code-switching, we see that the two slightly more advanced speakers (KIN1 and KIN9) seem to direct the flow of the conversation more so than the more beginning speakers. In addition, they use more large constituent switches, although not necessarily less single constituent switches.

In terms of use of the interaction as a language learning opportunity, we see that there is a distinct difference between KIN6 and KIN9, both of whom seek and also engender language learning help in the form of having lexical gaps filled, and the other speakers, who do not explicitly seek or use repetition and requests to gain language learning practice. This strategy seems

to be independent of the level of proficiency in Hungarian, and furthermore, seems to work best with small chunks, that is lexical items and short phrases.

When looking at these communication strategies that involve code-switching we must ask the question of what the link is between achieving successful communication at the point in question, and language learning more generally. Here we see that the two seem to work hand in hand when there are exchanges, offered by the interviewer or requested directly or indirectly by the learner that serve the two purposes together. Moreover, we have seen that those learners who already possess particular lexical items, often use a code-switch as a type of check or validation of the meaning of that item.

KIN1 and KIN9 use their switches to English to check on their understanding of the Hungarian and to expand their answers when their Hungarian is not sufficient. In the case of KIN1 this is an effective strategy as JUL and ZSU can understand him, in the case of KIN9, not, because of VIK's limited English. For KIN3 and KIN6 a far more limited type of code-switching takes place, as both their Hungarian and English are more limited than that of KIN1 and KIN9. Here the strategies are seen with the use of lexical gaps and borrowings more so than larger constituents. However again we see that the interaction with the interlocutors affects the success of communication on the one hand and language learning on the other, for while KIN6 receives feedback in the form of having lexical gaps filled, KIN3 does not.

Code-switching for the other speakers (especially KIN1 and KIN3) is primarily for the purpose of achieving understanding, rather than for language learning practice. KIN8 falls into a separate category. While he is the least advanced in Hungarian, it is most notable that he seems to be operating with a mixed code as his code, as opposed to switching back and forth between two codes for communicative purposes. He speaks a form of telegraphic speech that is comprehensible only for those with knowledge of both Hungarian and English. In the case of all of the other speakers, we see an attempt to keep the codes separated, and with KIN9, with the second greatest amount of switching, we see it clearly as a strategy for learning, that is with lots of lexical translations and lexical gaps bounded with requests to have them filled.

Code-switching on the part of the native speaker can be seen to work to a certain degree insofar as clarifying questions, through rephrasings in English, and in terms of filling lexical gaps which can aid both understanding and learning. However, the degree of effectiveness is limited by a number of factors including:

(a) level of proficiency in L3 (English) of the interlocutors

(b) level of proficiency in L2 (Hungarian) of the interlocutors

This last point is related to the extent to which the non-native speaker stays within the frame of L2 and makes attempts to respond in L2, in spite of potential ease of response in L3. This moreover is related to the communicative goal of the interaction in the case of these interviews, where two sometimes opposing goals—communicating information, and speaking in Hungarian existed.

In this case code-switching as a strategy is related to the level of proficiency of both speakers. In the case of code-switching over longer stretches of discourse on the part of the non-native speaker, in particular in those cases where expansions take place, it would seem that this strategy works counter to language learning. However, when the form of the switching is more direct rephrasings, it may be related to language learning as these types of code-switches may serve as checks on understanding either self-directed or directed at the native speaker. These types of language practice and repetition, moreover, were evident in only some of the speakers, not in all, thus suggesting that the level of proficiency does influence choice of communication strategy.

"Communication strategies are psycho-linguistic plans which exist as part of the language user's communicative competence. They are potentially conscious and serve as substitutes for production plans which the learner is unable to implement" (Ellis 1985, 182). If this is true, then we need to think of production in the case of these subjects as not constrained to one system, but rather made up of two interlocking second language systems. Here we see that code-switching as communication strategy is used for different sets of goals; for KIN1 code-switching and thus use of English allows his goal of giving information to be successful, while for KIN9 code-switching allows her to achieve a goal of language learning, although somewhat unsuccessfully due to the lack of English proficiency of her interlocutor.

Bremer *et al.* (1993) suggest that the native speaker in negotiation with the language learner can set up a learning environment by bringing the learner to the "zone of proximal development" (cf. Vygotsky 1978). Hence, each interaction can be seen as a potential language learning instance, insofar as all of the interlocutors are able to recognize and assist in one another's goals.

In response to the question of whether code-switching is a non-cooperative achievement strategy, we can see that it is an achievement strategy, although what is to be achieved, communication versus language learning determines whether or not it should be classified as non-cooperative. For the purposes of language learning, the subjects must rely on the support of their interlocutors.

