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ABSTRACT: CODE-SWITCHING IN GREATER BILBAO: A BILINGUAL VARIETY OF COLLOQUIAL BASQUE

This doctoral dissertation examines the role of code-switching between Basque and Spanish linguistic elements in the metropolitan area of Greater Bilbao in the Basque Country. The study consists of four articles and a compilation article. The articles examine bilingual speech from different points of view: variation in grammatical code-switching patterns, the role of swearing, slang and code-switching in constructing an informal register of Basque, language ideologies that discourage and encourage code-switching, and conventionalization of semantic-pragmatic code-switching patterns.

The Basque context of language revitalization has created new divisions between speakers, as the formerly unidirectional bilingualism has turned into a situation where great numbers of Spanish speakers are learning Basque in adult acquisition programs or in Basque-medium education. Basque is still, however, a minority language in the Greater Bilbao area and the bilingual Basque speakers live scattered among the monolingual majority. The effect of these social structures on linguistic structures is examined in two sets of data that were collected for the purposes of this study. For the first set of data, 22 hours of naturally occurring peer-group conversations with 22 Basque-Spanish bilinguals were recorded, while the second set consists of 12 hours of metalinguistic conversations with 47 bilingual Basques.

The speakers use their bilingual repertoire in numerous creative and dynamic ways. Yet some tendencies can be detected. Colloquial Basque in Bilbao is a bilingual speech style that always includes some code-switching to Spanish. There is considerable variation in the individuals’ code-switching patterns. Some of the informants, particularly L1-speakers of Basque, use very intensive and syntactically intrusive code-switching, whereas others, especially L2-speakers of Basque, only engage in syntactically peripheral code-switching, such as Spanish interjections, discourse markers and tags. The L2-speakers’ purist tendencies seem to have two sources: firstly, the normative setting of acquisition where language mixing is discouraged, and secondly, the general interpretation of new speakers’ code-switching as lack of proficiency in the minority language. Some Spanish elements have become conventionalized throughout the speech community as the default option. All informants use Spanish discourse markers, and swear words and colloquialisms are always introduced in Spanish in otherwise Basque speech. Spanish discourse markers seem to have been automatized as conversational routines, whereas Spanish swear words and colloquialisms have become conventionalized because of the domains they are associated with, and because of the lack of these stylistic categories in standard Basque.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. AIMS AND SCOPE

“Many of the linguistic transactions routinely carried out in our globalised world are actually being carried out in mixed languages such as the Canadian ‘franglais’, South American ‘portunhol’ and the North American ‘spanglish’ – much to the dismay of language purists.” (Rajagoplan 2001: 25)

Purist ideas have been very efficient in influencing our view on language: languages are generally seen as bound systems, and the ways in which multilingual speakers in language contact settings often actually express themselves are seen as a ‘mixture’. In this doctoral dissertation, the focus is on one of these mixed language varieties, spoken in the metropolitan area of Greater Bilbao in the Basque Autonomous Community. *Euskañol*, the combination of elements from *euskara*, Basque and *español*, Castilian Spanish, is studied from four different perspectives in the four articles that comprise the main body of the thesis.

The metropolitan area of Greater Bilbao is described by its linguistic diversity. My objective in this work is to find tendencies and common features in this diversity and provide at least a partial explanation of how these specific social circumstances may account for the kinds of patterns we find in the ways speakers organize the linguistic resources available to them. There are two general principles that guide my view on language and on the distribution of heteroglossic linguistic resources: first is the notion that the speakers use these resources in a way that makes sense in the specific social conditions (Heller 2007: 1). The second guiding principle is the urge of the speakers to use their linguistic repertoire as a whole, but the need to conform to the social boundaries that restrict their language use (Matras 2009: 19, 40). The principles are similar, but they approach the use of linguistic resources from different perspectives: the first focuses on the speakers’ agency, whereas the second focuses on the phenomena that restrict this agency. A Basque-Spanish bilingual might be fully capable of combining and playing with all the phonetic, morphosyntactic and pragmatic properties of the elements of her bilingual repertoire. Yet in a talk show on ETB2, the Spanish-language channel of the Basque Autonomous Community, she risks being misunderstood if she does so – and also risks angering monolingual Spanish speakers, who might view regional multilingualism as an imposition or the use of words they do not understand as “bad manners”. In a Basque oral exam, the bilingual risks being given a lower note if she uses Spanish discourse markers, even though they were a part of her natural speech style in informal interaction with her peers.
Diversity of individual speech patterns is inherent to any speech community, and in situations of language contact this diversity is further extended. Speakers combine their linguistic resources in creative and dynamic ways in their daily interactions. Yet, great parts of communication consist of prefabricated sequences and there are social structures that regulate the use of heteroglossic resources. Speakers are skilled at detecting conventions and patterns from their surroundings (Beckner et al. 2009). When the speakers share most of the social conditions, also community-wide patterns and tendencies are found. The theme that connects the four individual articles of this dissertation is, thus, the influence of social structures on linguistic structures: the description of the language ideologies and linguistic power relations that influence the choices of individual language users in Greater Bilbao and the tendencies that can be detected in the data.

Another theme that is central to this study and to this particular language contact is the large and ever-growing number of L2-speakers of Basque who have started using the minority language in (at least some of) their everyday interactions. Along with the native Basque speakers raised in traditionally bilingual communities, this dissertation examines euskaldun berriak, ‘New Basques’ (the native speakers are called euskaldun zaharrak, ‘Old Basques’) as users of code-switching as well as their role in the revitalization process. The CS practices of L2-speakers have not gathered much attention, or when they have, they have been treated as language learner strategies (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 160-161, Lehti-Eklund 2013). I wish to describe the New Basques as bilinguals and users of multilingual practices in their own right, not as perpetual learners. The differences or similarities of their language use compared to the native speakers are studied in all four articles. Often, such as in the use of conventionalized code-switching items, the distinction loses its importance. In Bilbao, three out of four Basque bilinguals are new or “revitalized” speakers, which makes the situation rather unusual among minority language communities. Points of comparison can be found, for instance, in other Spanish autonomies such as Catalunya and Galicia, in the Celtic communities of the British Isles and Brittany, and in Provence (see articles in O’Rourke, Pujolar & Ramallo Eds. 2015).

All in all, my doctoral dissertation is a contribution to the study of language contact and hybrid forms of speech in the Basque Country. At the same time, the themes that are examined in the individual papers add new perspectives to the existing international research literature on code-switching. They fill research gaps in areas such as the bilingual practices of new speakers of revitalized languages, the relationship between code-switching and swearing, language ideologies and attitudes towards code-switching and the community-wide conventionalization of code-switching within the framework of usage-based contact linguistics.

This compilation article will introduce the background of the study more extensively than would have been possible in the individual papers. It aims to bring together the main themes that connect the four articles.
The four papers are the following:


Most of the extensive literature on grammatical code-switching patterns has its roots in generativist and structuralist models of grammar. Variation in code-switching behavior has not been sufficiently studied (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 91) and neither have the code-switching patterns of L2 speakers (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 161). In this study, the differences in grammatical code-switching patterns between New and Old Basques are examined and classified according to their syntactic properties into extrasentential, intrasentential and intersentential switching. In the group of Old Basques, the intragroupal differences are wide. Five out of the ten Old Basques, who were recorded for the study, could be characterized as super-switchers, who engage in a lot of very intensive back-and-forth mixing, whereas the remaining five maintain the Basque frame more clearly. However, all Old Basques engage in a considerable amount of intrasentential switching. In the group of New Basques, the patterns were more uniform: the informants engage mostly in extrasentential switching, such as discourse markers, tags and fixed expressions. The differences are interpreted through different acquisition settings: the Old Basques learned the languages in a naturally bilingual community, whereas in a classroom setting strong boundaries between the languages are maintained.


The second article examines the relationship of code-switching, swearing, and slang and suggests that the colloquial register of Basque in Greater Bilbao is constructed by the combination of these elements. The connection between code-switching and swearing has not been a subject of serious studies, even though swear expressions are often uttered in a language other than the language of the interaction. (Dewaele 2004a, b) Many code-switches can be explained by changes in footing, that is, conversational shifts (Goffman 1981). The regularity of switching to Spanish when swear and slang’ expressions are introduced in my data might be due to the different domains that Basque and Spanish are associated with. The texture of Greater Bilbao demographics does not facilitate creation of Basque slang: as the Basque-speaking minority (24% of Greater Bilbao population) live scattered among the monolingual

---

1 I use the terms slang and colloquialisms to refer to language use below the neutral stylistic level. This is a very vague definition (Andersson & Trudgill 1990: 69), but I have not yet come up with a better definition for this type of items.
majority, the innovations, which are an essential property of slang, may not spread outside small groups of friends. The speakers have heterogeneous sociolinguistic backgrounds, the original vernacular of Bilbao has become virtually extinct, and swearing and slang expressions are rarely taught in the school curriculum. All the speakers, however, share the Spanish colloquial resources, which are then introduced to Basque conversations to strengthen the informal tone of code-switching as a speech style.


Even though often mentioned, attitudes and ideologies encouraging and discouraging code-switching have been rarely studied. Code-switching styles are often condemned by bilingual code-switchers themselves (Romaine 1995: 290–294, Gardner-Chloros 2009: 82). Yet code-switching styles persist, as they have important social functions in bilingual communities. In the third article, I address this ambiguity in the Basque-Spanish frame. Forty-seven bilinguals from Greater Bilbao listened to two speech extracts with heavy code-switching style and then discussed what they had just heard. The themes connected to the linguistic ideologies of purity and authenticity are examined as they emerged in their conversations. The respondents overwhelmingly condemn code-switching, yet consider it important in constructing colloquial registers of Basque. Code-switching is also interpreted differently according to the perceived background of the speaker in the speech extract, even though the respondents were not provided any background information about the speakers. When the speaker is perceived to be an Old Basque, code-switching is mostly seen as natural, whereas in the speech of New Basques, code-switching is interpreted as lack of competence in Basque.


This article is a contribution to the debate on the dividing line between code-switching and borrowing, which has been a widely debated subject in the code-switching literature. The debate is approached from a usage-based perspective. Conventionalized patterns of code-switching are shared by either all or the majority of informants in two sets of data gathered in the Greater Bilbao area:
1) naturally occurring conversations and 2) metalinguistic commentary about code-switching. All the informants seem to use Spanish discourse markers, colloquialisms and swear words in otherwise Basque-medium conversations by default. The elements present various degrees of morphosyntactic integration. Yet all these elements seem to be conventionalized within semantic-pragmatic patterns of introducing Spanish lexical material into Basque conversations. I conclude that neither repetitiveness nor morphosyntactic integration is enough to establish an item’s status as a borrowing: despite the frequency and predictability of the conventionalized elements, they are still part of the Spanish system. Conventionalized code-switching is a synchronic phenomenon. Even though some conventionalized elements might become established loanwords in Basque, the elements and patterns might also change when there is a change in the sociolinguistic circumstances. Most importantly, the informants do not consider these elements as Basque, but see them as Spanish words introduced into Basque.

1.2. CODE-SWITCHING TERMINOLOGY

The term code-switching has been widely criticized and debated for decades, particularly in interactionally-oriented research literature. The socially and interactionally meaningful juxtaposition of codes might not lie at the boundaries of normatively defined languages and varieties (Auer 1998 Ed.). In more recent literature, new terms such as “polylinguaging” (Jørgensen et al. 2011), “translanguaging” (Garcia 2009, Creese & Blackledge 2010) and “metrolingualism” (Otsuji & Pennycook 2010) have been developed to describe differing heteroglossic practices. I believe that all this terminology has been of added value: in examining differing language contact phenomena, accurate terminology can help us to direct the focus on the particularities of the specific case of language contact under study. However, as Gardner-Chloros (2009: 13) notes, code-switching, henceforth CS, is the term that has gained widest currency to describe multilingual talk. In this dissertation, CS is used as a working tool and as a technical term to describe any switch from one normatively defined language to another. CS can be single- or multiword, integrated or unintegrated, interactionally meaningful or completely unnoticed and unmarked. Alternational CS is used as a term for CS between structures from languages or varieties, whereas insertional CS is a process in which structures from one language are placed into a structure from the other language (Muysken 2000: 3).

The concept of language has also been called into question. Terms such as “polylingualism”, “translanguaging” and “heteroglossia” are favored instead of talking about “bilingualism” and interaction of two languages. Languages as bounded entities are inventions and constructions, products of exclusion and purism (Makoni & Pennycook 2007). The use of the word “bilingual” reflects the
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monolingual norm and seems to evoke an image of an individual with two separate systems, even though the linguistic repertoire should be considered as a whole, an inventory of resources to choose from (Blommaert & Backus 2011). To explore the organization of linguistic elements in bilingual talk, however, terms such as CS and bilingual speech are entirely appropriate. In everyday interaction, bilingual Basques do not always treat Basque and Spanish as different codes and communicative tools to express the speaker’s stance. Yet the focus of this thesis is precisely on the juxtaposition of two normatively separate linguistic systems and entities, Basque and Spanish, and how the features and lexical items associated with them reflect the surrounding society. In metalinguistic conversations the bilingual speakers describe the CS style as a mixture and consider Spanish lexical items in Basque conversations as erdarakadak, Spanishims. The languages and linguistic elements index different values, and the source of the switch is mostly not a coincidence. Even though all the switches cannot be assigned a clear pragmatic function, the juxtaposition between the languages becomes highly relevant, as linguistic tendencies of CS reflect societal and linguistic power structures.

The term variety can be criticized on the same basis as the term language: it is exclusive and provokes an image of a bound entity. Yet I have chosen to use it intentionally in the title of this thesis to focus on the regularities in the bilingual speech style that is colloquial Basque in Greater Bilbao.

