

Code switching in dialectal communities in Italy

Alberto A. Sobrero

This paper examines the relationship between code-switching and some sociolinguistic variables, in Italy, and particularly in Salento (Southern Puglia): macro- and microdiglossia (with a discussion upon Trumper's distinction), town/village, formality degree of the situation, age, social network. The author points out an integrated use of the two codes (dialect and Italian): in many Italian areas code switching is an available resource, in addition to the two coexistent codes.

In the second part of the paper the author examines the pragmatic dimension of code switching: its function in telephone calls and in requests for route directions, the relationship between code switching and gestural system and proxemics.

A program of methodological integration among the different approaches to code switching, at least in Italian dialectal communities, is urgently needed.

1. Sociolinguistic variables.

Though code switching (from now on CS) is practised in different ways in various communities, some sociolinguists (Giacalone Ramat, forthcoming) have shown that, in Italian dialectal communities, it is influenced at all events by the traditional sociological parameters - age, education, social background - undoubtedly more than other socio-cultural factors, such as loyalty or group cohesion.¹

After taking these statements for granted, I shall deal with other sociolinguistic problems.

In its macro-dimension, Italian/dialect CS always takes place within a community linguistic repertoire. In this repertoire each of the two codes occupies a position to which a particular constellation of values (stereotypes of positive or negative evaluation, sociolinguistic rules relating every linguistic choice to precise functions, etc.) is linked.

The actual problem lies in the unstableness of this relationship: the position of each code in the repertoire is not fixed but varies, both in time and in social space. When it varies, it causes CS to change, too.

¹ It is known, on the contrary, that in Italian communities abroad loyalty and group cohesion are the most important factors (Bettoni & Gibbon 1987).

Thus, within the same community, CS can change its value (and its related evaluation) as well as its functions.

This is why sociolinguists' diagnoses must be continually updated. In other words, they can be only partially generalized.

1.1. *Microdiglossia and macrodiglossia.*

As to the Italian situation, John Trumper's now classical diagnosis (Trumper 1977) seems a noteworthy example. He distinguishes two types of diglossia, and defines them on the basis of the relationship that, within the repertoire, dialects and dialectal koinai have with regional varieties of Italian.

He points out two conditions: one of macro-diglossia (or, true diglossia) and one of micro-diglossia (or, pseudo-diglossia). Macro-diglossia presents the following characteristics:

- both codes are distributed in a large number of domains
- there is a dialectal koine
- frequent overlapping of codes can be noticed, in functionally ambiguous situations
- mixed-language utterances are frequent in daily interaction
- dialect is socially stratified into varieties and registers.

In macro-diglossia both situational (socially determined) and metaphorical (individual) CS are observed.

According to Trumper, Veneto and Campania are typically macro-diglossic areas.

Here are some characteristics of micro-diglossia (or, pseudo-diglossia):

- one of the two codes is used in very few domains
- there is no koine
- there is a clear functional separation between the codes
- varieties do not mix (there are no mixed-language utterances)
- dialect is not socially differentiated.

Micro-diglossia is characterized only by situational CS (since one of the two codes is limited to few situations).

Emilia-Romagna is a micro-diglossic area, where dialect is limited to small local groups; but also some regions of Southern Italy, such as Calabria and Basilicata, are micro-diglossic areas.

In fact, fifteen years after its first formulation (which was later resumed and completed, but not changed in substance²), Trumper's diagnosis should be revised, particularly in the light of the objections made by Berruto (1987 and 1990). The present situation, in fact, cannot be easily related to Trumper's categories.

In Berruto's words (1990:122)

la quantità relativamente alta di enunciati mistilingui a San Giovanni in Persiceto (campione emiliano) induce a prospettare la necessità di qualche correzione o di ulteriori riflessioni, dato che l'Emilia-Romagna rappresenta tipicamente una situazione di micro-diglossia, in cui dovremmo aspettarci scarsità di enunciati mistilingui.

The relatively large amount of mixed-language utterances in San Giovanni in Persiceto (an Emilia sample) leads one to point out the necessity for some revision or further observations, since, according to Trumper, Emilia-Romagna typically represents a situation of micro-diglossia, in which we should expect a small number of mixed-language utterances.

But these examples can increase. In Catania, Alfonzetti (1993) has discovered characteristics of macro-diglossia: distribution of both codes in many domains, overlapping of codes in functionally ambiguous situations, and a large recurrence of mixed-language utterances; but it is not easy to show the presence of a dialectal koine; besides, in her own survey, dialect does not seem socially stratified in a clear way.

