

“GOING BILINGUAL”: CODESWITCHING DURING CHURCH SERVICES IN SOUTH TUCSON, ARIZONA

Amanda Snell

University of Arizona

The current paper uses Myers-Scotton’s (1998) markedness model to examine codeswitching in a United Methodist church in South Tucson, Arizona. From transcriptions of church services (n=20,569), the frequency of each language overall (SP=39.89%, EN=60.11%) and in sermons (SP=40.83%, EN=59.17%), prayers (SP=43.61%, EN=56.39%), and announcements (SP=34.78%, EN=65.22%) was determined. Spanish was the marked code, while English was the unmarked code. In addition, the frequency of codeswitches (n=938) was determined. The study contributes to current literature on codeswitching by highlighting the linguistic creativity and expertise the participants use while codeswitching in a church setting.

Keywords: bilingual services, codeswitching, language choice, markedness model

INTRODUCTION

San Juan Methodist Church in South Tucson, Arizona, offers one weekly Sunday service in which all aspects, including the songs, printed bulletins, and PowerPoint presentations, are fully bilingual. Bilingual Spanish/English speakers, as well as monolingual speakers of English and Spanish, attend the service, and the pastor shifts between English and Spanish to accommodate the linguistic preferences of all attendees. The current study examines this use of codeswitching, that is, the alternation between Spanish and English within “single conversational episodes” (Auer, 1998, p. 1), in this newly bilingual Protestant church. The study addresses the following research questions:

- 1) What is the frequency of each language (English and Spanish) in the bilingual church service?
- 2) Using frequency counts, which language is marked according to Myers-Scotton’s (1998) markedness model?
- 3) What patterns of language alternation can be observed during the church service?
- 4) What factors impact language choice and codeswitching during bilingual services?

The paper will begin with a literature review which defines codeswitching, introduces Myers-Scotton’s (1983, 1998) markedness model, and describes other sociolinguistic research in church settings. Then, the maxims which characterize the markedness model will be applied to data collected from bilingual church services in South Tucson. Finally, data on the frequency of Spanish, English, and codeswitching during four bilingual church services will be presented,

along with a description of what the data reveal about patterns of codeswitching at the church in which data were collected. Results reveal that, while codeswitching appeared to be the unmarked choice for bilingual interactions in the church, English was the unmarked code choice overall in the services (60.11%, n=12,365), but particularly in the linguistically more spontaneous aspects of the sermon, such as announcements (65.22%, n=3,223). In addition, the analysis revealed that speakers uttered an average of 21.93 words before codeswitching, and unlike other studies on codeswitching in churches (Alfaraz, 2009), codeswitching took place at the sentence level, rather than between sections of discourse.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

Codeswitching

Codeswitching is defined as an individual’s use of two or more language varieties in the same speech event or interaction (King & Chetty, 2014; Wei, 2013; Woolard, 2005). Studies of codeswitching can focus on language structure (Muysken, 2000), the social and communicative functions of the codeswitch, that is, the “immediate social and communicative contexts in which it occurs” (Gumperz, 1982; King & Chetty, 2014, p. 43; Zentella, 1997), or they can investigate both structural and social features (Auer, 1984; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Poplack, 2004).

Researchers concur that it takes great linguistic skill and creativity to codeswitch. Codeswitching is “systematic, rule-governed, and requires a great deal of bilingual competence” (Moro, 2015, p. 403). It is also a creative act. Wei (2013) defines creativity as “the ability to choose between following and flouting the rules and norms of behavior, including the use of language, and to push and break boundaries between the old and the new, the conventional and the original, the acceptable and the challenging” (p. 372). She argues that, in addition to creativity, codeswitching displays speakers’ symbolic competence (Kramsch, 2006), which is the ability of speakers to “shape the very context in which the language is learned and used” (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2008, p. 664).

Nevertheless, a wide variety of literature on codeswitching in and outside of school contexts has shown that speakers often associate the practice with deficit and shame (King & Chetty, 2014; Wei, 2013). King and Chetty (2014) suggest that “[w]hat is needed now is an understanding of CS that recognizes the co-construction of content meaning using the available language resources at hand in the classroom” (p. 48). Wei (2013) adds that that codeswitching research requires more “analytic approaches that transcend traditional disciplinary boundaries” (p. 376). Though a review of all the literature on codeswitching is beyond the scope of this paper, the following literature review will examine speakers’ motivations for codeswitching, focusing specifically on Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model and codeswitching in church settings.