As for the debate between CS and borrowing, I explain my views in Articles 1 and 4. I do not see the two as inherently different phenomena. The distinction can only be measured in diachronic terms, and in a language contact situation of two thousand years the lines will always be blurred. I have, thus, only excluded from my analysis Latin, Romance and Spanish-origin items that appear in normative Basque dictionaries, such as Elhuyar Hiztegia (2006, online).

1.3. STUDIES ON BILINGUALISM AND CS IN THE BASQUE COUNTRY

Muñoa (1997: 529) notes that Basque-Spanish CS has not been widely studied as it has been seen as an undesirable phenomenon. After the 90’s, however, this seems to have changed, and many Basque linguists have turned their attention to bilingual speech. The earliest studies were general accounts of the phenomenon. For Rotaetxe (1991), CS reflected clearly the previously diglossic situation in the Basque Country and the limited uses of Basque. Muñoa (1997) studied CS and its pragmatic functions in peergroup interaction in the city of Donostia and found that CS could be used for various conversational functions, such as lack of a Basque lexical item, emphatic strength, connotational implications, introduction of slang, to convey humour or irony, for reported speech etc. Esnaola’s (1999) study reports “good”
or “bad” results depending on the amount of Spanish discourse markers found in the youth speech in several towns through the Basque Country. The conclusion is, however, that such markers are used everywhere. Etxebarria (1998, 2004) notes that in the bilingual community of Busturialdea in the province of Biscay, Basque Country, CS can be found in both intersentential and intrasentential positions. Basque-Spanish CS often follows the syntactic rules of the grammars in contact, but often it does not (Rotaetxe 1994).

Grammatically-oriented studies have found that Basque usually acts as the base language in CS and that switching to Spanish mostly takes place from this frame. Epelde and Oyarçabal (2010a, b) study the French-Basque intrasentential CS of nine older informants. Despite Basque being an agglutinating language, the French constituents are usually inserted into the Basque matrix as “embedded language islands” (Myers-Scotton 1997) without system morphemes of the matrix language. Alternational rather than insertional types of CS, thus, seem to be preferred by the Basque-French bilinguals. Aurrekoetxea and Unamuno (2011) found out that in mixed sentences, the subordinated phrase can be both Basque or Spanish. The sentence is usually started in Basque and ended in Spanish or, as they conclude, referring to Poplack (1980), “euskaraz hasten dut y termino en español”, ‘I start in Basque and finish in Spanish’. Paraíta Couto et al. (Online 2014) found that in mixed nominal constructions, feminine seems to be the default gender for Basque-Spanish NPs and suggest that this might originate from the phonological quality of the Basque determiner –a, homophonous with the Spanish feminine gender marker. The tendency to Basque frame is also reflected in the articles of this work and fits the overall picture of the minority language usually being the matrix language for CS, into which elements from the socially and pragmatically dominant language, in this case Spanish, are inserted.

The informants in Epelde and Oyarçabal’s study (2010a,b) were elderly bilinguals. Basque-Spanish CS has been studied also in children and aphasics (Ezeizabarrena 2009, 2014, Ezeizabarrena & Aéby 2010, Ezaizabarrena & Munarriz 2012). In many studies and in the Basque public discourse, however, CS is specifically associated with younger generations. Esnaola concluded that frequent CS, especially discourse markers, gave the adolescent speech its special gazte kutsua, ‘juvenile touch’ (1999: 31). Amonarriz (2008: 171, 176) treats euskañol as one of the characteristics of Basque youth speech. Amonarriz has also noted in an interview in 2012 that “if there was no euskañol, many young people would not speak Basque” (http://sustatu.eus/aedelkartea/1356027895). Ibarra’s work (2011) describes the speech patterns of young people in Pamplona, Navarre, where CS seems to be an integral part of youth speech. Bereziartua (2013) has studied the written language of Basque youth in the town of Azpeitia, in a very Basque-speaking environment. She concluded that even in surroundings where Basque-speaking is constructed using vernacular expressions and the young people are mostly Basque-dominant, CS to Spanish is
used frequently. Bereziartua attributes this to the strong presence of Spanish mass media in the Basque Country.

A large-scale project to collect and document CS patterns across the Basque Country, in both French and Spanish provinces was started in 2011. The data collection for ACOBA project has been finalized but, apart from Epelde and Oyarçabal’s (2010a) and Parafita Couto et al. (Online 2014), the results are yet to be published. Information about the project can be found on their website (http://acobaiker.org/aurkezpena.html). What seems to be clear, though, is that despite the association of CS with youth speech in the public discourse, CS is not only attested in adolescents, but a frequent practice across all the Basque Country, in all age groups and genders. In the previous work on CS in the Basque Country, the approach has been either a general notification of the existence of CS as a phenomenon, or very specifically grammatically oriented. The results of grammatically oriented studies (Epelde & Oyarçabal 2010a, Aurrekoetxea & Unamuno 2011, Parafita Couto et al. Online 2014) have been mostly explained by other structural factors. In this study, I connect the syntactic and semantic-pragmatic linguistic structures of Basque-Spanish CS with the social structures of revitalization and the language dynamics of a modern metropolitan area.

1.4. BILINGUALISM IN BILBAO: PAST AND PRESENT

The stage of this Basque-Spanish language contact is the metropolitan area surrounding the city of Bilbao, in the province of Biscay, on the Spanish side of the Basque Country. The survival of the Basque language in the middle of the otherwise thoroughly Romanized part of Europe is often seen as some kind of a miracle. The mountains, the relatively scarce natural resources of the area and the military insignificance of the Basques have been mentioned as some of the reasons why the Romans had no interest in conquering and subjugating the region (Trask 1997: 11, Nuñez Astrain 2003: 21–24). The language contact between Basque and Latin started early, to the south of the Pyrenees approximately during the last century BC and to the north approximately a century later (Nuñez Astrain 2003: 30). The documented history of Basque has always been juxtaposed with Romance languages. The earliest Basque words, personal names and names of divinities, were documented in Roman tombstones during the first centuries AD (Nuñez Astrain 2003: 19). The first sentences in Basque were found side by side with the first Castilian sentences in a 11th century codex, *Glosas Emilianenses*, apparently written by a bilingual monk. What we know of Basque has been filtered and brought to the knowledge of the world through the contact with Romance.

As in the Basque Country as a whole, also in Bilbao the languages have been cohabiting since the city was founded in the 14th century. The pillars of the city’s
economy, the iron industry and the commercial port, have both attracted Spanish population to the originally Basque-speaking area along the centuries. Not only did the people of different language backgrounds mix, also languages seem to have been mixed to a high degree. In the metalinguistic commentary that I collected for this thesis (more in Section 1.5.), the respondents seemed to consider CS or bilingual speech a contemporary phenomenon. Nevertheless, throughout its history, numerous writers have complained about the low quality and mixed nature of Bilbao Basque. For instance, Juan Antonio Mogel, who lived in 18th century Biscay, did not “even want to talk about the purity of the language” and characterized the language situation in Bilbao as follows: “it seems that people here are doing their best to achieve a tertiumquid of the Castilian language and the Basque language, like over there some Israelites with Hebrew and Babylonian.” (Zuberogoitia & Zuberogoitia 2008: 19)

It is estimated that by the mid 19th century Spanish became the dominant language of Bilbao and its surroundings (Bilboko Udala 1991: 9, Zuberogoitia & Zuberogoitia 2008: 19). This happened mostly due to the industrialization of the region, which brought a change from the traditional peasant lifestyle to capitalism and drew mass immigration from other Spanish provinces to the area. Basque was rapidly losing ground, but Bilbao people were proud of their linguistic heritage and wanted to show it in their language use. Numerous songs, poems and sayings in a mixed Spanish-Basque variety were invented and registered during this era. The presence of Basque, however, was mostly symbolic. The Catalan writer and scholar Pompeu Fabra noted by the turn of the 20th century that, unlike in Catalunya, the bourgeoisie did not speak nor wish to learn Basque, despite being proud of the language. The same qualities that were used to demonstrate the superiority of the Basque language, its antiquity and difficult structure, were used as excuses that prevented its actual usage (Zuberogoitia & Zuberogoitia 2008: 19). Basque accent and Basque peasants were the laughing stock of the city people and origin of many parodies. Spanish was considered the language of industrialization, internationalization and modernity. (Zuberogoitia & Zuberogoitia 2008: 18, Urla 2012: 30–32)

In the 1930s, the Spanish Civil War broke lose. The Basques of Biscay overwhelmingly supported the republican troops. After bombing the Biscayan town of Gernika, the fascist forces lead by General Francisco Franco conquered Bilbao in 1937 and later managed to take the reins of the entire Spanish state. Biscay and the neighboring Basque province, Gipuzkoa, were declared to be “traitor provinces” and faced harsh penalties. The aim of the fascist government was to eliminate all symbols of Basque culture. The linguistic policies of the Franco era were actively discriminatory: Basque was banned from all public life and education, no Basque-language material was allowed to be published or distributed. Both children in schools and adults in public places were punished for speaking Basque. Examples of these punishments have been collected by Torrealday (1998):
“For Guillermo Garmendia Ayestarán, a fine of 100 pesetas for speaking Basque in the tram and thereby causing an altercation of public order”

“The teacher gave a necklace for the one who spoke Basque, and who had the necklace at the end of the day was subject to a beating”

Already before this overt linguistic discrimination was introduced, Basque was associated with the traditional peasant lifestyle, Castilian with progress and the needs of a modern, industrialized society. Negative attitudes combined with the direct oppression and the influx of immigrants lead to a drastic drop in Basque speaker percentages from an approximately 25 % of the population in the late 19th century (Irigoyen 1977: 409) to only 6% in the city of Bilbao in the aftermaths of Spanish transition to democracy in 1981 (Bilboko Udala 1991: 171). During the dictatorial regimen, the etymologically continuous vernacular Basque became virtually extinct except for a few farmhouses in the margins of the city. The language situation was characterized by a strict diglossia: Basque was relegated to farmhouse sphere, whereas Spanish was the language of all public life.

After Spain transitioned to democracy by the turn of the 1980s, strong language revitalization programs were implemented in the Basque Country. The institutional support has been solid, as have been the grass root efforts to revive Basque. The Basque language advocates have succeeded in mobilizing large sectors of the population to strive for a common project, the normalization of the Basque language. Now the overwhelming majority of children go through the Basque-medium educational system and the percentage of bilinguals in the Greater Bilbao area is 16,3%, while 17,6% of Bilbao population are classified as “passive bilinguals” (Basque Government 2014: 20). In the comarca and metropolitan region of Greater Bilbao, 24% of the population is classified as “euskaldun”, whereas 20% is classified as “quasi-euskaldun” (Eustat 2011). This means that more than half of the residents of the Greater Bilbao area have at least some knowledge of Basque.

After the transition, Basque was made a co-official language with Spanish and introduced to all public domains, most important of which is the education. As the result of the language revitalization, the Basque-speaking society has been divided and categorized into two sets of Basques which can be variously characterized as: New and Old Basques, L2-speakers and L1-speakers, speakers of the standard Batua and speakers of the vernacular. In the metropolitan area of Greater Bilbao approximately 75% of the Basque speakers are new speakers of Basque, euskaldun berriak (Basque Government 2009b: 72). In the Basque Country the terms for “new” and “old” speakers are deeply rooted folk categories. Euskaldun zaharra, ‘Old Basque’ or ‘old Basque speaker’, is a person who speaks Basque as his or her native language and knows vernacular Basque. Euskaldun berria, ‘a New Basque’ or a ‘new Basque speaker’, is a person who learned Basque as L2 and usually speaks the Basque standard euskara batua, ‘unified Basque’.
Iñaki Gaminde, a dialectologist native of Bilbao, refers to the Basque spoken in Bilbao, “many colours and sounds have been mixed here” (2005: 5). Bilbao has always been a contact point of Basque and Spanish, different features and varieties that the people moving to the city area have brought along. The etymologically continuous local vernacular may be extinct, but as the largest city and the economic motor of the region, Bilbao attracts people from the surrounding villages and from all over the Basque Country. Bilbao has never been seen as a very Basque-speaking city. During the fieldwork for this thesis, I was often confronted by the bilinguals I wished to record but also by Basque linguists who wanted to make sure I was aware of what I was doing and where I was. “Why would you study us, we are not real speakers?”, “Don’t you know that Bilbao is not a really good place to study Basque”, “Why don’t you go to Tolosa/Azpeitia/ the valley of Arratia, that’s where the best Basque is spoken?” However, as Zuberogoitia and Zuberogoitia (2008: 15) remark, “kuantitatiboki behinkin behin eta euskarari buruz ari garela betiere, ez dago horrenbesteko potentzialik daukan hiri bakar bat ere”. (At least in quantitative measures, when it comes to the Basque language, there is no other city with such a potential.) As they go on to note, many of the symbols of euskara have been originated in Bilbao: Euskalzale, the first magazine published entirely in Basque, Maskarada, the first Basque theatre group, the first bertso associations of improvised Basque poetry, the first professional euskaltegis etc. Bilbao is the birthplace of Gabriel Aresti, a poet and one of the fiercest proponents of Batua. Sabino Arana, who is often seen as the founder of Basque nationalism, was born in Abando, a former municipality which today is considered central Bilbao. Bilbao is also the city where Euskaltzaindia, the Basque language academy, is located.