In fact the five sociolinguistic features listed by Trumper often recur in a cross way: for example, in Salento (Southern Puglia: see Sobrero & Romanello 1981 and Sobrero 1992) Italian and dialect recur in almost all domains, overlapping of codes and quite a number of mixed-language utterances can be noticed (these are three macro-features), and at the same time there is no trace of dialectal koine, and dialect is not socially differentiated (these are two micro-features).

In my opinion, the weak point of Trumper's scheme lies not so much in the theoretical model as in its applicability to the diatopic dimension. Though one does not want to consider the Time variable, from a merely diatopic perspective - and a synchronic one - Italian regions (and subregions) are not only very large but mostly very differentiated and heterogeneous areas, not only in their social outline and economic development, and system of attitudes and cultural stereotypes - particularly dialect evaluation - but also, in numerous social and economic factors. This is why a strong social and cultural differentiation cannot but influence the organization of the linguistic repertoire of a community.

In other words, the search for spatial reference of regional dimension can be criticized because the variation is inside every region, inside every town, often inside every village.

If we really intend to give a diatopic representation of the linguistic situation of a region - but also of a town or of a village - we cannot outline it but as a leopard-skin.

² See one of its applications in Mioni (1979) and in Mioni & Amuzzo (1979).

1.2. Town and village.

From the linguistic repertoire now we have come to point out a parameter which, in Italy, seems really fundamental: the typology of the community.³

The recurrence, distribution and function of CS in town, at least in many Italian areas, appear basically different from the country and the village.

IN THE TOWN. With reference to Salento, Sobrero (1992:11-30) has shown elsewhere that in the town the age factor is of great importance: often the elderly, who learnt Italian as adults, while interacting in a formal situation with an Italian-speaking person, start their conversation in Italian, but then they switch - intermittently - to dialect, in order to fill the gaps in their mastery of the language, to emphasize or make comments, even metalinguistic ones.⁴

(1) A che cosa ne pensa, dell'insegnamento del dialetto a scuola?

B è una buona cosa... una buona cosa, perché anche i nostri... i nostri [SOTTOVOCE] aspetta, come se ditte mo... i posteri, no... [A VOLUME NORMALE] eh, i posteri annu a tramandare a lingua nostra

A 'what do you think of the teaching of dialect at school?'

B 'it's a good thing... a good thing, because also our... our [IN A LOW VOICE] wait a moment, how do we say now... to posterity, no... [IN A NORMAL VOICE] eh, to posterity we have to hand down our language'

The production both of CS and of mixed-language speech is common among the elderly: see, in example (1), the mixed-language segment *annu a tramandare a lingua* 'we have to hand down the language'.

Among young people, on the contrary, bilingualism is common: mixed-language utterances are unusual, whilst code alternation is prevalent. The few commutations consist in insertions for quotations, technicalities, pragmatic locutions: *le sat'u, nu sat'u* 'well, I don't know', or in insertions with a function of comment: *si fa una cavalcata: nu m-b-e' ka propju ga'lop, annu, è una sfilata* 'they go for a ride: actually they don't gallop, it's a parade'. The comment is often a humorous one: (*a ballare*) *ci vado proprio poco se no le pesetas se fi nifenu* 'I very seldom go (dancing) otherwise I get through my pesetas'.

³ From now on, my examples will be referred almost exclusively to a specific part of Italy, the Salento (province of Lecce). Regarding what I have stated in the previous paragraph, my following observations cannot be automatically extended to different areas: they can only be compared with the observations one can make for communities with a linguistic and communicative repertoire like the communities of Salento (such as, for instance, the communities studied by Giacalone Ramat, quoted in the text).

⁴ Situation: interview. In the reported fragments the surely dialectal parts are underlined.

If we project the observations in apparent time on real time, it seems that in town people tend to switch from interphrasal alternation to the inclusion of dialectal insertions into an Italian linguistic structure, in which limited and marginal functions of pragmatic type (deictics, tag switching, humorous purpose) and of textual type (comment) are prevalent.