Rights and Obligations Sets

Focusing on the social motivations for codeswitching, Blom and Gumperz (1972) distinguished between situational and metaphorical (or conversational) codeswitching (p. 425). The difference lies primarily in whether codeswitching involves changes in speakers’ rights and obligations (RO) sets, which Myers-Scotton (1998) defines as “codes of behavior that are established and maintained by the social group” (p. 24). In the case of *situational codeswitching*, a change in code signals (and is triggered by) “clear changes in the participants’ definition of each other’s rights and obligation” (Blom and Gumperz, 1972, p. 424). This definition of codeswitching parallels Fishman’s (1972) conception of diglossia, in which two language codes are compartmentalized and accomplish different sets of functions (Sebba, 2011). According to

Fishman's notion of diglossia, for example, community members may use the more prestigious language variety to speak with interlocutors with authority, and the less prestigious variety in informal settings with less prominent interlocutors. In this way, they may engage in situational codeswitching. *Metaphorical switching*, on the other hand, the focus of many current sociolinguistic studies (Woolard, 2005), does not indicate changes in the rights and obligations of interactants. Instead, codeswitching can serve as a metaphor for the other roles a speaker (or language variety) occupies. Therefore, metaphorical codeswitching has a "social indexical effect" (Woolard, 2005, p. 3) which depends on interactants' consciousness of the associations and connotations of language. An example of this social indexical effect may be seen in data Myers-Scotton (2002, p. 214) presented of a bilingual Banda mother's interactions with a child, during which she codeswitches from Chichewa into English to emphasize a consequence:

Bwera kuno. Dzakhale ndi mwana bwera. OR ELSE ndikupatsa nchito zitatu
(Come here. Come stay with the baby. Or else I'll give you three chores).

In this example, the mother briefly switches from Chichewa into English to emphasize the seriousness of her threat to assign chores if the child does not obey. The effect of this codeswitch depends on the child recognizing the symbolic meaning of the switch to "or else."

According to Myers-Scotton (1993, p. 60), however, speakers always negotiate their "positions in rights-and-obligations balances" when they codeswitch. She holds that the RO set, defined as "a theoretical construct for referring to what participants can expect in any given interaction type in the community" (Myers-Scotton, 1998, p. 23), is a critical component of explaining codeswitching choices. Therefore, her definition of codeswitching does not align with the claim of metaphorical switching that codeswitching does not indicate a change in RO sets. Instead, she argues that language choices are determined as marked or unmarked according to particular RO sets, or "codes of behavior that are established and maintained by the social group" (Myers-Scotton, 1998, p. 24). The unmarked choice is "the linguistic variety which is the most expected, while the marked choice is most unusual" (Myers-Scotton, 1993, p. 89). Speakers choose to use the marked or unmarked code to accomplish certain sociopragmatic purposes.

The RO set may be precarious, at times, in the case of a pastor. Unlike individual speakers negotiating with individual interlocutors, the pastor represents a variety of rights and obligations, including his religious beliefs, his role as an employee overseen by a board of English-speaking church leaders, and his role as a pastor to a congregation he leads, but which also supports him financially. At the same time, he is speaking to congregation members with their own sets of rights and obligations as participants in the church community, differing ways of using the codes outside the church, and expectations for worship.

The Markedness Model

Myers-Scotton (1983) first proposed the markedness model to "[explain] variation in linguistic code choices" (p. 132) and to acknowledge the sociopragmatic functions of codeswitching. However, she argued that negotiation, not cooperation, as Grice (1975) had suggested, was the key implicature involved between interactants. Myers-Scotton's markedness model for codeswitching thus consists of maxims that govern the negotiation of identity in conversation. It "relies on the premise that participants in conversation interpret all code choices in terms of a natural theory of markedness" (p. 115). In other words, the speakers compare a code choice to the norms of their speech community and recognize it as marked or unmarked based on their understanding of the rights and obligations required in the interaction. Myers-Scotton's model (1998) proposes the following maxims (p. 26):