1.5. DATA AND METHODS

All themes that are explored in the four articles and in this compilation article of this dissertation, have their basis in more than a decade of everyday observations made across the Basque Country, but specifically in the Greater Bilbao area. The accumulated background knowledge has guided the research. Many interesting conversations and metalinguistic commentary were never recorded, some recordings failed due to too much background noise or a bad recorder, some data were never transcribed. Yet all these instances revealed important matters for the overall picture of multilingual practices in the city of Bilbao and in its surroundings. The observations were not documented systematically but they have been an integral part of my understanding of the multifaceted phenomenon that CS is. The observations regarding multilingual practices of the Basque bilinguals started during my time as an Erasmus-student in the University of Deusto in the academic year of 2002 – 2003. Since then, I have visited the Basque Country several times a year. I have had the
chance to observe closely the language dynamics in the university between students of differing linguistic backgrounds, in various cuadrillas, groups of friends, in numerous classes of euskaltegis – Basque language schools – and in a barnetegi – an intensive Basque immersion language school. From October 2010 to July 2011 I lived in Bilbao collecting data, planning the dissertation and the future data collection. During that time, I attended several groups of berbalagunak, chat buddies, in which Basque learners and speakers gather to speak Basque in otherwise mostly Spanish-language environment. I also attended daily Basque language classes in an euskaltegi in the center of Bilbao with the aim to participate in the examination of the Basque language diploma EGA, Euskara Gaitasun Agiria. This has provided me with accumulative knowledge of CS practices in the Greater Bilbao area, the metalinguistic commentary surrounding it, and the underlying language ideologies by which the metalinguistic comments seem to be influenced.

The sociocultural knowledge serves as the background, but the main findings are based on two types of data collected in Greater Bilbao. The first dataset was gathered in 2005, 2007 (these first recordings were also used for my MA thesis), and in 2011. The data consist of 22 hours of speech recordings from 22 informants from the Greater Bilbao area (ten Old Basques, twelve New Basques). The informants were found through my social network, which is reflected in their age and educational level: all but one informant were in their twenties or thirties at the moment of recording, and most of the informants had completed or were completing a degree in higher education. Prototypical Old Basques differ considerably from this profile (Echeverria 2003a), but, though in this case incidental, “young, urban and educated” is actually the most prototypical profile of new speakers both in the Basque Country and in some other communities where new speakers of regional minority languages have been studied. Costa (2015), for example, describes how new speakers in Provence are construed as speakers of “new languages” that index youth, urbanity, modernity and middle class membership in opposition to the values associated with traditional speakers.

Various techniques were used to avoid an interview-like atmosphere in order to elicit CS and so that the informants would feel as relaxed as possible (Milroy & Gordon 2003: 66–67). Most of the recordings were conducted either in a bar atmosphere or at a dinner table, and usually with more than one person at a time. Being part of the same social networks also helped to relax the atmosphere, as I was not a mere outsider. The informants were not aware of the focus of my study and seemed to be at ease in these conversations, as some CS occurred in all of them. These data served as the basis for the first two articles of the dissertation, and were also used in Article 4. Some background information of the informants is presented in Table 1 below.
Table 1. Background information of the informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>New Basque/Old Basque</th>
<th>Place of origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB/OB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Oarsoaldea (Gipuzkoa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Lea-Artibai (Bizkaia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Debagoiena (Gipuzkoa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Arratia (Bizkaia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Arratia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Arratia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Greater Bilbao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>Durangaldea (Bizkaia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that most of the informants that are categorized as Old Basques were born outside of Greater Bilbao, whereas all the New Basques were born in the district. This is typical of city areas: people come in from different towns and villages and later establish themselves in the city. As the etymologically continuous vernacular of the city area is only spoken by few, also the Old Basques who were born in the Greater Bilbao area usually have their linguistic roots elsewhere. The Basque vernacular they learned at home from their parents was brought to Bilbao by the parents, who moved from their villages to the city. There is no vernacular Basque variety for the newcomers to adapt to. The Basque speakers living in Bilbao are constructing their daily Basque combining features of several linguistic varieties and registers.

In Dataset 1, more than 1500 examples of CS were found. Descriptions of their grammatical distribution can be found in Article 1 and in Section 3.2. of the compilation article. Articles 2 and 4 (the latter combined with material from Dataset 2) deal with the semantic-pragmatic distribution of the switches.

Dataset 2, a short questionnaire and 12 hours of metalinguistic conversations with 47 Basque-Spanish bilinguals, was collected in December 2011 and January 2012. What contributed greatly to the design of Dataset 2 was a somewhat failed attempt
to gather attitudinal data on CS using matched-guise technique in summer 2009. In that study, 109 respondents across the Basque Country listened to 18 extracts and answered a rather complicated questionnaire. The answers have not been analyzed thus far, but the questionnaire used for Dataset 2 was formulated according to the themes that the respondents brought up during the earlier, failed data collection. What became clear was that the most interesting and insightful metalinguistic commentary was often provided after the respondents answered the questionnaire and that the spontaneous metalinguistic commentary was more important for the analysis of CS than answers to a questionnaire. This is why the focus of the study in Article 3 and in the gathering of Dataset 2 was on the recorded conversations and the metalinguistic commentary rather than on complex questionnaires.

The respondents listened to two speech samples with intensive CS style. The speech samples were both extracted from the naturally occurring conversations recorded for Dataset 1. The respondents listened to an extract once and completed the questionnaire of Table 2. After this, the extract was played once again. The main aim of the questionnaire was to focus the respondents’ attention on the speech characteristics instead of on the content of the extract. The speech samples are described in more detail in Article 3, as are the average results for the statements of the questionnaire.

### Table 2. The questionnaire

**After listening to the extract, please give your opinion of the person who speaks on the tape.**

Which are the most important characteristics of the person’s speech style [hizkera] (5)?

1. This person speaks like people you can hear on the street.
   - 1) Strongly disagree  
   - 2) Disagree  
   - 3) Do not agree or disagree  
   - 4) Agree  
   - 5) Strongly agree

2. This person learned Basque at home.
   - 1) Strongly disagree  
   - 2) Disagree  
   - 3) Do not agree or disagree  
   - 4) Agree  
   - 5) Strongly agree

3. This person received Basque-medium education (in model B or D).
   - 1) Strongly disagree  
   - 2) Disagree  
   - 3) Do not agree or disagree  
   - 4) Agree  
   - 5) Strongly agree

4. This person could be a language teacher.
   - 1) Strongly disagree  
   - 2) Disagree  
   - 3) Do not agree or disagree  
   - 4) Agree  
   - 5) Strongly agree

5. This person knows Basque well.
   - 1) Strongly disagree  
   - 2) Disagree  
   - 3) Do not agree or disagree  
   - 4) Agree  
   - 5) Strongly agree

6. This person knows Spanish well.
   - 1) Strongly disagree  
   - 2) Disagree  
   - 3) Do not agree or disagree  
   - 4) Agree  
   - 5) Strongly agree
Following Milroy and Gordon’s (2003: 67) suggestion that the richest metalinguistic data is often produced in group sessions, I had informants discuss the speech samples in small groups of two to four people. The heavy CS style did not go unnoticed, and the common theme of the discussions was CS. These data were examined in Articles 3 and 4. The background information of the recorded interviews in relation to the location, the participants’ relationships to each other and the length of the interviews is presented in Table 3. The participants that provided the information for Dataset 2 are more diverse in background than those in Dataset 1: among the respondents there were Basque students and teachers, engineers, friend groups, youth participating in the activities of a gaztetxe, an occupied house turned into a cultural center for the youth, etc. The age range was from nineteen to fifty-seven. Twenty-two women and twenty-five men participated. Twenty-three of the respondents classified themselves as Old Basques, twenty-two as New Basques and two as both.

Table 3. The place and length of the recordings, participants’ relationship to each other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Participants’ relationship with each other</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied house</td>
<td>Occupied house</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>33min 25s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friends, work colleagues</td>
<td>50min 13s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Barakaldo</td>
<td>Private home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>1h 06min 34s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Barakaldo 2</td>
<td>Private home</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>51min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque students Aresti</td>
<td>Language school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learning Basque in the same class</td>
<td>35min 44s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque teachers</td>
<td>Language school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work colleagues</td>
<td>42min 13s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Bilbao 1</td>
<td>Cultural centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>59min 26s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Bilbao 2</td>
<td>Private home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>58min 54s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Bilbao 3</td>
<td>Private home</td>
<td>2/1²</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>39min 24s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque students Lizardi 1</td>
<td>Language school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learning Basque in the same class</td>
<td>38min 43s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque students Lizardi 2</td>
<td>Language school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learning Basque in the same class</td>
<td>39min 37s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>Language school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1h 04min 02s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers 1</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work colleagues</td>
<td>47min 13s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers 2</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work colleagues</td>
<td>41min 42s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma C2</td>
<td>Cultural center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Studying in the same class</td>
<td>53min 15s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma C2</td>
<td>Basque cultural center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Studying in the same class</td>
<td>53min 44s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>11h 56min 32s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Two friends participated in the recordings; however, only one gave permission to use her data. Only one of the participants is thus included in the total number of respondents.
The length of the recordings varies: the longer the recording, the more eager the participants were to discuss their views on the subject. Sometimes the conversation required more input from the interviewer, sometimes no guidance was needed. Niedzielski and Preston (2000: 38) have argued that in folk linguistic interviews, nonnative speakers have been able to elicit data that would have been more difficult for native speakers to elicit: when the fieldworker is a nonnative speaker, the respondents can consider themselves experts in the variety that is the topic of discussion. The respondents clearly considered themselves to be experts in the Basque reality, and were very helpful in explaining the linguistic situation in the Basque Country in detail. As a nonnative speaker, I was also able to ask “silly questions” to elicit more explicit answers; had I been a native speaker, the questions could have been considered tests to expose the respondent’s naiveté, as the fieldworker would have been assumed to already know the answer (Niedzielski and Preston 2000: 38). I was present at all the recordings and transcribed a total of 12 hours of conversations, which helped gaining a detailed knowledge of the conversational data.

All speakers make value judgements on a language: metalinguistic evaluative comments are part of their linguistic repertoire (Cameron 1995: xi). The linguistic commentary and speakers’ knowledge has been previously examined in the folk linguistic framework. The type of data collection methods, recordings highlighting the phenomenon under study and the subsequent commentary, have been used in folklinguist dialectological data gathering, often combined with spatial tasks (Niedzielski 1999, Vaattovaara 2013), but to my knowledge they have not been applied to the study of CS4. My initial aim was to collect any and all types of metalinguistic commentary about CS. When the themes that were frequently discussed seemed to bring up deeper issues in the understanding of the concept of language and in creating social divisions, my focus shifted towards manifestations of linguistic ideologies and ambiguity. Only a small part of what was said in the recordings is examined in this dissertation, mainly in Article 3, but also in Article 4. These data helped me immensely in getting an even wider picture of the phenomenon at hand, and of the diverse net of opinions and attitudes which color Basque bilinguals’ perceptions of bilingual speech. Dataset 2 could be also used as a point of comparison to Dataset 1: when people were discussing CS and were very aware of it, the amount of CS was reduced and limited mostly to the use of Spanish discourse markers.

---

3 Folk knowledge of language: people’s beliefs about their language and language use. (Niedzielski & Preston 2000)
4 In Chana and Romaine (1984) and Amuda (1986), the participants answered a matched-guise test about different types of CS in English-Punjabi and Yoruba-English conversations. It was found that all CS, but particularly CS of intrasentential type, evoked negative reactions.
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

CS exists in most bi- or multilingual communities, even though in some it is more prevalent than in others. The linguistic units and constructions in bilingual speech can be arranged on a scale from essentially dynamic and creative to essentially reproductive. Auer (1999) predicted that the development in language contact situations runs through three stages: 1) CS, where the switches have a clear pragmatic function, 2) language mixing, where language alternation between the different varieties has become the unmarked option and 3) fused lects, where some categories are already shared by the contact varieties. In Auer's model, the stages follow one another in a chronological order. All these stages, however, seem to be present in my data. Basque-language discourse is animated with Spanish elements to show side remarks, distance, quotations etc. Often, however, the mixture is intensive back-and forth-mixing that has no pragmatic function. Article 4, in particular, examines the early stages of fusion, as pragmatic markers, swear words and colloquial expressions seem to be shared categories in both languages.

Two strong traditions have characterized the CS research. The syntax of language contact has been thoroughly examined, mostly with the focus on its grammatical outcomes, patterns, constraints and tendencies between hundreds of different language pairs. The second question that has provoked the interest of CS scholars is that of the pragmatic functions of CS and other multilingual practices: what do speakers achieve with the juxtaposition of linguistic varieties and what do the linguistic resources used in the communicative event index? The interactional functions have been examined in a conversation analytical frame, often accompanied with criticism of the structuralist tendency to see the languages as inherently distinct codes, even though a mixed system can be a default code in itself (Auer 1998, Ed.). The socially indexical uses of heteroglossic elements in microlevel encounters have been studied usually within the framework of interactional sociolinguistics, often under such terms as “polylingual languaging” (Jørgensen et al. 2011), “crossing” (Rampton 1995) and “metrolingualism” (Otsuji & Pennycook 2010). Sometimes the two traditions meet at the syntax-pragmatics interface, for example in the study of CS of discourse particles. What has not been thoroughly studied, however, are the patterns and tendencies that lexical, socially indexical elements might form: not syntactic, but semantic-pragmatic patterns. The generativist-oriented CS studies have not usually taken into account the social aspect of linguistic organization and the third wave sociolinguistics has mostly

---

5 "The principal move in the third wave then was from a view of variation as a reflection of social identities and categories to the linguistic practice in which speakers place themselves in the social landscape through stylistic practice.” (Eckert 2012: 93-94)
Theoretical background

dealt with micro-level interactional encounters with the focus on stylistic resources in specific instances of interaction. Likewise, CS literature exploring ideological and attitudinal perspectives has been scarce.