IN THE VILLAGE. Here the variety of behaviour is greater. We find the dialect-speaking person - aged, but also young - who consciously selects dialect, even in the most formal situations; we find the bilingual person, who alternates the codes by controlling perfectly the rules of the choice, based on the situation, and particularly on the interlocutor; and we find the mixer type, who alternates the two codes and produces numerous CS, but mostly produces a great number of mixed-language utterances. The mixer type is particularly common, and it seems very interesting that, in the sample examined in Salento, 50% of the subsample consisted of speakers of this type. The mixer type often reveals a refined ability of metalinguistic analysis:

(2) Questo modo di usare i termini dialettali... eh, credo che questa...

l'interposizione della parola dialettale nel linguaggio corrente che ci sforziamo di usare... molto spesso serve in noi a rimarcare un aspetto o una vicenda o un fatto o un dato in modo più energico rispetto a come si potrebbe fare... usando la lingua italiana. Se per esempio passa una bella ragazza e uno dice "arda che bella" no?... e non riesce ad esprimere con completezza il concetto. Se invece dice, anche se uno sta parlando, dialogando "arda le b:ed:al!" [A VOCE ALTA] esprime con... con maggiore enfasi... con più... fa comprendere meglio il suo pensiero"

"This way of using dialectal terms... eh, I think that this... the

interposition of a dialectal word in the common speech we try hard to use... it very often helps us to point out an aspect or an event or a fact or data in a more emphatic way than we might do... using the Italian language. If, for instance, a nice girl is passing by and one says "look how nice she is" you see?... and he cannot express his idea completely. If, on the contrary, he says, even though one is speaking, talking "look how nice she is" [IN A LOUD VOICE] he expresses with... with greater emphasis... with more... he makes his thought better understood"

The mixer's condition seems to be a very common and absolutely natural one: in the sense that in a village people acquire a mixed competence from childhood. We could say that mixer's mother-tongue is neither dialect nor Italian, but the mixed code.

This can be verified by employing with interviewees the technique used for the first time by Labov, in his classic study on New York City (Labov 1966): by eliciting the account of situations in which the interviewee believes s/he has been in serious danger of death. In this way, an emotional involvement is obtained, which determines choices of

style - and particularly choices of code - that are more spontaneous than those made in the other parts of the interview. In the surveys made by NADIR (New Atlas of Dialect and Italian for Regions) in Salento up to now (See Sobrero et al. 1991), however, this stimulus has never produced a preferential choice for dialect in subjects of the mixer type. On the contrary, at least in two cases in this very section of the interview, a clear preferential choice for Italian has been noticed. Though there are incidental explanations (nowadays, the narrative structure is induced by a radio-TV model endowed with great prestige, and this also determines - most probably - the code selection; the choice of Italian may be induced by the convergence to an interlocutor which is estimated as prevalently Italian speaking), but the fact is significant, in any case.

Even in case of emotional involvement the mixer does not show a preferred code: therefore his mother-tongue is the mixed code.

1.3. The 'situation' variable

After discussing the concepts of macro- and micro-diglossia and considering the town/country variable, let's now deal with the situation variable, with particular reference to a village.

The situation plays a very important role, especially regarding the 'formality' degree.

In a formal situation, with asymmetrical roles, CS from dialect into Italian is common. In this case the importance of the situation of formality - and of role relationships - is so strong that it can overcome the 'normal' tendency to conversational convergence.

In the following fragment, recorded in a municipal office, employee B starts his turn in dialect, accepting his interlocutor's code selection, but soon afterwards he switches into Italian:

(3) F So di:-ak:ordu ku s:in uria ma kiru ka l-a tati ste kosi ka lu datori di lavoro l-a dati lu kontributi sapia ka (...)

B kwel:u sa kosa e sul:es:u. ka magari a invertitu (...) 'a invertito.. kwel:a ke mi dovevi dare al komune.. te la sej tenuta a k:asa.

F I agree with you but he who has given you these things that the employer has given you these contributions (he) knew that (...)

B 'That one, you know what has happened, that perhaps has exchanged (...) has exchanged.. the one you were to give me at the municipal office.. you have kept it at home'.

1.3.1. Children and the formality degree of the situation.

In 1991, in Salento, we carried out a campaign of interviews in 14 places, to children of different social rank and belonging to two age groups: 8 to 10, and 11 to 14 years. On the whole, 98 interviews were recorded: they were conducted in a relatively informal way, about matters of immediate interest (such as Christmas presents, the family, etc.). Then we noticed the code selection and the recurrence of CS, and we compared the data collected in this way with the behaviour of the same children observed in a situation of absolute spontaneity (while playing, in the family, etc.).