Table 1: Myers-Scotton’s (1998) Markedness Model

1) The Unmarked Choice Maxim	“Make your code choice the unmarked index of the unmarked rights and obligations set in talk exchanges when you wish to establish or affirm that rights and obligations set.”
2) The Marked Choice Maxim	“Make a marked choice which is not the unmarked index of the unmarked rights and obligations set in an interaction when you wish to establish a new rights and obligations set as unmarked for the current exchange.”
3) The Exploratory Choice Maxim	“When an unmarked choice is not clear, use switching between speech varieties to make alternate exploratory choices as alternate candidates for the unmarked choice and thereby as an index of a rights and obligations set which you favor.”
4) Deference Maxim	“Switch to a code which expresses deference to others when special respect is called for by the circumstances.”
5) Virtuosity Maxim	“Switch to whatever code is necessary in order to carry on the conversation / accommodate the participation of all speakers present.”

According to this model, speakers assess the RO set of the interactional context and then make an unmarked or marked linguistic choice. Sometimes, the marked choice is made out of consideration for the audience, such as when speakers draw upon the virtuosity maxim to make a marked choice when they or their listeners cannot communicate fluently in the unmarked variety. Other times, speakers may show deference to those who demand special respect or “to those from whom [they] desire something” (Myer-Scotton, 1983, p. 123). This commonly occurs when children speak to their parents in formal language while preparing to make a request.

At other times, speakers may use the marked variety to symbolically acknowledge other identities. Myers-Scotton’s (1983) markedness model includes a multiple-identities maxim as part of the exploratory choice maxim, which states that speakers may “optionally make more than one exploratory choice as metaphors for multiple RO sets, thereby implicating multiple identities for oneself” (p. 126). This maxim is often adhered to in public discourse, such as when a speaker begins with an informal style, like a joke, before shifting to an authoritative style. Myers-Scotton does not specify situational features for an RO set, because the RO set is “derived from whatever situational features are salient for the community for that interaction type (Myers-Scotton, 1998, p. 24). Furthermore, these situational features are not static, but “the hierarchical relation of one feature to another feature in an interaction type may change” (p. 24). In other words, the markedness model is flexible and applicable to a variety of interaction types.

Myers-Scotton (1983) points out that codeswitching can fall into a variety of the maxims above depending on the context. For bilingual speakers, codeswitching may be “an unmarked choice [...] in certain conventionalized exchanges; it is an exploratory choice under the multiple-identities maxim in nonconventionalized exchanges; and finally, it is a marked choice which flouts the unmarked-choice maxim in certain conventionalized exchanges” (p. 122). Since each code speakers use represents a unique RO set, the act of codeswitching “symbolizes the dual identities of the bilingual speakers” (p. 122). Therefore, codeswitching may be used with motivations of “establishing or affirming multiple identities by using more than one code” (p. 123). The pastor, however, may not just be trying to establish his own multiple identities, but may codeswitch with the motivation of affirming multiple identities, as he seeks to unite English

and Spanish speakers into a relatively new bilingual church community. The success of this new community may depend on the validation of the multiple identities that participants hold.

Rational Choice Models

Another key concept of Myers-Scotton's markedness model is rational choice. In fact, she considers the markedness model one type of rational choice model, with theoretical underpinnings in Elster's (1989) rational choice model. Elster's (1989) model suggests that speakers' ability to choose rationally is governed by two filters: external and internal constraints. External constraints include situational factors, such as socioeconomic status, age, gender, and ethnicity, which lead to an opportunity set. Applied to codeswitching, Myers-Scotton (2002) interprets the opportunity set to mean a speaker's linguistic repertoire, discourse strategies, and cultural-specific views of appropriate interaction (Myers-Scotton, 2002, p. 207). Constraints internal to the speaker include the "markedness evaluator," which Myers-Scotton (1999) defines as a speaker's sense of "the degree to which alternative linguistic choices are unmarked or marked for a given interaction type" (p. 1261). Finally, Myers-Scotton (2002) proposes a third filter, rational choice, in which "speakers take account of what they *want* to do and what they think they *can* do" (Myers-Scotton, 2002, p. 208) and act accordingly. The rational choice models, in sum, argues that "speakers recognize that all choices impose costs and supply benefits to both groups and individuals" (p. 1270) when choosing to use the marked or unmarked code.