In this section, I will summarize the most important theoretical backgrounds of the dissertation. The literature related to the specific sub-fields of CS is discussed in more detail in the articles. Here I will examine the fields that, in retrospect, finally emerged as the most important ones for the interpretation of the whole. I approach CS mostly as patterns and tendencies on a community-wide level. Singular and unique instances of interaction are not examined, unless those singular instances of interaction are meant to illustrate a starting point of a continuum towards more reproductive types of CS.

2.1. ATTITUDES AND IDEOLOGIES. ARTICLES (1), 3, (4)

CS styles provoke emotions, yet attitudes and ideologies related to mixed forms of speech have been studied surprisingly little (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 81, Garrett 2010: 78). When CS has been studied, it has mostly suffered from a negative stigma. Speakers often attribute CS to laziness or lack of competence and generally condemn hybrid speech styles. Yet in some communities, especially in those where the members of the community wish to showcase a hybrid identity different from the two more monolingual communities, the attitudes may be more positive (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 81). Some bilingual varieties function as important symbols of ethnicity (Gumperz 1982: 62, DeFina 2007; Bullock & Toribio 2009: 10) and in many communities hybrid forms of speech are generally more accepted than monolingual speech styles (Álvarez-Cáccamo 1998, Meeuwis & Blommaert 1998, Gardner-Chloros 2009: 2, Matras 2009: 105,116).

Even though rarely empirically studied, attitudes in bilingual communities are often mentioned even in the earliest CS literature. Both Gumperz (1982: 62–63) and Grosjean (1982: 148) describe individual reactions to CS and conclude that what some bilinguals condemn, others consider as a legitimate form of informal speech. The attitudes of most of the bilingual communities display considerable ambiguity. Bilingual speakers often disapprove of CS and express admiration of purist forms of language, yet these attitudes are not consistent with their CS behavior. Many habitual switchers, in fact, condemn CS while they themselves are engaging in it (Romaine 1995: 290–294, Gardner-Chloros 2009: 82). This seems to suggest that there is an element of covert prestige related to CS and that the purist discourses are learned rather than spontaneous (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 81–82).

Language ideologies have mostly been studied within the framework of linguistic anthropology. Ideological clashes in language contact settings have been studied frequently, and in some studies the focus has been on bilingual forms of speech
(such as *nostalgic purism* in Hill 1989, *anglicisms* in Heller 1999 or the concept of *polyonemie* of Jaffe 2007). More than individual attitudes, the studies of language ideologies describe the general attitudinal atmosphere towards certain varieties or forms of speech, the underlying currents that encompass the political, social and individual level. This attitudinal atmosphere then influences the linguistic choices and ideas of individual language users. Language ideologies are thus both public and private. Language ideologies have been described, for example, as the “mediating link between social forms and forms of talk” (Woolard 1989b: 3), “cultural systems of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (Irvine 1989: 255), or in a more concrete manner focused on linguistic structures, practice and metalinguistic commentary, “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure or use” (Silverstein 1979: 193) or a “community’s idea of good language practice” (Spolsky 2004:14).

Since the days of Bloomfield, Weinreich and their much cited examples against bilingual speech (Bloomfield 1927: 395, Weinreich 1968: 73), linguists have moved towards greater tolerance of multilingual, heteroglossic practices. Generally, however, the public opinion and educational policies have not changed significantly. This is seen in bilingual communities where the educational policies are aimed at keeping the languages separate. In Quebec, for example, the efforts to keep French free from English contamination have been reflected in the educational practices, and anglicisms are considered errors (Heller 1999: 150). In the same way, the learners of Basque do exercises aimed at eradicating the *erdarakadak*, Spanishisms, from their speech and writing

The linguistic ideologies that are named and examined in this dissertation are the ideologies of *purity, authenticity, anonymity* and *native speaker ideology*. Also ideologies such as nostalgia for a past when CS did not occur come through in the metalinguistic conversations, but I believe that the four named above are the most crucial ones to explain the themes that are examined in this study. Purity is rejection of hybrid forms of speech: languages and linguistic varieties are seen as compound packages that can and should be neatly separated (Blommaert et al. 2012, Jørgensen et al. 2011). Authenticity claims that the value of language lies in belonging somewhere and to someone, in being an expression of, to quote Woolard (2008), “the essential Self” of a speaker group. Native speaker ideology (Doerr 2009) glorifies the linguistic forms of the native speaker of a language and casts the linguistic productions of everyone else as deviant. Anonymity is the ideology of “just talk”: unmarked forms of language can go unnoticed (Woolard 2008). Anonymous language varieties and features of speech do not draw attention to themselves. They are not seen as political statements or deviant forms, as they belong to everyone.

---

6 The term nostalgia is from Hill (1989).
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minority language situations with traditionally unidirectional bilingualism – that is, the minority language speakers are bilingual, the majority language speakers are not –, such as in the Basque Country, the anonymous public language in cities like Bilbao is clearly Spanish and opportunities to use Basque have to be sought out. Despite the revitalization and even though Basque has been introduced to new spaces and domains, using Woolard’s anonymity vs. authenticity dichotomy (Woolard 2008), Basque has not yet acquired the necessary amount of anonymity as a common public language to be considered “just talk.” Speaking Basque with strangers is generally marked behavior (outside very specific streets, bars and areas). The variety most commonly used by New Basques, the standard Batua, is subject to evaluation as artificial and formal (non-authentic, from nowhere), which might hinder many Basques’ language use. In their daily interactions, Basque speakers of Bilbao might therefore choose Spanish over Basque to be accepted and understood and to avoid drawing attention to their forms of speech.

Language ideologies guide our linguistic activities. They are critical factors in shaping language structure, models for constructing linguistic evaluations and models for engaging in communicative activity (Kroskrity 2004: 496). Language ideologies have a profound effect on multilingual practices, on what is said and by whom, which kind of linguistic behavior is encouraged and which is not. Community-wide language ideologies are critical factors in the development and direction of contact-induced language change, yet so naturalized for members of the community that they go unmarked and often uncontested. Different ideologies in different contact settings, for example, lead to differences in bilingual speech patterns. Hybrid speech practices and mixing as the unmarked language choice are the norm in many bi- and multilingual settings, such as in the Galician case described by Álvarez-Cáccamo (1998) or among the Zairian community in Belgium described by Meeuwis & Blommaert (1998). In some others, like among the German-speakers of Romania or Catalans in Catalonia, where the linguistic minority has traditionally held some economic power, the contrast between different varieties remains psychologically real and ideologically meaningful to the speakers, and they can use this contrast in their advantage in interaction (Woolard 2004: 83).

2.2. NEW SPEAKERS. ARTICLES 1, 3, (4)

When I began my research, I referred to L2 speakers of Basque as ‘late bilinguals’, as the term was the closest equivalent to new speakers that I could find in earlier CS and bilingualism literature. This terminology is reflected in Article 1. However, I have since adopted the term new speakers. New speakers have been a part of my study since the beginning, yet I was unaware of the emerging field of study until the late 2013. In a special issue of International Journal of the Sociology of Language,
new speakers are defined as “individuals with little or no home or community exposure to a minority language but who instead acquire it through immersion or bilingual educational programs, revitalization projects or as adult language learners.” (O’Rourke et al. 2015) and in EU COST Action IS1306 network they are described as “new multilingual citizens who, by engaging with languages other than their ‘native’ or ‘national’ language(s), need to cross existing social boundaries, re-evaluate their own levels of linguistic competence and creatively (re)structure their social practices to adapt to new and overlapping linguistic spaces”. In traditional linguistic literature, this type of speakers have been studied as “nonnative”, “second language” “L2-speakers” or “language learners” (O’Rourke et al. 2015: 1). In English-language literature the use of the category is relatively recent, but in the context of Spanish revitalization, the new speakers have been known as euskaldun berriak in the the Basque Country and neofalantes in Galicia. In the Basque Country, the term emerged as a folk category (Urla 1993), and is now being reproduced both by everyday language users and by sociolinguists. In Catalunya no such label exists, but the new speakers of Catalan have been studied extensively (Woolard 1989a; Woolard 2008; Pujolar & Gonzalez 2013; Woolard 2013; Woolard & Frekko 2013, Pujolar & Puigdevall 2015).

More recently, the definition of the new speaker and the processes and trajectories of new speakerness have been expanded to include groups such as immigrants, as the category is not specific to minority language contexts. The themes that have been studied within the framework include, for example, speaker profiles, ownership of a language, legitimacy and linguistic authority, language affiliation and linguistic mudas – how and why do people adopt a new language in their daily life (articles in O’Rourke, Pujolar & Ramallo 2015, Eds.). The linguistic practices of the new speakers have not been studied extensively. Recent preliminary work on new speakers’ linguistic practices was presented in the New Speaker Symposium of the COST network in November 2014 in Barcelona. (2nd International Symposium on New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe: Opportunities and Challenges. 20–22 November 2014, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya)

The generativist tradition has always focused on inherent linguistic competence of a native speaker. The ideal speaker-listener has been the yardstick compared to which the linguistic productions of other types of speakers have been measured, mostly as deviant, not fulfilling the native standards. Often these non-ideal speakers have been shut out from data gathering completely. Even for studies on bilingual speech, the most wanted individuals seem to have been “balanced bilinguals”, who supposedly master the rules of an inherent bilingual grammar. In sociolinguistic and dialectological research, the search for “authentic speaker” (Eckert 2003) or NORM (non-mobile, older, rural, male, Milroy & Gordon 2003: 52) has often ruled out the language of nonnative speakers. L2 speakers or new speakers are a rupture in the etymologically and generationally continuous chain. Their competence and authenticity has, thus, often been questioned and they have not been studied as
language users in their own right, but as a deviance from the native default. New
speakers’ speech patterns have been mostly examined as non-target like, full of
interferences and errors. The perceived differences in speech patterns have been
naturalized and hierarchized in replication of native speaker ideology. Kroskrity
(2004: 501) describes this process in the case of standard languages, but it can be
equally applied in relation to ideal vs. non-ideal speaker groups.

In the Basque Country, the ideologies and attitudes surrounding the New
Basque/Old Basque division have been examined by Echeverria (2003a, b), Urla
(2012) and Ortega et al. (2013, 2015). In Echeverria’s studies, authenticity was
connected to masculinity, Old Basques and their vernacular speech forms, while
New Basques and their linguistic varieties, mainly the standard Batua, were
considered as less authentic. Jacqueline Urla’s book Reclaiming Basque (2012)
is a thorough account of the revitalization movement and describes its efforts to
make Basqueness, being euskaldun, an inclusive identity that anyone can acquire
through one’s linguistic choices (2012: 72–73). Drawing on multiple focus group
discussions and interviews with new speakers, Ortega et al. (2015) found out
that there are significant differences between those who acquired the language
in adult language courses by ideological reasons and those who acquired Basque
in bilingual education. The first group is more committed to the language, as they
had to work hard for it, while the latter group takes the minority language more as
a given and does not see Basque as a particularly threatened language. What the
New Basques have in common, though, is that they seem to consider themselves
to be fundamentally, inherently different from the native speakers. Access to
native speaker networks and Basque vernaculars seems to be an important factor
predicting new speakers’ later language use. Those who do not have access to
vernacular forms often do not use the language in informal contexts.

2.3. GRAMMAR AND VARIATION IN CS. ARTICLES 1, (4)

Grammatical studies of CS used to concentrate on finding constraints and universal
models for bilingual grammar. These models, although useful in describing CS
patterns in specific communities and between specific pairs of languages, have
largely been proven not to be universal. The first one to develop universal constraints
was Poplack (1980): equivalence constraint predicted that switching would
only be permitted when the sentence structures are equivalent; free morpheme
constraint predicted that CS cannot occur between bound morphemes. Numerous
counterexamples were found immediately. Free morpheme constraint would exclude
large parts of data in language contact situations where one of the participating
languages has a rich inflectional morphology, such as the Finnish-English examples
provided by Halmari (1997) and Kovács (2001), the examples from diverse language
pairs provided by Myers-Scotton (1997: 26–32) or many instances of my own data. Equivalence constraint would exclude data from contact situations where the participating languages have, for example, different word orders. In my data, cases such as Example 1 would violate both constraints, even though they are fairly common and do not differ in terms of fluency or frequency from other instances of bilingual clauses in the data.

   [That NEG is PP-LOC-DET that is low.class-DET]

   ‘That’s not PP-like, that’s low class.’ (F29, Dataset 1)

In the latter part of the sentence, Basque word order would be [FOCV] (barriobajeroa da), whereas Spanish unmarked focus word order is [VFOC]. According to the equivalence constraint, this would not be a permissible switching site, as the word orders are not equivalent. Yet the bilingual example follows the Spanish word order [VFOC]. Free morpheme constraint is also violated: the Basque determiner –a, a bound morpheme, is added to the Spanish adjective barriobajero.

Poplack declared all the instances that violate her constraints as “nonce loans”, which are fundamentally different from “true CS” (Poplack and Sankoff 1984, Poplack and Meechan 1998), inciting a debate about what could be called a code-switch and what would be a borrowing. This debate has been going on in CS literature ever since (and the distinction is often the first question that is asked from any person studying CS!). Other universal models and constraints for CS have been proposed by several scholars. These include Government and Binding (DiSciullo et al. 1986), Matrix Language Frame Model (Myers-Scotton 1997), and null theory following the principles of Chomsky’s Minimalist Program (McSwan 2000). The universality of the constraints and models has been found lacking. Yet they have all been valuable templates through which to test hypotheses and examine data from different types of language contact situations.