Among the results, this seems the most interesting one: most children build the 'interview' situation - though it was conducted by a known person, in an informal way - into a formal situation: they put aside their natural behaviour (which is strongly dialect-speaking) and engage in starting and keeping the high code (Italian) during the whole conversation. CS are relatively unusual and uncontrolled, whilst uncontrolled mixed forms are more recurrent. The youngest children produce more CS than pre-teenagers (this confirms the thesis of Meisel 1990).

Social class does not seem to be influential.

This is a convincing interpretation: during their early socialization, the children in these places acquire (mostly through school, and probably also through TV) strict rules of sociolinguistic behaviour: they have to speak Italian to those who speak Italian in a situation considered, or built, as a formal one; they can/have to speak dialect in all other situations.

The characteristics of this model are two:

a) from the 'conversational' perspective it is a model of convergence (they have to adapt to their interlocutor), which strengthens the stimuli to convergence already provided through 'baby talk'. In this sense it is a strong model;

b) from the 'sociolinguistic' perspective it has its remote foundation on a hypothesis of diglossia. Children introject it and use it until when they are subjected to the action of school and of the agencies of primary socialization. But they will put it aside soon afterwards, because it is not very adherent to the sociolinguistic reality of the area which, on the contrary, is no longer diglossic, as we have already seen.

1.3.2. Adults and the situation.

As a matter of fact, many surveys prove that in dialect-speaking communities the behaviour of adults no longer follows this model or follows it in a much less strict way (see the numerous examples provided by Alfonzetti 1993). Among adults CS becomes an available resource, in addition to the two coexistent codes (Auer 1984, Lüdi & Py 1986,

Myers Scotton 1988: see also the concept of 'bilingual's speech modes' by Grosjean (forthcoming). It can be used for different purposes, and it has a weak link with the formality degree of the situation.

A complex example of CS based on the situation, and particularly on the interlocutor, is provided by Giacalone Ramat (forthcoming): it concerns the interactions in a foodstore in Nibbiano (in the province of Piacenza), where the owners generally speak dialect with the people of the village, and Italian with customers they do not know and with the village children and youth, whose preferred code is Italian. This rule causes a linguistic production rich in CS, part of which has the function 'CS related to the interlocutor'.

Further research (Collovà & Petrini 1981, Sobrero 1992:81-94 and others) allows us to generalize the rule: in rural communities waiters, shop-assistants, pedlars, hairdressers, and generally 'tradesmen' master a complex system of rules very well, which implies, so to say, the 'integrated use of the two codes': not only the choice and change of code referring to the interlocutor, but also the mixed use of the two codes (dialect insertions with function of comment or emphasis, quotation, pet phrase, etc.). From the conversational perspective, we could speak of hyperconvergence in this case (of course, as far as average behaviour is concerned).

The surveys made for NADIR confirm this, as demonstrated by the following fragments of interaction. The first one was recorded at the Fair of San Nicola in Salve (in the province of Lecce).

- (4) B kwat:ro ma:le:te djet:fi mila lire.. kwat:ro... volete ma:le:te kolarate
kwat:ro djet:fi mila lire?
B 'four T-shirts ten thousand lire.. four... do you want coloured T-shirts
four ten thousand lire?'
- (5) B t'e s:u b:e:l:e ste ma:le:te kwat:ru djet:fi mila lire
B 'how fine these T-shirts are four ten thousand lire'
- (6) D ± pero t-a misurari sip:urria ka si 'no no la pots:u pijari
B e iu titilia ka me ntsurul...
D me!
B mo a fare veramente ku m:e spoju b:a me mintu la dzak:a [B si
spoglia per indossare la giacca] dopu kai provamu te la piji no?! non e
ka..
D '± but you have to try it on otherwise I cannot buy it'
B 'and I used to say that I would get married!...'
D 'drop it!'
B 'now let's put it really that I undress and put on the jacket [B undresses
to put on the jacket] after we have tried it you'll buy it, won't you? I
you won't!..'

The seller B alternatively shouts in Italian (cf.(4)) and in dialect (cf.(5)) but, when talking with his customers, he immediately converges on the choice of the code and register preferred by them (cf.(6)).

Thus, the seller alternates Italian and dialect, preferring to use the former when in public and the latter when in private. But - and this is the most interesting aspect - generally he also uses a 'mixed-language speech', especially during the negotiations with his customer.