One premise of Rational Choice models is that speakers almost always have multiple identities, reflected by their linguistic choices (Myers-Scotton, 2002, p. 206). However, purely rational choice may be limited by speakers' conformity, the need to interact effectively, and risk aversion (Myers-Scotton, 1999, p. 1264). In addition, they must also consider their listeners when making choices. Myers-Scotton (2002) argues that "speakers engaging in codeswitching (CS) choose as individuals, but simultaneously behave as group members because they know that how their choices are interpreted depend on the values their listeners subscribe to or accept" (p. 205). In other words, speakers cannot simply choose the optimal or fairest code:

"The unmarked choice is not necessarily the one that gives all the actors what they consider the best or the fairest outcome; rather, the unmarked choice is only the choice which is most *expected*. It may also be the most *feasible*. And at least for certain types of interactions (e.g., potentially status-raising situations), what makes an unmarked choice expected is that it conforms to ideas about markedness of those persons in the community of power and prestige, *those who set norms for these interactions*." (Myers-Scotton, 1999, p. 1263)

Questions about the expected and feasible choices for interactions, as well as who sets the norms for expectation and feasibility, are particularly interesting in settings in which speakers have multiple addressees, such as in the bilingual church setting. As the church's demographics shift, so can the expectations for code choice. The pastor's ability to act rationally is certainly constrained by his need to conform to the rules, the need to interact with each member of the congregation, and to avoid the risk of alienating members by using marked codes (including by not codeswitching when codeswitching would otherwise be the appropriate choice for the situation.) Under the markedness model, the speakers' goal is to "enhance rewards and minimize costs; in two words, the goal is *to optimize*. What this means is that speakers choose one variety over another because of the benefits they expect from that choice, relative to its costs" (Myers-Scotton,

1999, p. 19). Thus, the pastor is faced with the task of analyzing costs and benefits of code choice and choosing the optimal code for each portion of the church service.

Frequency as a count

The markedness model facilitates both qualitative and quantitative analysis of bilingual interactions by using frequency counts to distinguish between marked and unmarked choices (Myers-Scotton, 1993, 2002). These frequency counts lend more objective support towards distinguishing between the unmarked and marked language varieties. Woolard (2005, p. 6) criticizes the markedness model as “fundamentally circular” in the sense that “[a] linguistic variety is defined as unmarked because it is more frequently chosen, and Myers-Scotton predicts that it will be more frequently chosen by speakers because it is unmarked.” Woolard (2005, p. 7) argues that the most useful aspect of the markedness model is not frequency, but social indexicality. On the other hand, Woolard admits that the study of marking is useful and “poses the most interesting remaining problems for codeswitching studies” (p. 7). Myers-Scotton (2002) defends the markedness model’s use of frequency and maintains that “frequency counts can establish the variety to be labeled the unmarked choice in any corpus” (p. 206). Although Woolard expresses a valid concern, frequency is a critical component of the markedness model because it is the only proposed way to allow quantitative, not just qualitative, analysis of codeswitching. For this reason, the data in the following study are analyzed using word frequency to objectively determine which code is marked.

RESEARCHING LANGUAGE IN BILINGUAL CHURCH SETTINGS

Most studies taking place in churches have focused on the sociocultural aspects of language use (Han, 2009, 2011; Souza, 2014, 2015). Churches provide a unique landscape from which to study language. First, their support for a language can impact whether a language will be maintained in the community. Along with schools, churches are one of the most important institutions for language maintenance (Fasold, 1987, p. 221). Cashman (2009) reports that in states like Arizona, Spanish has strong informal institutional support but “very weak and eroding” formal institutional support (p. 53). Moral panic about immigration and differential bilingualism, defined as “the unequal value accorded to the bilingual skills of Anglos over the bilingualism of U.S. Spanish speakers” (p. 56), also characterize the community. English-Only instruction is required in public schools across the state of Arizona, and in Tucson, as demonstrated by the Census data in Table 2, communities of Spanish-speaking immigrants tend to live separately from wealthier, monolingual White communities. Although individuals in Tucson are undoubtedly influenced by these policies in some spheres of their lives, churches are not constrained by these English-Only laws, and church communities may offer services in language other than English or multilingual services.

