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Code Switching: Definition

Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code Switching:

“Broadly defined, code switching is the ability on the part of bilinguals to alternate effortlessly between their two languages”

-> Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: toward a typology of code-switching
Why this subject?

• “English disease”

(“for recovery and preservation of the Dutch language”)

• Research question: How do Dutch people evaluate Dutch, Dutch/English and English?
Measuring language attitudes: basic theories

- Mentalist theory: sees language attitudes as being mental and neural states of disposition (Chomsky)

  vs

- Behaviourist theory: considers attitudes to be behaviours or responses to a given situation
Measuring language attitudes: classical contraposition (1/2)

- **Direct methods vs. indirect methods**

- **Direct methods introduce aspects with negative methodological connotations:**
  - possible ambiguity in the formulation
  - open questions: limitation of writing for answering
  - distortive (both open and closed questions)
  - most important: *more rational*
Indirect methods:
- more spontaneous and sincere responses
- bear in mind the **affective** component of language attitudes, which are very often irrational
“This technique involves asking interviewees to evaluate the personal qualities of speakers whose voices are recorded on tape, whereby the same speaker uses different linguistic varieties”
Matched guise technique: features (1/2)

- Respondent is not aware of same person speaking
- Social/independent variables can be taken into account
- Spoken material studied from a strictly linguistic approach (phonetic, morphological, syntactic, etc.)
- Total control over variable ‘voice’: speed, volume, tone, style, length, etc.
- Spoken material can be short (+- 20 sec.)
- Evaluation on the basis of voices
Matched guise technique: features (2/2)

- Distractors
- Respondents should not know that the experiment is about code switching
- 7 points scale
- Results: often stereotyped prejudices towards a variety
My experiment (1/3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Spanish                | B       | 20 sec.
| Dutch                  | A       | 20 sec. |
| Frisian (+Dutch)       | C       | 20 sec. |
| German                 | D       | 20 sec. |
| Dutch/English          | A       | 20 sec. |
| French                 | E       | 20 sec. |
| Norwegian              | F       | 20 sec. |
| English                | A       | 20 sec. |

Evaluation after every sound clip
My experiment (2/3)

- Validity: same conditions for every speaker and respondent:
  - text
  - gender of the speaker
  - tone, style, speed, volume, length
  - respondent conditions
My experiment (3/3)

- Social variables: age, gender, level of education, travel behaviour

- Dependent variables: I think this speaker is

  old-fashioned  1 2 3 4 5 6 7  modern
  stupid         1 2 3 4 5 6 7  smart
  unattractive   1 2 3 4 5 6 7  attractive
  strange        1 2 3 4 5 6 7  normal
  unkind         1 2 3 4 5 6 7  kind
  poor           1 2 3 4 5 6 7  rich
Matched guise technique: Critiques

Basic question for an experiment:
Do I measure what I want to measure?

- Stereotype that does not exist
- Often done in classrooms
- Repeating -> different focus
- Only one style -> generalizibility
- No real-time responses
- Semantic differentials often copied
- Biggest limitation: Values and their meaning
Statistical analysis: 4-way repeated measures ANOVA (1/3)

4 social/independent variables: 4-way

>1 scores from the respondents repeated measures

Compare means ANOVA

Null-hypotheses:
- There is no effect in the means of factor ‘age’
- There is no effect in the means of factor ‘gender’
- There is no effect in the means of factor ‘education level’
- There is no effect in the means of factor ‘travel behaviour’
- There are no interaction effects
Assumptions:
- Normal distribution per subgroup: Q-Q plot
- Same variance in subgroups:
  smallest variance > 0.5 x biggest variance
- Dependent observations
Statistical analysis: 4-way repeated measures ANOVA (3/3)

- SST = SSG + SSE
- Repeated measures: SSE - SSS
- 4-way -> 4 factors contribute to SSG -> F-values (and effect sizes if significant, partial eta-squared) for every single variable and every possible interaction:
  A, B, C, D
  A*B  A*C  A*D  B*C  B*D  C*D
  A*B*C  A*B*D  A*C*D  B*C*D
  A*B*C*D
Factor analysis (1/2)

- Underlying factors?
Factor analysis (2/2)

- Why?
  - searching for explanations
  - reducing variables
  - getting orthogonal variables (good predictors for regression analysis)

Assumptions:
  - variables at least at interval level
  - enough respondents (n > 10 x number of variables)
Questions
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