These negotiations present two conflicting features: on the one hand they have all the characteristics of 'private negotiation' (they bargain over the price of an item), on the other hand they take place 'in public'. The seller wants to achieve the highest price, but he also has other reasons, in a certain sense conflicting with the first: on the one hand he wants to show his customer that he is giving him a very special discount, granted only to him (exclusiveness), on the other hand he wants to show his generosity and his willingness to bystanders, in order to turn them into customers (involvement). This double function, public-private and of exclusiveness-involvement, causes a form of linguistic behaviour in which we can notice alternating solutions and intermediate solutions, such as the choice of an Italianized dialect, or a strongly regional Italian, or - often - of a mixed-language speech:

- (7) A [discute sulla taglia di un paio di mutande che la cliente sta acquistando]
ma l-e'lastiku lu pwei puru kambjare! no te prok:upare l-e'lastiku e
b:wonu. gwarda.. stavolta.. e de kwali'ta b:ona kwesta kwa.
B [discusses about the size of a pair of knickers that the customer is
buying] 'but the elastic you can also change it! don't worry the elastic is
'good.. look.. this time.. it is good quality this one'

Something similar also happens at the hairdresser's. B is the hairdresser, D a friend-customer:

- (8) B avre:b:e dovuto kjamarti in disparte a 'dirtelo (...) <-- buned:a --> vap:ona
bambolina na: na bimba ± komu ie.. kira vap:ona no s:apimu t'e fine a
fat:U
D + la vap:ona kwa + la mam:a i [la vap:ona k-e moria..
B m:..
D al:ora kwe'fa kwa... i:u e k:ap:atu lu ts:itu l-a
l:as:ata. l-a: l-a kjusa nru lu konventu i li sworl .. a Trikase.
B 'she should have called you aside and told you (...) <-- lovely --> little
girl little doll better still a child + as you .. that little girl we don't know
what happened to her'
D + 'the little girl here + the mother of this little girl who is dead.'
B 'm:..
D 'so this one. it has happened her fiancé has left her, he has shut her up in
the convent of the nuns, in Tricase.'

B's competence is, however, not only bilingual (dialect and Italian). Her most frequent productions, in the presence of two or more interlocutors, are alternating or mixed:

(9) B e.. tua madre.. a kiru repartu sta?

B 'and.. your mother.. which yard is she in'?

Both at the market and at the hairdresser's the change of inter- and intraphrasal code is continuous and completely 'non-marked'.

In conclusion, we can state that 'both the choice and the change of code (in its various forms) are not marked functionally,⁵ and - as it seems - not even socially' (see Sobretero forthcoming for four proofs of this diagnosis).

1.4. The social network.

A situation like the one shown in these examples - that is a linguistic situation more usual in villages and in the country, but also in many small towns, especially in the South of Italy - is clearly and completely referred to in the considerations of Berruto. According to him a relatively high frequency of commutations of code and mixed-language utterances *contemporarily* (i.e. of bilingual speech) should be typical of situations with little or no conflict between the codes and of their consequent large area of overlapping and interpenetration (Berruto 1990: 130).

The concept of 'communication network' then acquires great importance. A limited conflict between the codes is observed in closed and multiplex networks, just like rural communities.

In-network relationship (usually not very formal) favours CS: and this is easily verifiable in the analysis of conversations. Let's examine the case of telephone calls (Tempesta 1992).

Contrary to what happens in face-to-face interaction, the opening of telephone-calls takes place 'in the dark', and the first turns of conversation consist in mutual acknowledgment and negotiation both of the code and of the register. In a village, between interlocutors of middle-low social class, this phase of acknowledgment and negotiation ends in the first four turns: in the second and the third turn, one of the two interlocutors uses a dialectal marker of low formality which allows - and starts - a process of convergence to dialect from both of them (cf.(10) and (11)).

⁵ On the hypothesis of non-markedness of CS in certain communities, see also Myers Scotton (1983) and Spolsky (1983).

(10) A pronto?..
B e: Luidg : *i ?*
--> A *se*

B tj:ao (...)
A 'hello?
B e: Luidg : *i ?*
--> A *yea*

B hallo (...)'

(11) A pronto?..
B (NOME) ?!

A e: Donato!.

B e: tlao

--> A mē?

A 'hello?.

B (NAME) ?!

A e: Donato!.

B e: hallo

--> A mē?

As we can see, this function of CS is conversational, and it is basic for the organization of telephone interaction; but it can be activated - and it can give rise to convergence - only between interlocutors situated in neighbouring nodes of the same social network.