Han (2009) saw minority churches as sites of socialization and language learning for adults and children. In an ethnographic study on a minority church in Canada, she described how a church facilitated a Chinese couple’s inclusion by asking them to participate in legitimate roles of interest to them. This social and emotional support allowed the couple to thrive socially in this setting while also making linguistic gains. Han suggested that social inclusion in the form of offering legitimate speaking positions “has the power of constructing a positive identity that can bring about social, economic, and linguistic effects” (p. 662). In another study, Han (2011) described how a Chinese church in Canada developed institutional multilingualism, in part through codeswitching, which constructed multilingualism in a monolingual society. The

community accomplished this by “adopt[ing] a linguistic pragmatism that accepts all linguistic codes as appropriate media of evangelical Christianity” (p. 395).

To our knowledge, only one study, Alfaraz (2009), has applied Myers-Scotton’s markedness model to examine how a priest codeswitches between English and Spanish during bilingual Catholic masses. Using word count frequency in each language, she determined that Spanish was more frequent (and unmarked) in non-ritual discourse, but English was more common overall and in ritual discourse. She also reported that songs and language switches served as transitions between sections of the mass. However, she admits that more research is needed on the factors that influence language use and alternation in the formal context of religious services (p. 444).

Ritual and non-ritual talk:

In her study of codeswitching practices in bilingual Catholic masses, Alfaraz (2009) distinguished between ritual talk, or talk in the service “used for prayers, readings, and chants, in which participants follow a script” (p. 421), and non-ritual talk, “found in the homily and parts of the greeting and concluding remarks, in which talk is not guided by a script” (p. 421). While ritual talk serves a ceremonial purpose, “non-ritual talk serves various purposes, including teaching a religious message, introducing a theme, or conveying information about upcoming social events” (Alfaraz, 2009, p. 421). Alfaraz found different patterns of codeswitching in ritual versus non-ritual talk. In the masses she observed, the priest used Spanish in 57.7% of speech events involving ritual talk, but only in 23.4% of events involving non-ritual talk, such as the sermon. In addition, patterns of codeswitching were different in each type of talk, with non-ritual talk featuring intrasentential and intersentential switches and more codeswitching in general. Ritual talk, on the other hand, involved more intersentential switches. In sum, ritual talk was more constrained, while non-ritual talk functioned similarly to conversational switching (p. 427).

Empirical studies have not examined the differences in frequency of ritual and non-ritual language between Catholic masses and Protestant (including United Methodist) services. However, Alfaraz (2009) reported frequent ritual language in the Catholic masses she observed, in which the frequency of ritual talk outnumbered non-ritual talk in four out of six services (p. 421), while there was no ceremonial language in the observed Protestant (United Methodist) bilingual church services. In the observed United Methodist church setting, ritual language was incorporated infrequently into the service and mostly took the form of scripture citations in the middle of the sermon as well as some phrases the congregation repeated together. For example, during almost every service, the pastor stated, “God is good,” and the congregation responded, “All the time.” Then the pastor stated, “All the time,” and the congregation answered, “God is good” in unison. Other aspects of the service, including prayers, did not use ritual language.

As the literature review indicates, few studies examine codeswitching in bilingual churches, particularly quantitatively. Although Alfaraz (2009) studied codeswitching in Catholic masses, she calls for more research on “factors that influence language choice and alternation in formal registers” (p. 443). In addition, Myers-Scotton (1998) calls for “more studies that test the hypothesis that frequency in outcome types positively correlates with the unmarked choice (p. 28). In addition, studies on codeswitching both inside and outside the classroom are necessary to highlight and understand the how and why multilingual speakers alternate among the languages they speak, as well as to counter deficit views of language alternation in school and community settings. However, very few studies of codeswitching take place in church settings.

The current paper will address these gaps by using Myers-Scotton’s (1998) markedness model to examine codeswitching in a United Methodist church in South Tucson, Arizona. This context is slightly different from the bilingual masses which formed the setting of Alfaraz’s study, largely because the United Methodist church involves much less ritualistic language than Catholic masses. In addition, the study will highlight choices made by church leaders, who are obligated to negotiate RO sets not just with one interlocutor, but with their entire congregations and those for which they work, such as local or regional church boards. Finally, the current study contributes to current literature on codeswitching by highlighting the linguistic creativity and expertise the participants use while codeswitching in a church setting.