We see it being used as a language learning strategy on the part of KIN1, KIN6 and KIN9. Whether it is effective, depends both on the nature of the interaction with the interlocutors, which we were able to examine here, and also on the degree of retention of language learned, which we cannot determine from the data presented here. Hence longitudinal data of interactions with these adult second language learners may help us to find out more about the interplay between communication strategy and language learning.

Appendix A
Description of verbal morphology used to determine the level of grammatical ability of the subjects

Level 1: – use of base form (based on 3S) for all persons
          – use of copula *van*
          – use of frequent, set expressions *tudom* 'I know' in 1S

Level 2: – use of infinitive
          – systematic use of morphological endings attached to base in the form of base + vowel (*-i*, *-e*, *-o*)
          – use of past tense of copula and in set expressions;
            mondtam 'I said', *szoktam* 'it's my habit to'

Level 3: – productive use of some other forms (e.g. 1S, 1P, 3P)
          – productive use of definite and indefinite forms in 1S and 3S although not always correctly
          – use of verbal prefixes (not in separable form).

Appendix B
Transcription conventions

Below is the basic set of transcription conventions used in the examples. They are drawn from MacWhinney (1991). For a more complete explanation of transcription conventions see MacWhinney (1991). The presentation of the examples has been modified; more than one utterance has been listed on a single line in some cases, and false starts that entail only partial words have been deleted. In addition, retracings have been removed. In the examples, Hungarian words are presented in ALL CAPS. Examples given in the text are in italics, with Hungarian words also in ALL CAPS.

*XXX:	marks the speaker
xx	unintelligible speech treated as word
xxx	unintelligible speech, not treated as word
&	phonological fragment
#	pause between words
< > [>]	overlapping speech follows
< > [<]	overlapping speech precedes
,,	tag question
%eng:	English translation
%com:	comment on the preceding line
%add:	addressee
[=]	explanation of preceding word
[=?]	alternative transcription
[?]	uncertain transcription
[=!]	paralinguistics, prosodics
+...	trailing off
+/.	interruption
+,	self-completion

References

Bialystok, E. 1983. Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In: Faerch, C.–Kaspar, G. (eds): Strategies in interlanguage communication. Longman, London.

Bialystok, E. 1990. Communication strategies: A psycholinguistic analysis of second-language use. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Bremer, K.–Broeder, P.–Roberts, C.–Simonot, M.–Vasseur, M.-T. 1993. Ways of achieving understanding. In: Perdue, C. (ed.): Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives. Vol. II: The results. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ellis, R. 1985. Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Faerch, C.–Kasper, G. 1980. Processes and strategies in foreign language learning and communication. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin 5: 47–118.

Hatch, E. (ed.) 1978. Second language acquisition. Newbury House, Rowley MA.

Langman, J. 1989. The role of institutional structure and agents of change in ethnic group development: The Yugoslav community in the Netherlands. Ph.D. dissertation. Stanford University.

Langman, J. forthcoming. Analyzing second language learners' communication strategies: Chinese speakers of Hungarian. In: Acta Linguistica Hungarica.

MacWhinney, B. 1991. The CHILDES project. Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale NJ.

Nyíri, P. 1994. Kínai élet és társadalom Magyarországon. (Vázlat egy szociopolitikai kulturális elemzéshez) [Chinese life and society in Hungary. Outline for a sociopolitical cultural study]. In: Jönnek? Mennek? Maradnak? [Are they coming, going, staying?]. MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete, Nemzetközi Migráció Kutatócsoport Évkönyve, 50–84.

Romaine, S. 1989. Bilingualism. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Tarone, E. 1977. Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage. In: Brown, H.D.–Yorio, C.A.–Crymes, R.C. (eds): On TESOL '77, 194–203. TESOL, Washington DC.

Tarone, E. 1981. Some thoughts on the notion of communicative strategy. In: TESOL Quarterly 15: 285–95.

Váradi, T. 1980. Strategies of target language learner communication: message adjustment. In: International Review of Applied Linguistics 18: 59–71.

Vygotsky, L. 1978. Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wesche, M.B. 1994. Input and interaction in second language acquisition. In: Gallaway, C.–Richards, B.J. (eds): Input and interaction in language acquisition, 219–251. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Address of the author: Juliet Langman
                        Department of General Psychology
                        Eötvös Loránd University
                        H–1064 Budapest
                        Izabella utca 46.
                        Hungary
                        e-mail: langman@izabell.elte.hu