If we pass from rural networks to urban networks, the enlargement of networks increases, matters, enriches individual experience, and favours a larger group identification (Mioni 1991:26). The different structure of communication networks also explains the different presence of mixed-language speech and of code variation: in town, contacts with non-dialect-speaking people increase and, consequently, the action of 'filter of the interlocutor' (Giacalone Ramat 1979) increases as well, so that it increases the percentage of CS controlled by the interlocutor.

We can define this statement better, with the help of still unpublished data, again referring to Salento: the choice and the change of code present a connection with role relationship; and this is much stronger in villages than in towns. This fact can be explained only if we consider the different structure of rural and urban networks.

1.5. More variables.

Of course, the definitions of 'village' and 'town' related to network are merely indicative. Actually there are two patterns: we can find an open and not very multiplex network in a village, and closed and multiplex networks in small towns.

The interference of a 'strong' local variable, for example an ideological choice, is able to modify presence, habits and functions of

CS. This is the case, quoted by Alfonzetti, of the different yearning for integration into the State, in these years of strong tendencies to regional and local autonomy.

In these cases, it will be necessary to single out, one by one, variables such as social structure, social styles (Kallmeyer & Keim 1988), group organization, etc.

2. *The conversational variables.*

So far we have dealt with sociolinguistic variables (macro-and micro-diglossia, town/village, formality degree of the situation, age, social network, etc.). But the choice of CS can also be governed by strictly 'local' rules of behaviour, appraisable only with the specific analysis of the single communicative interaction. This kind of inquiry is typical of the conversational analysis (see, for instance, the studies of Peter Auer, of Aldo di Luzio and of the Konstanz School). I will not deal with this point any longer.

I would like to say a few words, instead, about other variables, which are not often considered in all their importance, maybe because in the tradition of studies on speech they are not considered as classic variables, either sociolinguistic or conversational. I want to recall two of them which, in my opinion, are the most relevant.

2.1. *Pragmatic frameworks of the linguistic event.*

Let's consider the case of the telephone call structure once again. The telephone call - as a 'neutral' event - has its own linguistic etiquette, perfectly known to all of us who use the telephone. In a dialect-speaking setting this etiquette is re-modelled with a series of additional rules, adjusted to local, linguistic and pragmatic resources. Immacolata Tempesta (1992) has reconstructed these 'rules', in a local declension, and limited them to the openings.

The selection and change of code are entirely part of the linguistic and paralinguistic means which perform, in the openings, eight different conversational functions: 1) willingness to telephone cooperation, 2) acknowledgment, 3) opening salutations, 4) negotiation of code and register, 5) opening of focus (link function) / request and assurance of attention, 6) apologies, 7) greetings, 8) expression of emotions and moods.

CS operates particularly in the first four functions, and mostly in the phases of:

- 'acknowledgment': the linguistic choice, oriented to dialect or Italian, serves to state network relationships, formality degrees, etc. (Tempesta 1992:141); thus, within the acknowledgment, CS carries out functions of definition of the communicative situation, self-introduction

and convergence: in other words, CS becomes constitutive of the 'acknowledgment' phase;

- 'negotiation of code and register': the openings with CS into dialect always concern in-network telephone calls, with a low formality; regarding the sociolinguistic dimension CS in the lower and lower-middle social class is common - in both directions - for adaptation to the interlocutor's code selection. In other words, CS conveys the sociolinguistic information, which is of basic importance to settle the negotiation.

Telephone calls, as well as medical examinations, the game of bowls, the offer of a cup of coffee, etc. follow quite constant rituals. Every single event, both from the linguistic perspective and from the pragmatic one, consists of two strata: a basic 'framework', and a series of 'free variations', considered acceptable by the community.

What is the relationship between the basic framework and CS? Which position does CS occupy in the free variation? Which functions are prevalent in each phase of the interaction? What relationship is there between these rules and the sociolinguistic outline of the single speaker, and of the community? In my opinion, some factors, in which sociolinguistic and conversational variables cross one another, deserve deeper attention than that we have devoted to them so far.

2.2. *Gestural system and proxemics.*

In my opinion, gestural system and proxemics are pragmatic variables of great interest.

As has been shown in various studies (finally in Sobrero 1992:161-172, with a calculation of the correlation index on a sample of 456 linguistic productions), in the Southern Italian area the gestural system is positively related to the use of dialect. In a situation of coexistence of the two codes, we can easily show that there is also a relationship - a complex one - between the gestural system and CS. Certainly, this relationship exists in the system of greetings, as graduate Arseni has shown in her degree thesis *Il sistema dei saluti a Marittima* (LE), University of Lecce (1991).