As Gardner-Chloros notes, variation in CS grammars has not been examined enough and should be taken as a serious issue to investigate (2009: 91). Variation can be addressed on many levels: between communities, between different speaker groups in a community, between different language pairs with distinct typologies etc. There are some previous studies on variation: variation inside the community has been studied, for example, by Poplack (1980) who found that in the Puerto Rican community of New York, Spanish-dominant bilinguals mostly engaged in extrasentential tag-switching, whereas the bilinguals who had more of an equal competence in the two languages used more intrasentential switching. In Australian Finnish and Australian Hungarian communities studied by Kovács (2001) there were clear generational differences in the use of case inflection in
bilingual NPs. Whereas immigrants of the first generations preferred insertional patterns with Finnish and Hungarian case morphology, the second and third generations more often left the English insertions unintegrated. Variation between communities was also studied by Poplack (1988) and the status of the languages seemed to be an important factor in determining CS patterns. In Ottawa-Hull community, where French was a minority language, switching to English from a French conversational base was three times more common than in Quebec, where French had a stronger position (1988: 226). Language attitudes also came to play: compared to the Puerto Rican community of New York where mixing was intensive, fluent, and a sign of a hybrid identity, in both French-English bilingual communities of Canada the languages were usually left separate and the switches were flagged with metalinguistic commentary.

The earlier works on CS grammar were summarized by Muysken (2000), who divided the previously found grammatical tendencies into patterns of alternation, insertion, and congruent lexicalization. Various factors such as linguistic typology, norms, attitudes and ideologies, linguistic competence and societal dominance seem to affect the typology of CS patterns. Insertional patterns, for example, are likely to appear in first-generation immigration groups and in communities where one of the languages has rich bound morphology, whereas congruent lexicalization, in which the linguistic systems are at least partially shared, is mostly found at dialect-standard continua, between closely related languages or within second generation migrant groups. Alternational patterns in which the syntactic structures remain separate are accepted in all communities with CS, but are particularly frequent in stable bilingual communities.

CS patterns in three bilingual communities were also compared by Carter et al. (2011), who used Matrix Language Frame Model (Myers-Scotton 1997) as their theoretical framework. Both in Welsh-English community of Wales, and in Welsh-Spanish community of Patagonia, Argentina, Welsh was the default matrix language, whereas in the Spanish-English community of Miami there was greater variability. Carter et al. (2011) attributed the results mainly to structural factors such as different vs. similar word orders. There were, however, other factors such as differences in linguistic status, differing linguistic attitudes, identities, differences in the linguistic mode in which the languages are usually spoken – bilingual vs. monolingual mode (Grosjean 1997), which also might have affected the choice of matrix language. All in all, as the work on variation goes on to show, tendencies can be detected, but bilinguals’ CS patterns can rarely be attributed to one single factor, and the most important factor is unlikely to be a typological one. Under similar sociolinguistic circumstances, however, similar patterns are often found across different language pairs (Gardner-Chloros 2009: 109).
2.4. SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC SPECIFICITY. ARTICLES 2, 4

In the more than 1500 instances of CS that were recorded for Dataset 1, all types of switching are found: creative innovations and reproductive, predictable patterns, tag-switching and intensive intrasentential mixing. Many of the code-switches are creative innovations that are seemingly unconnected to discourse external motivations.

Some elements, however, are clearly more prone to be code-switched and borrowed than others. Johansson (2002) has used the term attractiveness, for which there are both semantic and structural motivations. Ease of processing and semantic usefulness raise the attractiveness of an element (Backus 2005: 323), as does syntagmatic freedom. Open class items are more easily borrowed than closed class items (Backus 2013: 3). Often semantic and structural motivations overlap.

Semantic specificity is one of the reasons for lexical items to become code-switches – the base language words would not convey the same meaning nor have the same indexicalities in relation to the language-external world (Backus 2001). Matras (2009: 112) discusses the concept of para-lexicality. Referencing para-lexical concepts is more than mere generic labeling: the word forms are treated as “individualised identity-badges”. Names of institutions, for example, are prone to be considered as something culture-specific (Matras 2009: 107). High school does not have the same connotations as the German Gymnasium, which is not the same type of school as Basque ikastola, even though all of them are frequented by sixteen-year-old youth.

Gaps and prestige are the most frequently cited motivations for borrowing (Matras 2009: 145). The speakers attempt to avail themselves of their full inventory of linguistic resources. So-called cultural loans are typical examples of gap-fillers (2009: 150). They are situated high on the semantic specificity scale. The same words in the other language would not evoke the same associations or convey the same stylistic effect, even though similar referents would exist. Example 2 below is from Dataset 1. The social security office in the Basque Autonomous Community is administered by the Spanish state. The words would be easily translatable to Basque (and they have been translated as gizarte segurantza), but when the informant inserts the Spanish form, the bilinguals are able to evoke the precise imagery associated with the particular activity setting.

2. Ordun, ba bai, ordun pasa dira seguridad socialera.
   [then er yes, then go AUX.INTR.3PL security social-ALL]

   ‘Then er yes, then they have gone to the social security.’ (M32, Dataset 1)

Nouns have been traditionally considered to be the easiest elements to switch and borrow. They usually appear at the very top of borrowability hierarchies (Backus
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2001: 8, Matras 2009: 134), as they are structurally rather independent. Discourse markers and tag expressions, however, even though far fewer in number, are easily applied as conversational routines and conventionalized because, unlike nouns, they have a high token frequency. Fixed expressions and constructions are highly semantically specific and, at the same time, structurally independent from the rest of the sentence. They also often have a clear pragmatic function, such as guiding the conversation, signalling closings etc. Items such as connectors and tags often escape speakers’ conscious control, as they are employed to regulate the interaction, but are not a part of the core message. (Matras 2000, 2009: 21). Even though many of them consist of multiple morphemes and lexical items, fixed expressions have many properties that likens them to single lexical items and content words. They are lexical chunks, retrieved from the memory as a whole, and thus easy to process (Backus 2003a).

Backus (2001) assumes that familiar items are preferred over composing novel expressions. Cross-linguistic semantic congruence is likely to be higher for general concepts that can be found in almost all languages. Figurative language rarely has exact equivalents in both participating languages and usually cannot be replaced with another lexical item, just vaguely paraphrased (Backus 2001: 3). It would, thus, naturally follow that items such as fixed expressions would be the type of material that is easily drawn from the other language, especially if the language in question is the socially dominant language of one’s surroundings.

Considering the items discussed in Articles 2 and 4, for example Spanish swear words have various properties that make them prone to borrowing in conversations in which Basque is the base language. As swear words are figurative language, they are high on the semantic specificity scale. Traditional Basque swear words and taboo expressions are mostly associated with peasant lifestyle and many directly describe farmhouse activities (Salaberri & Zubiri 2008). They are associated with a social sphere and interactional contexts which do not resonate with urban demographics, whereas Spanish swear words are frequently heard and reproduced in all types of interactions: in urban surroundings, in the media, by young people etc. This seems to have led to the extinction of Basque swear words in the speech of urban Basque speakers and to the fixation (conventionalization) of Spanish swear words in their language use. Most swear expressions are syntactically independent tags and interjections, so switching is not syntactically risky. They are also fixed expressions, which makes them easy to process. They have clear pragmatic functions which are often repeated in a conversation: they provide emotional relief (Dewaele 2004a), and can be also used as side remarks of the conversations to provide evaluative commentary (Lantto 2014).
2.5. USAGE-BASED LINGUISTIC THEORY IN CS. ARTICLES 1, 2, 3, 4

All the theoretical approaches that have been briefly discussed this far come together in the framework of usage-based linguistics. In the usage-based view, different types of linguistic phenomena can be analyzed as properties of a single system (Beckner et al. 2009). Contact linguistics, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics and contact-induced language change can all be combined under one theoretical umbrella (Backus 2013: 5). I have always seen language, also CS, as a constantly changing system, yet it was not before writing the last article of this dissertation that I could find a sole framework to support this view (and even for this discovery I have to thank an anonymous reviewer of Article 4). Yet the underlying idea of change through repetition, categorization, and the emergence of bilingual constructions drawn from the complete linguistic repertoire of bilinguals in instances of interaction has been my perspective on language since the first article completed in 2011.

Language is a complex, dynamic, adaptive system that is based on the interactions between the speakers of a speech community. The speakers’ and their interlocutors’ past and current behavior affect their future linguistic behavior. Grammar and all other aspects of language emerge from interrelated patterns of experience, social interaction and cognitive processes (Beckner et al. 2009). Multilinguals have in their repertoire constructions of many languages and pragmatic knowledge of how they are used. When using their multilingual repertoire to achieve maximum expressiveness, the boundaries of the normatively defined subsystems are violated and trespassed, sometimes consciously to engage in creative language play (Example 3), sometimes for a clear, yet repetitive and partially conventionalized discourse function (Example 4), sometimes for highly automatized conversational routines, such as discourse markers (Example 5).

3. Eta zuzek ibiliko zarie zeozer de cantineras edo holan? De cantineras edo de zezetas?

‘And you are going there as cantineras or something like that? As cantineras or as somethings?’ (F29, Dataset 1, unique occurrence)

In Example 3, the speaker plays with the expression de cantineras (roughly translated as ‘barmaids’), which she uses in the first sentence and repeats in the second sentence. She then inserts the Basque colloquial word zeozer, something, into the Spanish construction. The constructions blend here, as it is impossible to attribute language to the last sibilant. In Basque, the expression ‘(dressed) as something’ would be zeozetaz
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mozorroto, with the instrumental case marker –z. In the speaker’s Biscayan dialect –z sounds exactly the same as the Spanish –s. She re-uses the linguistic elements she has used previously in her utterance. The combination of the elements of the two languages to achieve a humorous effect is easier to understand in this recycled way. She can freely use and play with the elements of both languages, as all participants of the conversation speak Basque and Spanish. She has no problem using grammatically intrusive forms of mixing.

4. Nik hogeitazortzi urte ditut, ikasi dut lanbide-hesiketa be bai, eta ya está.

‘I am twenty-eight years old, I have studied in vocational school also, and that’s it!’ (M28, Dataset 1, 11 instances in the data)

In Example 4, the speaker introduces himself to the recorder, gives the basic information about his age and studies and then wants to imply that he has nothing more to add. Closing a sequence is a very common conversational function for CS (for example, Alfonzetti 1998) and often same type of fixed expressions are selected for a specific discourse function (Backus 2003b). Every selection of a form increases its degree of entrenchment (Backus 2005: 323). The expression ya está, ‘that’s it’, appears eleven times in the data, mostly in similar discourse functions. It is often pronounced in a slightly phonetically reduced way as [ja’sta:], which indicates that it is perceived as a single lexical unit. Eleven occurrences in a data would be considered by some scholars, such as Myers-Scotton (1997: 207) who defined the distinctive criterion between a code-switch and a loan to be a matter of frequency and predictability, to be evidence of the integration of the element to the new system. The expression ya está would, thus, be considered a loan, not a code-switch. However, as a multiword unit and fixed expression, despite its frequency, ya está is unlikely to be included in normative dictionaries of Basque in the future and become established this way. Usually mostly single morpheme content words, such as single nouns, get the normative seal of approval.

5. Euskaraz edo gazteleraz edo bi gauza, baina batzuk, o sea, hitz batzuk, adibidez, o sea, me entiendes edo ez dakit zer.

‘In Basque or in Spanish or both, but some, I mean, a few words, for example, I mean, do you understand or I don’t know what.’ (F25, Dataset 2, o sea = 415 instances in the data)

Discourse markers, as in Example 5, are examined in detail in Article 4. Compared to nouns, their token frequency is high. For some scholars, the root of their easy conventionalization lies in instances of interactional footing and discourse practices
(De Rooij 2000, Maschler 2000), Matras (2000, 2009), in turn, suggests that they start becoming conventionalized due to momentaneous lapses in the mechanisms that control the separation of linguistic subsystems, as the speaker's attention is focused on the core message. The processing load of a bilingual speaker is reduced when the system of conversational routines can be shared (2009: 113). I believe that both phenomena happen, and that both motivations add to the same effect, but the first one might be more likely an initial step towards automatization: CS of a discourse marker can be used as a tool for footing to achieve a conversational effect, and discourse markers with a conversational effect can become conversational routines when this effect is frequently reproduced. The end result seems to be that the discourse markers easily become part of a bilingual speech style (Auer 1999, Goss & Salmons 2000, Maschler 1998, Matras 2000), and that in minority language situations, they are usually drawn from the majority language (Goss & Salmons 2000, Matras 2009: 98, 140). When discourse particles of the socially dominant language are repeatedly and frequently used, they leave their mark on the cognitive organization of the varieties.

Repetition of an activity has a cumulative effect on the future behaviour (Bybee & Beckner 2009: 829). Pragmatic functions of CS have been a prominent subcategory of CS studies. Yet I have decided to leave them mostly aside in the description of this language contact site and focus on repetitive phenomena instead. In Articles 2 and 4 some instances of footing (Goffman 1981) are discussed, but only as origins of interactional practices which, when used repeatedly for the same function, may lead to conventionalization of these items. The cognitive system of the language users constantly updates itself according to their experiences, and the usage affects linguistic structure (Bybee & Beckner 2009). When a change has happened in the mental representation of the contact varieties in the minds of various individuals, the conventionalization of new elements has reached the community level. The native equivalents of the new words and expressions might be gradually replaced or their function might be reduced, as the new items in process of conventionalization take more space and acquire new connotations. The path leads to contact-induced language change that in the case of CS is primarily lexical, but the lexical elements can bring along the structural qualities of the source languages, such as differences in the word order\(^7\).