Personally, I am not acquainted with studies on a direct relationship between the gestural system and CS.

2.3. *Other factors.*

Finally, there are other factors on the boundary between pragmatics, stylistics and cultural anthropology, to which we should turn our attention. I refer to cognitive-linguistic structures such as spatiality and deixis, and to forms of cultural 'imprinting', such as the system of shared knowledge, cultural and linguistic stereotypes of community,

argumentative style of group or community. I am speaking of the different 'prestige' of dialect: a factor subjected to remarkable and swift variations in time (the same community changes attitude within a few years) and in space (the attitude is completely different in neighbouring communities) and related to social changes, to the spreading of ideologies, to the existence of opinion leaders and to the range of their influence, etc.

3. *Social variables and conversational variables.*

Now I would like to put in a word in favour of the interaction between the sociolinguistic approach to CS and the conversational one.

In every articulation of verbal interaction the speaker has to make a lot of linguistic and paralinguistic choices: of register, style, tone and loudness of voice, speed and rhythm of morphological, phonetic and lexical level, etc. One of these choices - governing the other ones from the perspective of the interaction organization - concerns the code: the speaker selects it from the ones in his repertoire, but the initial choice is not necessarily definitive. It may happen that: 1) the code selection is renegotiated during the interaction; 2) the speaker changes his code - even for very short fragments of conversation - for stylistic "variatio".

In both cases it seems methodologically improper to consider CS only within the sociolinguistic setting or only within the conversational setting in which it is produced. In both cases, we shall have only a partial vision, and any explanation of CS will not be satisfactory.

The integration between the sociolinguistic approach and the conversational one undoubtedly has a greater explanatory power, especially because the relationship between the two orders of variables is very, very close.

3.1. *Requests for route directions.*

Let us consider the ways of asking for route directions. Between the first and the second turn we can notice confirmation or variation of code. Normally, the person questioned converges on the code selected by the interviewer; but it may also happen that the interviewer uses dialect and the informant uses Italian, or vice-versa.

De Masi (1992) has considered a large corpus of requests for route directions and has calculated - with the χ^2 test - the relationship between question code and answer code by using place (village or town), sex, age group, social rank and education level as control variables. In other words, he has analysed the problem of the statistical ratio between CS which takes place within the first and the second turn and the main social variables. This is his comment on the related statistical table:

(...) Si può, quindi, affermare che un soggetto appartenente al ceto medio, di età non superiore a cinquant'anni e che viva in paese difficilmente utilizzerà un codice differente dal codice domanda. I dati in nostro possesso ci dicono che nelle condizioni descritte si ha una 'variazione' di codice (CS per alternanza di codice) nel 20,39% dei casi, una 'permanenza' di codice (assenza di CS) nel 61,85% dei casi, e una oscillazione (codice misto) nel 17,76%

(...) We can, therefore, state that a subject belonging to the middle class, not older than 50 and living in a village, will most likely not use a code different from the question one. Data in our possession show us that, in the conditions described, a 'variation' of code (CS for code alternation) can be noted in 20,39% of cases, a 'permanence' of code (absence of CS) in 61,85% of cases, and a 'fluctuation' (mixed code) in 17,76%

As we can see, some social variables strongly interfere with the dynamics of the conversation, to the point of making certain conversational choices statistically very probable in particular points of the interaction.

As I have just said, CS is the most relevant of these conversational choices - or, at least, it is strategically predominant.

Thus, a program of methodological integration among the different approaches to CS, at least in Italian dialectal communities, is urgently needed.

Address of the Author:

Alberto A. Sobrero
Dipartimento di Filologia Linguistica e Letteratura
Università di Lecce
Piazza Arco di Trionfo
73100 Lecce
Italy

References

- Alfonzetti, G. (1993), "Italiano e dialetto nel discorso: modalità sintattiche del contatto", in Moretti, Petrini & Bianconi (1993:353-380).
- Auer, P. (1984), "On the meaning of conversational code-switching", in Auer & Di Luzio (1984:87-108).
- Auer, P. & A. Di Luzio (1984), *Interpretive Sociolinguistics*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Berruto, G. (1987), *Sociolinguistica dell'italiano contemporaneo*, Roma, La Nuova Italia Scientifica.
- Berruto, G. (1990), "Italiano regionale, commutazione di codice e enunciati mistilingui", in Cortelazzo & Mioni (1990:105-130).
- Beitoni, C. & J. Gibbons (1987), "Italian speakers in Australia: creative in practice, but traditional in attitudes", *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, series S, 4:66-80.
- Collovà, P. & D. Petrini (1981), "Lingua, dialetto e commutazione di codice: interazioni verbali in un negozio del Luganese", *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 5-6:257-293.
- Colombo, ed. (1979), *Guida all'educazione linguistica*, Bologna, Zanichelli.
- Cortelazzo, M.A. & A.A. Mioni, eds. (1990), *L'italiano regionale*, Roma, Bulzoni.
- De Masi, S. (1992), "Fatti conversazionali, variabili socioculturali e scelte linguistiche nell'indicazione stradale", in Sobrero (1992:173-193).
- Dittmar, N. & P. Schlobinski, eds. (1988), *The Sociolinguistics of Urban Vernaculars*, Berlin / New York, Mouton - De Gruyter: 232-257.
- Foresti, F. & A.A. Sobrero, eds. (1991), *Dialetti Realtà Ricerca*, Bologna, CLUEB.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. (1979), *Lingua, dialetto e comportamento linguistico. La situazione di Gressoney, Aosta*, Musumeci.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. (forthcoming), "Code switching in dialectal communities: effects on language shift", in *Papers for the Workshop on Broader Considerations*, European Science Foundation, Bruxelles (22-24 november 1990).
- Grosjean, F. (forthcoming), "The psycholinguistics of language contact and codeswitching: concepts, methodology and data", in *Papers for the Workshop on Concepts, Methodology and Data*, European Science Foundation (Basel, 12-13 January 1990).
- Heller, M., ed. (1988), *Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, Berlin / New York, Mouton - De Gruyter.
- Kallmeyer, W. & I. Keim (1988), "The symbolization of social identity. Ethnography and analysis of linguistic variation in a project about urban communication in Mannheim", in Dittmar & Schlobinski (1988:232-257).
- Labov, W. (1966), *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, Washington, Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lüdi, G. & B. Py (1986), *Etre bilingue*, Berne, P. Lang.
- Meisel, J.M. (1990), *Two First Languages. Early Grammatical Development in Bilingual Children*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- Mioni, A.M. (1979), "La situazione sociolinguistica italiana: lingua, dialetti, italiani regionali", in Colombo (1979:101-114).
- Mioni, A.M. (1991), "Il punto di vista della sociolinguistica", in Foresti & Sobrero (1991:17-34).
- Mioni, A.M. & A.M. Arnuzzo Lanszweert (1979), "Sociolinguistics in Italy", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 21:81-107.
- Moretti, B., D. Petrini & S. Bianconi, eds. (1993), *Linee di tendenza dell'italiano contemporaneo*, Roma, Bulzoni.
- Myers Scotton, C. (1983), "The negotiation of identities in conversation: a theory of markedness and code choice", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44:115-136.
- Myers Scotton, C. (1988), "Codeswitching as indexical of social negotiations" in Heller (1988:151-186).
- Simone, R. & U. Vignuzzi, eds. (1977), *Problemi della ricostruzione in linguistica*, Roma, Bulzoni.
- Sobrero, A.A., ed. (1992), *Il dialetto nella conversazione. Ricerche di dialettologia pragmatica*, Galatina, Congedo.
- Sobrero, A.A. (forthcoming), "Sociolinguistic variables of code switching in dialectal communities", in *Papers for the Summer School on Code-Switching and Language Contact*, European Science Foundation (Pavia, 9-12 September 1992).
- Sobrero, A.A. & M.T. Romanello (1981), *L'italiano come si parla in Salento*, Lecce, Milella.
- Sobrero, A.A., M.T. Romanello & I. Tempesta (1991), *Lavorando al NADIR. Un'idea per un atlante linguistico*, Galatina, Congedo.
- Spolsky, B. (1983), "Comment", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 39:129-137.
- Tempesta, I. (1992), "Mezzi linguistici e strategie conversazionali in aperture di telefonate", in Sobrero (1992:115-142).
- Trumper, J. (1977), "Ricostruzione nell'Italia settentrionale: sistemi consonantici. Considerazioni sociolinguistiche nella diacronia", in Simone & Vignuzzi (1977: 259-310).