Language ideologies are constructed from sociocultural experiences of the speaker. They are multiple and context-bound and more than mere evaluations, they are also *models for engaging in communicative activity*. (Kroskrity 2004: 496)

---

\(^7\) The bilingual focus constructions in my data could be used as an example: when the focal element is of Spanish origin in an otherwise Basque clause, the word order mostly follows the Spanish order \[VFoc\], not the Basque word order \[FocV\]. The new word order is brought along with the Spanish lexical elements, as their structural properties are part of the focus construction. When used repeatedly, this word order may start affecting the word order of Basque monolingual clauses, as the word order pattern \[VFoc\] becomes more entrenched in Basque bilinguals' mental representation of their linguistic repertoire even with Basque focal elements.
As in all usage-based views on language, ideologies of practice must be deduced from actual usage (Kroskrity 2004: 505). Woolard (2004: 75) wishes to challenge the assumptions scholars have made about CS and the questions they have asked: even within the field of linguistic anthropology, where the scholars generally attribute positive value to CS, the dominant view of CS as a deviance from the monolingual norm still prevails. Instead of asking why multilinguals use CS, as if monoglot language use was the norm, we should rather ask why multilingual speakers would not make use of all available forms in their repertoire. I believe that all of the articles in this dissertation partly answer that question. Ideologies, indexicalities of different languages and semantic and pragmatic specificity are crucial factors that guide our linguistic choices. According to Backus (2013), purism acts as a brake in the borrowing process. Other linguistic ideologies mentioned in the Section 2.1., such as native speaker ideology and linguistic authenticity, regulate who can use certain types of linguistic resources in their speech. Not all CS styles or switching patterns are seen as belonging to everyone. Language is an adaptive system: we become more fluent and skilled in the actions we constantly practice – this is why bilingual speech leads to more bilingual speech, combination of elements to more and sometimes even novel combinations, code-switching of an expression to future code-switches of the same or similar expressions. Yet if a speaker is under heavy purist pressures, it is less likely that she becomes a fluent code-switcher.
3. RESULTS

In the following, I will summarize the main theses and findings of this work as a whole. These arguments have been previously examined in the four articles that comprise the main body of my doctoral dissertation. The aim of this summary is to explore and examine the themes that stand out in the individual papers, demonstrate how they are linked and show how they support one another.

3.1. THESIS 1: COLLOQUIAL BASQUE IN GREATER BILBAO IS AN ESSENTIALLY BILINGUAL VARIETY.

A bilingual is always situated at a point of a continuum between the bilingual and the monolingual mode of speech procession. When bilinguals speak to monolinguals, who only know one of their languages, they are in a monolingual language mode. At the other end of the continuum, when they speak in an informal setting to other bilinguals with whom they are used to mixing languages, the mode is bilingual. The topic, the setting and the background of the informants are factors affecting the degree of activation of the bilinguals’ varieties and the place on the continuum at which the bilinguals find themselves. (Grosjean 1997) Virtually all Basque speakers are bilingual, and in the Greater Bilbao area also functionally bilingual, as knowledge of Spanish is essential to the survival in daily life. With other bilingual Basque speakers, they have no need to maintain the separation of linguistic subsystems in order to be understood. All respondents of both datasets used CS to some extent, even during the interviews in which they were condemning CS. Basque seems to be spoken in a bilingual mode unless the circumstances call for strict language policing, particularly in informal situations.

The statement of the title 3.1. is something I already suggested in Article 1. My reasoning in the first article of this dissertation was mostly based on intuition and background sociocultural knowledge. In Article 2, I examined the theme more closely. Colloquial words and expressions, along with swearing, were always used in Spanish in my recordings. I suggested that the Basque slang, or colloquial speech style, is constructed using the combination of CS – which in itself is usually seen as informal speech, since it defies the normative purist boundaries –, Spanish slang expressions and swearing, and that all these phenomena combined strengthen the effect of informality. What I had already speculated in the first two articles was confirmed by the respondents in the interviews of Dataset 2, examined in detail in Article 3. The respondents told that Basque without CS, “to speak well” (Example 6),
was too formal. In a bar environment, Spanishisms were appropriate (Example 7), or even compulsory, if Basque was to be maintained as the language of the conversation (Example 8).

6. Ze nik uste dut euskara ere dela hizkuntza bat ondo hitz egiten duzunean dirudiela formala dela.

‘I also think that Basque is a language that, if you speak it well, it seems formal.’ (M20, Occupied House, Dataset 2)

7. Egokia da momentuan, momentuko euskera, hori bai, tabernan dao eta tabernarako egokia da.

‘That’s appropriate for the moment, Basque of the moment, that yes, she’s [referring to the speaker of the CS speech sample] in a bar and that’s adequate for a bar conversation.’ (F33, Diploma C2, Dataset 2)

Spanish items are particularly abundant in peer-group interaction. They are often seen as an essential part of an informal speech style. The informant below states that Basque without Spanishisms is not even an option for peer-group interaction.


I: Bai. Orduan bi aukera dauzkazu euskara eta erdarakada hoiekin edo edara?

M: Bai, azkenean.

I: Lagunartean egiteko?

M: Bai.

‘M: Er well but those Spanishisms I think are typical when you are speaking among friends. Because the other option is, if you don’t use Basque with Spanishisms, you speak Spanish. Well, it’s a lot better to speak like that than to speak Spanish.'
I: Yes. So you’ve got two options: Basque and with the Spanishisms or Spanish.

M: Yes, finally that’s it.

I: To speak among friends?

M: Yes.’ (M33, Interviewer, Engineers 2, Dataset 2)

According to the informant and many others who stated that colloquial Basque was Basque with CS to Spanish, CS was beneficial for maintaining Basque as the language of conversation. He clearly had a pro-Basque stance: it is better to speak like this than to speak Spanish. In many conversations, the use of CS to Spanish was directly attributed to the prestige of Spanish as one of the truly international global languages (as in Example 9) and to its inevitability in the life of a Basque speaker in Bilbao (as in Example 10).


‘She needs another international language, er her, to explain her ideas and to give them some weight’. (M45, Basque teachers, Dataset 2)


‘Spanish is always around here. It’s very difficult to stick to your guns. I mean, here in Bilbao, right? It’s different in the villages.’ (F29, Dataset 1)

In Greater Bilbao most Basque speakers are L2 speakers who use mainly the standard variety Batua. The attitudes towards Basque are generally positive and, even though there is a clear difference in the linguistic power distribution, Basque does not lack professional prestige (Amorrortu 2002: 825). Batua, however, was disfavoured by Old Basques from Biscay both in solidarity and professional dimensions of a matched-guise test (Amorrortu 2002: 827). Amorrortu attributes this to a perceived lack of authenticity of the standard variety. This attitude is clearly stated in Example 11 by one of the informants of Dataset 1, but it might be changing, as Batua has become more widespread over the last decades.

---

8 The point of comparison was the Biscayan dialect.

*'It’s that* I think that Batua is quite orthopedic, artificial.’ (F20, Dataset 1)

In her work on free radio stations, Urla demonstrates that colloquial Basque speech styles can take very different forms in different social contexts even when the areas are geographically close. The Basque “from the street”, different from the purist standard, is created using ambiguous word forms, word play, and anti-normative, hybrid practices with resources from Batua, Spanish and Basque vernaculars in a way that responds to the surrounding sociocultural reality. (2012: 169–201.) In other settings in the Basque Country, local Basque vernaculars, *euskalkiak*, have been connected to informal registers and linguistic authenticity (Echeverría 2003a, Ortega et al. 2013), but in the city of Bilbao, there is no such vernacular. Some people try to make their urban Basque speech styles more informal using features of the vernacular (Ortega et al. 2013, Amonarriz 2008: 177–180). The standard variety is most commonly associated with education, written language and the Basque media (Amorrotu 2002: 826), and the Spanish elements also seem to be a way of making Batua seem more informal and youthful. In some conversations, it was assumed that colloquial, but unmixed Basque would exist in more Basque-dominant settings than in Bilbao. The province of Gipuzkoa was often mentioned. Vernacular Basque dialects, *euskalkiak*, and *hika*, the informal second-person addressee system that is largely missing from Batua and the Greater Bilbao area, were mentioned as possible unmixed informal registers of Basque.

After the discussion of Example 8, I asked if the informant could see colloquial Basque without CS to Spanish existing somewhere else. He answered that this colloquial Basque variety without Spanishisms might exist in a more Basque-speaking atmosphere.


*'In my view it could exist in the towns and villages where Basque is deeply rooted, for example Durango, it could be one of those villages. Or in many towns in Gipuzkoa. Why that is, well finally in many places the Spanish influence is much less strong.’* (M33, Engineers 2, Dataset 2)

I have only studied the setting of Greater Bilbao, but according to the preliminary findings of the ACOBA project the speculation that in a more Basque-dominant
place CS would not occur is not accurate. CS exists even in places where the intergenerational transmission of Basque was not interrupted and the Basque speakers do know the vernacular connected to informal speech styles. The findings of Bereziartua (2013) and also those of Esnaola (1999) seem to confirm this. Despite the general condemnation of CS in public discourse, CS styles seem to serve important functions in the bilingual Basque society. They will not be eradicated by stronger language policing and purist shunning, and they are not generated by linguistic deficit.

All this, in some form, can be attested in earlier CS literature. Even though empirical studies of attitudes towards CS are rare, the ambiguity – the condemnation of bilingual practices on one hand, the indirect acceptance and even encouragement of the speech styles that are not restricted to monolingual purist norms on the other hand – was already mentioned by Haugen (1977:332) in his description of Norwegian Americans. My informants voice this ambiguity aloud as non-linguists, and show remarkable metalinguistic awareness of the language dynamics in their bilingual community.

3.2. THESIS 2: THE DEGREE OF INTRUSIVENESS AND THE AMOUNT OF CS VARIES ACCORDING TO THE TYPE OF BILINGUALISM OF THE INFORMANTS.

Even though more attention was paid to the constraints that Poplack (1980) developed in her classic article on CS in the Puerto Rican community of New York, Poplack also examined differences between “dominant” and “balanced” bilinguals. She found out that the Spanish-dominant bilinguals who had most recently arrived to United States used mostly extrasentential tag-switching, whereas the “balanced bilinguals” used more syntactically intrusive types of bilingual speech, namely intrasentential CS. Intrasentential CS has been connected to high bilingual proficiency also by Nortier (1990). The usual reasoning is that in order to be able to combine the languages in rapid speech production, the bilingual needs to know both languages well. (Muysken 2000: 225). Muysken considers the most grammatically intrusive forms of intrasentential CS in which the structures of the languages converge, in his terminology congruent lexicalization, as a phenomenon that is characteristic of second generation immigrants, typological similarities, individuals with a high bilingual proficiency, and relaxed linguistic norms within a speech community. I compared the syntactical structures of CS in the speech of New and Old Basques.
Results

Figure 1. The grammatical distribution of the switches in Dataset 1

Figure 1 shows the distribution of the switches in Dataset 1. Even though all informants engage in some kind of CS, Old Basques of my data use more and more intrusive types of CS than the New Basques. In the group of Old Basques, 1032 instances of codeswitching were found, more than half of which were intrasentential. The amount of extrasentential codeswitching – discourse markers, tags, fixed expressions – is also notable (334). There are 107 instances of intersentential switching, in which whole sentences are uttered in language other than the base language of the conversation. New Basques mostly produced extrasentential switching (335/456), such as discourse markers and swear expressions, and there were very few instances of intersentential switching, which shows that they clearly wanted to maintain Basque as the language of the conversation.

The next two examples illustrate what this means in practice. They are prototypical examples of the differences between the two speaker groups. The speaker of Example 13 is a New Basque, who uses Spanish discourse markers in otherwise rather monolingual Basque speech. This type of switching is used by both New and Old Basques.

13. *Claro, es que dira antzineko tipografiak, eta claro, ez baduzu- ez badakizu ondo, ee, zer diren...*

‘Sure, it’s that they are ancient typographies, and sure, if you don’t- if you don’t know well, er, what they are...’ (F28, Dataset 1)
Discourse markers are easy to switch: they are situated in the periphery of the sentence or utterance and do not violate any potential grammatical constraints or sentence structures. When Example 13 is compared to Example 14, the differences in the speakers’ CS styles become clear. Both of the informants are educated, well-travelled women in their late twenties (at the moment of the recording), expressive and extroverted. The main difference is that the second informant learned both languages in her early childhood, whereas the first informant learned Basque in an euskaltegi, a Basque-language school for adults. The second informant is an Old Basque, a native speaker.

Example 14 is evidence of intensive back-and-forth CS, which could only be found in the speech of Old Basques. As Figure 1 shows, the differences in CS patterns between New and Old Basques are clear. The intragroup differences in the CS patterns of the Old Basques, however, were quite remarkable, which mostly seems to come down to differences in personality and expressiveness. Even though most Old Basques used considerable amounts of intrasentential CS, not all of them engaged in highly syntactically intrusive mixing. Five of the Old Basques could be characterized as “super-switchers” with highly intensive switching patterns.

Congruent lexicalization is the most structurally intrusive CS pattern in Muysken’s typology (2000). In congruent lexicalization, the structures of the participating languages are shared and items from both linguistic varieties are inserted into this shared structure. In theory, this should be unlikely to happen in the case of two as typologically different languages as Basque and Spanish. Yet many of these super-switchers often seem to be able to converge the structures and form a high linear equivalence. One case is Example 14, in which Spanish insertions, discourse markers and a subordinate clause are inserted into what seems to be a Basque syntactic frame. The traditional Basque word order would be SXV, yet all the clauses in Example 14 seem to follow the Spanish word order SVX. It seems that in the mental representation of these super-switchers, the linguistic structures have sometimes already converged.
15. Baina nire familien afiliaturik ez dago, bueno afiliurik ni simpatizantes tampoco, orduen difícilmente.

‘But in my family there are no members, well members nor allies either, so that’s difficult.’ (F29, Dataset 1)

In Example 15, another informant explains that in her family there are no political leanings towards the center-right moderate Basque nationalist party. Her speech rhythm is very fast, there is no hesitation or flagging. It is difficult to define a base language for the utterance, but it is clear that it is produced with a high degree of fluency. The words and expressions follow in a rapid succession from both participating languages. This is something that does not occur in the speech of the New Basques in my data.

3.3. THESIS 3: THE VARIATION IS MAINLY CAUSED BY DIFFERENT SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS PLACED UPON THE SPEAKERS.

In Article 1, it was found that the late bilinguals [new speakers] use less and syntactically less intrusive CS than the early bilinguals, which is in accordance with observations made elsewhere in other bilingual communities (Poplack 1980, Nortier 1990). The documented variation between “balanced” and “dominant” bilinguals has been explained by the former group’s competence in mastering the CS grammar (as in Poplack 1980, Bullock & Toribio 2009: 8–9). In the conversations of Dataset 2, the differences between Old and New Basques are frequently commented on. Even though some respondents see all CS as lack of competence in Basque and believe that using CS must be a sign of a New Basque, most respondents see CS as typical of Old Basques.

Of course, each case study is unique, but at least in the case of Basque the differences in the amount or quality of CS might be mostly explained by the different sociolinguistic limitations and expectations placed on different groups of speakers. In a revitalization context new tensions arise as new speakers claim their ownership and rights to a minority language (O’Rourke & Ramallo 2013: 288). The neofalantes of Galician in O’Rourke and Ramallo’s study (2013: 296) describe the language policing of their speech as “Big Brother”-like surveillance of their language use, whereas the native speakers were automatically granted the linguistic authority of their Galician. One of my informants, an Old Basque herself, states that Old
Basques “don’t have to prove anything to anyone”. In Article 3, the respondents make it clear that when native speakers use CS, it is considered authentic, natural language use for informal situations, whereas when used by nonnative speakers, it is seen as a lack of competence.


‘Me, for example, I do it a lot and my friends they do it quite a lot too. Yes. Both old Basques and new Basques do it. And I think new Basques do it because they don’t know and we do it because that’s what comes naturally to us’. (F33, Friends Bilbao 3, Dataset 2)

The pressures to produce pure Basque can be both external and internalized. The differences in CS patterns can be partly explained by differences in acquisition setting: Old Basques learn the languages in a bilingual community, whereas New Basques mostly learn them in a normative classroom setting, where the practices are oriented towards “double monolingualism” (Jørgensen et al. 2011). Here two New Basques explain that CS would not be natural for them. When they studied the Basque language in a classroom, they learned to speak only Basque and to put Spanish aside. They also tell that they do not like the mixing habits of Old Basques and young people, who take Basque for granted.

17. M: Honek bezala mintzatzeko, pentsatu beharko nuke, hori sartu dezaket gaztelerez-

F: Antzeztu bezala, antzeztu beharko genuke. (laughs)


I: Bai.

M: Eta ordun ohituta daukagu burua momentu batean ari zarela gaztelerez, beste momentu batean ari zarela euskaraz. Eta ez ditugu nahasten, ze ikasi dugu, ahalegintzen zinen euskaraz mintzatzen, eta momentu horretan alboratzen zenuen gaztelera. ... Eta nik ez dut ondo pasatzen ba zera, hizkera biak batean bilduta ikusita.
Results

F: Euskaldun zahar askorekin egiten zaidala mingarria hainen joera, batzuetan pasatzen dira, eta tartekatzen dute dana, eta es que sentitzen naiz txarto. ... Argi da, despilfarroa apur bat iruditzen zait.

M: ‘To speak like her I would have to think, “can I say this in Spanish”.

F: Like acting, we would have to act (laughs).

M: And that happens a lot. We have learned Basque, right? We don’t have it from the family.

I: Yes.

M: So we are used to having our head at one moment in Spanish, at another moment in Basque. And we don’t mix them, because we have learned, you made the effort to speak in Basque, and at that moment you put Spanish aside. ... And I don’t feel good about seeing the languages mixed like that. ...

F: With many native speakers their attitude hurts me, sometimes they don’t give a damn, they switch everything and it’s that that makes me feel bad. It’s clear, it seems to me a bit of a waste.’

(M52, F57, Interviewer, Couple, Dataset 2)

The need to appease socially dominant interlocutors seems to be a central motivation for maintaining demarcation boundaries between the normatively defined linguistic subsystems (Matras 2009: 38). As noted earlier, variation in CS patterns has often been explained in terms of linguistic competence. I have attempted to explain different CS patterns in the speech of New and Old Basques as an outcome of differing social constraints rather than as an illustration of an inherent mastery of a native bilingual grammar. However, if we do not separate competence from performance, which is what usage-based views of language have as one of their core tenets, it might well be that the bilinguals who code-switch more have a higher competence in bilingual speech. The use and non-use of CS might lead to differences in cognitive representation of the varieties. Some speakers are less restricted by the purity ideals than others. Perhaps they grew up in surroundings where CS was the norm. Perhaps they belong to a group of speakers whose language authority is never questioned. Perhaps they did not encounter very purist tendencies in classroom, or learned that the purist register reserved for the classroom is just that, whereas outside the classroom CS is an acceptable choice. Perhaps they have personality traits that foment stylized speech and expressiveness.
A bilingual speaker who feels less constrained by purist tendencies, also feels free to introduce elements in another language to the discourse. The bilingual practices are introduced in singular instances of interaction, and when they are not questioned or focused on, the speaker learns that this linguistic behaviour is tolerated or even encouraged. She starts doing it more often, and through repetition, cognitive connections begin to form. The cognitive apparatus changes slightly and the CS patterns become more entrenched in the mental representation of the varieties. Each time the CS processes are more unconscious and become more entrenched at each instance of use. This might lead to more instances of more fluent CS in the speech of the bilingual individual. The cognitive system has adapted to CS and is, thus, more prepared for repeated instances of bilingual constructions.

At the same time, another individual is surrounded by social constraints and ideologies that hinder his language use. If he gets feedback about CS not being acceptable behaviour and his bilingual speech is corrected and criticized by people with more linguistic authority, such as teachers, parents and native speakers, he is less inclined to use CS and more inclined to stick to monolingual modes of speech. He also gets feedback from his surroundings that confirm the message: “bilingual speakers like me do not use CS”, “CS is more common for other types of bilinguals”. When CS is not used, the cognitive system has no chance to adapt to it and no fast connections are formed. This might lead to more conscious, less fluent type of CS in his speech, or even to avoiding bilingual speech altogether.

Access to Basque-speaking networks and Basque vernaculars has been shown to be an important predictor of new speakers’ use of Basque (Ortega et al. 2015). The development of New Basques as users of bilingual practices might evolve along the same lines: when they gain access to Basque-speaking networks, they also might gain more linguistic confidence and start introducing more Spanish linguistic resources in their informal interaction. A good example of this is the informant in Example 13. She completed all her education in Spanish, but then went on to study Basque in an euskaltegi in order to receive her EGA (Euskara Gaitasun Agiria, Certificate of Competence in Basque, C1 within the European Framework). I first recorded her in 2007, when she had just finished her Basque language studies. Now, seven years later, she works in a Basque language environment and has started to increase the amount of CS in her speech. “Yeah, well, I’m surrounded by Old Basques”, she told me recently, “They mix Basque and Spanish all the time, so I have started to mix as well, it’s contagious.” This is, of course, only anecdotal evidence, but seems to indicate that both of these informal speech styles, the CS style and the vernacular, might be more easily learned in contact with native Basque speakers and their networks. We learn new patterns in our linguistic interactions, but those linguistic interactions are constrained by social interaction. Our linguistic usage adapts to our communication partners in order to ensure communicative success (Beckner et al. 2009: 14, Backus 2014: 93). When our daily interactions involve people who are
Results

regular code-switchers, it is natural that we change our linguistic practices towards more bilingual modes of speech.

3.4. THESIS 4: THERE ARE CERTAIN TYPES OF CS ALL THE BILINGUALS SEEM TO SHARE.

Colloquial Basque is mostly based on Basque, yet includes a certain amount of Spanish expressions to maintain the informal touch. Even though all bilinguals in theory can mix and match freely the elements of their two languages when constructing a conversation with other bilinguals, in reality their use of different linguistic resources is conditioned and regulated by the sociolinguistic circumstances that surround them. In the Greater Bilbao area, the original vernacular has largely become extinct. Most Basque speakers are new speakers of the minority language. Due to the high mobility of a metropolitan area, people moving in and out, also native Basque speakers have differing dialectological and sociolinguistic backgrounds. The CS elements might, therefore, be essential in constructing a common colloquial speech style in Basque. For Old Basques, the CS style has gained certain anonymity as the unmarked register of peer-group conversations. Yet, if a nonnative speaker of Basque uses CS it is not considered “just talk” anymore, but often criticized and seen as lack of competence in Basque. Nevertheless, there are some types of entrenched CS patterns that are shared by all informants. They seem to be so ingrained in the colloquial Basque speech styles of Greater Bilbao that they go unmarked even in the speech of New Basques, who otherwise feel obliged to maintain purist monolingual norms.

In Dataset 1, most of the informants, especially the ones who learned Basque after adolescence, were clearly determined to maintain Basque as the language of the conversation, at least until the recorder had been turned off. This can be seen in the small amount of intersentential switching during the recordings (see Figure 1 in Section 3.2.). The informants used, however, Spanish discourse markers, swearing and slang expressions repeatedly. They were not random occurrences: the patterns of this conventionalized CS seemed clear and consistent. Although the purpose of the study was not to look for universal principles, most certainly there were patterns, tendencies that revealed what kind of material was code-switched. Some expressions (such as the fixed expression resulta que, ‘it turns out that’, four instances in the data) that had caught my attention as interesting new inventions were repeated elsewhere, by another informant.

When dealing with these clear tendencies of what kind of material was code-switched, a question started to form: was the syntax the right place to look for intrusiveness? If these elements, even though mostly clause-peripheral, were repeated by several informants, did it mean that they had become a part of a bilingual variety in this specific linguistic community? The same semantic-pragmatic subsets
were repeatedly code-switched even by New Basques, who otherwise had no tendency
to CS. After observing and frequenting Basque lessons for years, my observation
was that the bilinguals who were still in the process of normative learning of Basque
in classrooms, used these Spanish lexical items even in the classroom settings. The
teachers who tried to encourage the students to use the “proper” Basque equivalents,
used the same erdarakadak, ‘Spanishisms’, when avoiding them was not the most
important issue to concentrate on.

Convergence and fusion can also happen on a lexical/semantic-pragmatic level,
not only on syntactical level. The process of fusion, according to Auer, often starts
with relatively unbound elements of grammar: discourse markers, fixed expressions
etc (1999: 324). Semantic-pragmatic patterns can become shared by the varieties.
New innovations are created in interactional contexts. The innovations may or may
not be recycled. Recycled elements may or may not be propagated across the speech
community and become sedimented, conventionalized patterns. When mixed
patterns have been conventionalized throughout the community, they have made
their way into language systems in terms of shared knowledge of the individuals in
the community (Auer 2007: 337). This shared knowledge changes when even newer
practices come into being and are gradually spread across the speech community.
The amount of CS and its degree of intrusiveness varies by informant, yet it is shared
knowledge that the conventionalized CS patterns are bilingual resources available
for all. Their use is unmarked: the marked option would be to use Basque items for
discourse-structuring, swearing or slang, at least in informal contexts.

The question is whether the Spanish elements that are introduced into Basque
by default as members of their semantic-pragmatic categories should be called
CS? If they are so deeply ingrained, should they rather be considered established
loans? These questions are already answered in Article 4, but I will answer again,
and my answer is no. First of all, we cannot ignore the speakers who call these
element “Spanishisms” and the CS variety “Basque with Spanish” (Articles 3 & 4).
Languages are not linguistic facts of the matter, but flags of allegiance (Rajagopalan
2001: 22). Their boundaries are primarily defined by cultural norms and by their
speakers. The speakers consider colloquial Basque as a speech style with elements
from both Basque and Spanish. Secondly, these elements still belong to the Spanish
system: pragmatic markers are grasped from the Spanish-speaking surroundings,
as are the colloquial elements that purist, formal registers of Basque seem to lack. In
addition, the expressions are typical elements of spoken language and thus unlikely
to become established loans recorded in normative dictionaries.

Backus (2003b) concludes that conventionalized alternational CS is not likely
to be the origin of mixed languages. In the Basque case I tend to agree: I would call
colloquial Basque a bilingual variety, which cannot be considered as an established
mixed language but presents early stages of fusion. The variety is partially stable, as
certain semantic-pragmatic categories are used in Spanish by default and variability
is, thus, restricted. Other than that, the bilingual speech patterns present enormous variation – as mixed speech is the unmarked form for many speakers and colloquial Basque is always spoken in a bilingual mode, other categories or elements can be expressed in either one of the languages. Even the stable CS categories of the bilingual variety are only stable stopped in time, and might never become considered fully Basque by the speech community.

In Article 4 I discussed conventionalized CS patterns as potential early loanword layers which can be considered early stages of a mixed language. Yet, in the development from two separate varieties into a mixed language, the presence of purist norms reinforced by language authorities has to be taken into account. Some items of the now conventionalized categories can become established loanwords, most likely single lexical items such as the common discourse marker bueno, ‘well’ often seen written in Basque with the monophtong as beno, or the vulgar word puto, ‘fucking’, which has been accepted into the dictionary Elhuyar Hiztegia (2006). It is, however, unlikely that, despite their propagation and frequent use, other Spanish expressions such as multiword discuss markers or swear expressions will be formally accepted by the Basque language academy Euskaltzaindia. The acceptance is crucial for the elements to be encoded as established elements of Basque. Without formal acceptance, the elements will lead a parallel life and might fall out of use according to the changes in the surrounding Spanish-speaking society. The two systems are intertwined and in a constant, dynamic movement. What is frequently and predictably employed as a conventionalized code-switch at a given moment of time, may fall into oblivion in a couple of generations. The Spanish numbers, for example, are discussed in Article 4 as a formerly conventionalized CS pattern, which is no longer used by the younger generations, who have been educated in Basque-medium schools.
4. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Gardner-Chloros (2009: vii) uses a poem of an old Indian legend as an analogy for the theoretical approaches that the researchers have taken in their study of CS. In the poem, six blind men approach an elephant: one finds the trunk and declares that an elephant resembles a snake; another one happens to find the “broad and sturdy side” of the elephant and concludes, thus, that the animal is like a wall. The third man finds the tusk and claims the elephant to be like a spear, and so forth and so forth. All of the men approach the elephant from different sides: all of them are correct, yet fail to see the creature as a whole. I certainly cannot claim to have seen the whole elephant. What I have tried to do, however, is to describe several parts of the Basque-Spanish elephant in its habitat of Greater Bilbao. In this section, I will explain the main implications of this research for CS studies, language revitalization efforts and for the Basque Country. I will also point out some questions that this research project has still left unanswered.

4.1. IMPLICATIONS FOR CS LITERATURE

The themes that were discussed in the articles and in this compilation article of my doctoral dissertation are inseparable from the revitalization context in which they have been studied. Yet, besides being a description of CS in a specific bilingual community, all of the articles have offered new perspectives to add to the existing CS literature. Variation in CS patterns of new and traditional speakers, conventionalization of certain CS patterns, relationship of swearing, CS and slang in the construction of a colloquial register of Basque, language ideologies discouraging and encouraging CS, are all themes that can be compared and contrasted with other bilingual settings to see if similar phenomena occur elsewhere, and if they do not, what could be the reason behind this.

I believe that the most important, though at the same time rather self-evident, general finding of this work for CS theory as a whole, is that one approach to CS really cannot be separated from another, even though they have been mostly studied separately. In my view, the different parts of the elephant are best combined within the framework of usage-based linguistic theory, as the sociolinguistic aspect, semantic-pragmatic aspect, grammatical aspect and the cognitive aspect can all be combined in one theoretical framework. Most conversational material consists of prefabricated chunks, but sometimes new practices, also new bilingual innovations,
are originated in interactional encounters. Linguistic ideologies have an effect on linguistic structures of these encounters and they regulate in large degree what is said and by whom, and which type of innovations get noticed and recycled. Sometimes the innovations are reproduced by several individuals and propagated throughout the speech community. They might form conventionalized CS patterns, which in turn might lead to contact-induced language change. The indexical value of languages, the domains they are associated with, as well as where they are spoken and learned also affect the type of linguistic material that becomes code-switched and borrowed. Syntactic properties of the elements might also hinder or facilitate the switching process. All aspects of language are interrelated, and contact linguistics and usage-based theory are a perfect match (Backus 2013).

4.2. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE BASQUE COUNTRY AND OTHER REVITALIZATION CONTEXTS

After Spain transitioned to democracy, numerous surveys and studies have emerged with statistics showing the progress in the language revitalization of the Basque Country (for example Basque Government 2009a&b, 2014). Both institutional support and an enormous effort from the grassroots organizations have been required to arrive at the point where the normalization process is at the moment (Urla 2012). It is a rare case of a minority language gaining speakers instead of losing them. Nevertheless, as the studies of language revitalization and new speakers show, successes in language revitalization cannot be counted only in quantitative measures. New tensions and struggles for legitimacy and linguistic authority arise (O’Rourke & Ramallo 2013), and despite the acquisition of linguistic knowledge and competence, the speakers’ linguistic practices might not follow the aims of the revitalization movement.

Even though the speaker percentage has clearly been increasing, concerns for the quality of Basque, along with the concerns for the usage of Basque have been raised in the revitalization discourse of the Basque Country. These concerns usually involve the youth and L2-speakers of Basque, who have acquired a relatively high competence of the language (especially compared to the formal requirements of the Common European framework for languages), but nevertheless seem to use it in a non-desirable way or in non-desirable amounts. Often these concerns seem to reflect the belief that the youth and new speakers as speaker groups are not “good enough”, so their patterns of language use must be somehow deviant. However, there is also real cause for concern, as the findings from recent studies show that the youth who have learned Basque in school do not seem to be using it outside the classroom. Even though macrosocial policies and individual level of minority language acquisition are necessary conditions for the revitalization process of a
language, it is on the microsocial level of informal encounters that the language use is determined. Without progress in language use in everyday encounters and social networks of Basque bilinguals, the progress that takes place on other levels is mostly symbolic (Martínez de Luna and Suberbiola 2008). Another concern that has been raised is that the New Basques do not master the registers and pragmatics that are needed to act in the Basque-speaking community outside the classrooms (Urla 2012: 206).

The categories *euskaldun berria* and *euskaldun zaharra*, New Basque and Old Basque, are naturalized throughout the Basque Country and at this point it is not realistic to avoid them. It is, however, important to note that the terms create divisions, essentialize speaker groups and guide people’s perceptions of the speakers and the varieties that they use. The binary nature of the terminology obscures individual variation, and nonnative speakers are judged by different parameters than the native speakers.

Native speaker ideologies can be especially damaging in a minority language and revitalization context, as they make the integration of new speakers difficult and create boundaries between those who are considered authentic and those who are not. The two speakers who spoke in the speech samples of Dataset 2 spoke mostly Basque in the one minute extracts, yet in the answers to the question sheet and in the metalinguistic conversations the informants evaluated the speakers’ Spanish competence to be higher than their Basque competence, especially in the case of the speaker who spoke Batua (the results in Article 3.) It is the competence of Basque, not Spanish, which is under scrutiny. I have witnessed several instances of my Basque friends and acquaintances mocking politicians’ and television personalities’ non-nativelike Basque. Similarly, I have heard several evaluations of our common acquaintances’ Basque competence, even of those who learned Basque as children, as not good enough. Their Spanish competence, though, is never questioned.

When we were climbing a mountain with a group of students of a *barnetegi*, an immersion language school of Basque, a passer-by told us to “stop raping the Basque language”. The group consisted of new speakers who were on or above the level B2 of the Common European framework for languages. I remember how in many conversations, all instances of hesitations in Basque speech were interpreted by an Old Basque interlocutor as a cue to use Spanish instead. The change of language was mostly motivated by the best intentions and by the deeply rooted convention of linguistic accommodation, as the use of Basque in the presence of Spanish speakers is often considered “bad manners”. Yet a New Basque might take it as a signal that their Basque competence was put into question.

The Advisory Council of Basque has already proposed that the concept of *euskaldun* should be understood as a continuum and be expanded to encompass all range of competences in Basque, from passive understanding to native-like fluency in everyday language use. Language policies should not use terms such as “quasi-
Discussion and implications of the research

euskaldun” or different labels for new and old speakers (Urla 2012: 209). If we do not make a strict divide between native and nonnative speakers of a language, but see linguistic variation as inherent to a society, we can consider the speakers as individuals who have in their repertoire the linguistic resources they have acquired from their experiences. Languages are not learned as entities. There is no need to assume a standard target or to aim at native-like speech or writing. Instead of learning “a language”, we should see language learning as processes where we learn more resources to expand our communicative competence and multilingual repertoire (Blommaert & Backus 2011). Not only L2 speakers but native speakers alike differ in their competences, and their linguistic resources are not equally spread across all domains.

All speakers of Basque are bilingual. Unless they have highly purist tendencies or are confronted by purist social pressures, they will use bilingual speech to express themselves. The mythical pre-contact pure Basque has not existed for centuries and, even though a standard language for formal uses can and should be developed and maintained, there is no need to demand it outside classrooms, broadcasting studios, Basque-language press and literature (and literature leaves plenty of room for heteroglossic experimentation). Basque–Spanish CS style, or euskañol, is no low quality Basque. It is, at least in the Greater Bilbao area where there is no common vernacular, one of the informal registers of Basque. Demands for purity and unmixed varieties of language can be detrimental, not beneficial, for Basque language use in informal domains. Excessive concerns for quality of Basque may fill the speakers with self-doubt: is my Basque good enough? Should I speak Spanish instead?

New speakers are not merely speakers of the revitalized language or sheer numbers that the language has somehow “gained”. They acquire the new language, but they rarely abandon their native language. In bilingual communities, both languages are always present. New speakers should be regarded as new bilinguals or, depending on the situation, possibly multilinguals. Multilinguals engage in multilingual practices. Both languages, their structures and lexicon are going to be present in the speech of all bilingual individuals, old and new. In order to further promote the minority language, different bilingual speech patterns should be embraced as an expression of a bilingual speech community in which everyone can participate to the extent they are capable of doing so. Instead of a threat or a demonstration of failures in the revitalization process, CS should be seen as an integral part of bilingual speakers’ communicative competence.

4.3. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Basque only exists as a contact variety. Unlike when studying CS and entrenchment in immigrant communities, no pre-contact comparisons can be made. The origins of
changes are hard to detect, as both languages and their combinations have been a part of the bilingual repertoire of Basques for generations. In the context of the Basque Country, Greater Bilbao area is closest to a blank slate as it gets when it comes to studying the results of a contact between the purist minority language standard and the majority language. An environment in which the minority language is acquired in classrooms rather than learned in a bilingual community provides an opportunity to examine how entrenchment and conventionalization of contact-induced phenomena begin and proceed.

The metalinguistic commentary of Dataset 2 provided information about speakers’ opinions about which elements they consider Basque and which elements they consider Spanish. The originally Spanish elements were frequently commented on, and the speakers avoided CS when it was the topic of conversation. The use of Spanish discourse markers in these conversations convinced me of their conventionalization, as they occurred even when the speakers were hyper-aware of CS. The main focus, however, of Dataset 2 was not on this sort of information, but on the more general ideological atmosphere surrounding bilingual practices in the Basque Country. In future studies I would like to concentrate further on the issue and examine what elements that are originally Spanish are treated as parts of Basque. The study could involve comparisons of commentary in metalinguistic conversations with practices in naturally occurring conversations and in conversations in which the speakers were specifically instructed to use only Basque. The possible clash between explicitly articulated ideologies and ideologies of practice provides a fertile ground for study. More experimental studies in linguistic laboratory, such as listening to tapes with CS and marking each Spanish element – also combined with subsequent conversations – could be used to widen the picture of relationship between CS, borrowing and conventionalization processes.

Following individual speaker trajectories and changes in language use patterns is another theme I would like to explore further. Do New Basques use more CS when they gain more linguistic confidence? Is the bilingual speech style acquired in contact with the native speaker community? This was hinted at at the end of the Section 3.3., but has not been thoroughly examined in this dissertation, or, to my knowledge, elsewhere. A study of entrenchment of source-language items in individual bi- and multilingual repertoires combined with the study of speaker trajectories could be used to explain diversity and individual variation, and to mirror their relationship to community-wide conventionalization. The speech patterns and speaker trajectories of New Basques and other new speakers who do not fit the profile of “young, urban, educated, middle class” would also be an important question to study. Are there challenges that are unique to working class New Basques? Are there different barriers or factors that encourage their Basque language acquisition and later language use? The variety learned by New Basques is generally Batua, and speaking the standard language has middle class connotations.
One question that remains to be answered is the causal relationship between criticisms or feedback and linguistic practice. For now, I can only assume such a relation to exist. I can provide evidence of different CS patterns and of differing evaluative judgments considering CS when used by different speaker groups. I have also witnessed negative feedback of CS in interaction: the new speakers tend to police each other in groups of berbalagunak, when they gather to talk Basque. I myself, along others have been a target of negative feedback using Spanish resources in Basque speech. In summer 2004 I was working as a waitress in a restaurant in a very Basque-speaking village. The other young woman who worked as summer help was also a new speaker of Basque. The owners wanted us new speakers to speak “good Basque” and to use “proper Basque words” instead of Spanish loanwords. This, however, alienated us from the elderly villagers who came to the bar regularly and did not master the standard language, but used Spanish loanwords which were a part of their local Basque vernacular. In one case I used the vernacular loan word, zenizerue (from Spanish cenicero, ‘ashtray’) instead of the standard hautsontzia. The owner promptly corrected me, as I was supposed to use the standard variant. A couple of days later, in the presence of the owner, I used the word hautsontzia with an elderly local man, who did not understand what the word meant. “Zenizerue, it’s what she means, zenizerue” the owner told the man, solving the problem in communication. The customers were not used to Batua. Often they asked me to change the Basque television channel ETB1 to Spanish, as they did not wish to listen to “that artificial shit, Batua”. These cross-pressures between using “proper standard forms” accepted by my employers and “authentic vernacular forms” accepted by the customers made communication sometimes difficult and made me very aware of the linguistic forms I could use at a given moment in interaction with different people. Without a clear determination and insistence to use Basque, the easiest and neutral option would have been to use Spanish, the anonymous language of “just talk”, shared by all bilinguals.

How usual these kinds of occurrences are still remains unclear. Interviews with New and Old Basques, as well as observations of concrete interactions could give a more complete picture of the relation of feedback and new speakers’ use and non-use of CS. Are native speakers the ultimate “socially dominant interlocutors” (Matras 2009: 38) that restrict new speakers’ use of heteroglossic elements, or do teachers and other new speakers have more linguistic authority in this respect? How much does other speakers’ behavior actually affect new speakers’ linguistic choices? The language contact setting of the Basque Country is one of a kind and changing rapidly, as the number of New Basques is constantly increasing. In many places, such as in Greater Bilbao, they outnumber the native speakers. Traditional ways of categorizing and evaluating speakers and their language use need to be reconsidered, as they are no longer fit to describe the mosaic of the new urban Basque society.
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