THE STUDY

Context and Setting

South Tucson and Tucson, located 65 miles from the border of Mexico, are considered “quasi border” communities, sharing demographic and social features of both border cities and metropolitan areas (Jaramillo, 1995, p. 69). The political climate is highly conservative, with anti-immigration policies, including Arizona’s Senate Bill 1070 (O’Leary & Sanchez, 2011), and a strong Official English Movement (Jaramillo, 1995). Nevertheless, Spanish seems to be maintained. There is less intergenerational loss of Spanish than in other parts of the country (Jaramillo, 1995, p. 85). Churches seem to support this trend. Roman Catholic churches in the area offer well-attended Spanish language masses, and other churches offer translations of services (Jaramillo, 1995). However, there is only one bilingual Protestant church in South Tucson known to the researcher.

San Juan (a pseudonym) United Methodist Church, the site of the study, is located in a small community in South Tucson, about 15 minutes from the University of Arizona and one square mile in area (Jaramillo, 1995, p. 70). According to the 2010 Census, 80.3% of the population of South Tucson identify as Hispanic/Latino, compared to 41.6% of those living in the city of Tucson and 16% of those surveyed in the United States. 32.9% identify as being foreign born, compared to 15% in the city of Tucson and 12.9% in the United States. 79% of individuals living in this zip code report speaking a language other than English at home, compared to 33.5% in Tucson and 20.7% in the United States. 49.9% of inhabitants have a high school diploma, compared to 84.1% and 86.0% in Tucson and the United States, respectively. 4.7% have a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared to 24.7% in the city of Tucson and 28.8% in the United States. The median household income in the zip code is \$28,617, and 44% live in poverty. In comparison, the median household income in Tucson is \$37,032, with 25.2% of people living in poverty, and in the United States, the medium income was \$53,046, with 14.8% living in poverty.

Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of South Tucson, Tucson, and the United States, according to United States Census Bureau (2010)

	South Tucson	Tucson	United States
Total Population	5,730	527,972	318,857,056
Hispanic/Latino	80.3%	41.6%	16%
Foreign Born	32.9%	15%	12.9%
Speak a language other than English at home	79%	33.5%	20.7%
Have a high school diploma	49.9%	84.1%	86.0%
Have a bachelor’s degree or higher	4.7%	24.7%	28.8%

Median household income	\$28,617	\$37,032	\$53,046
Living in poverty	44%	25.2%	14.8%

Although census data can be limiting, particularly, as sociologists have pointed out, with regard to the “coercive nature of the self-identification question” of national origin (Gimenez, 2014, p. 99), these data provide an overview of the demographic characteristics of the zip code in which the church is located. As the data indicate, the church is located in a community with a large percentage of Spanish speakers, many born outside the United States. The city reports higher levels of poverty than found in both the city of Tucson and in the United States, and fewer than 5% of the population have a college degree. However, the high levels of poverty in this community belie the great linguistic wealth of community members.

For 65 years, San Juan was not bilingual, and the majority of congregants were older, monolingual English speakers. Concerned that the congregation did not match the demographics of the community, the regional United Methodist church hired the current pastor to offer Spanish services immediately following English services led by a monolingual English-speaking pastor. The regional board later requested the church to offer a single, bilingual service. The pastor was originally skeptical about the idea, which came from his superiors. According to the pastor, after the church “went bilingual,” many of the older, monolingual English speakers left. The current church body includes English monolinguals, Spanish-monolinguals, and bilinguals; attendees include families with young children, retirees and “snowbirds” who live in Tucson only during the winter, individuals rebuilding lives after being in prison, and individuals who have lived and worked in the community for decades. Many of these families are linguistically mixed. The pastor reported that a few spouses have a different preferred language than their spouses, which makes the bilingual services ideal for them. In addition, there are intergenerational families in attendance, some which include Spanish-speaking grandparents and English-speaking grandchildren, each with various degrees of comfort in the other language.

Approximately forty individuals currently attend weekly church services. The church services are informal with lots of participation from the group. The services begin with a series of bilingual songs, followed by announcements, a prayer, a sermon, and sometimes communion, and ending with more music. A team of musicians leads the music, and young children from the congregation participate by playing plastic instruments in front of the stage. The pastor and his wife warmly greet members of the congregation as they enter. The church is also involved in the local community during the week, offering a food pantry for the neighborhood, doing outreach with children, offering a free health clinic, and working closely with the police and school system to offer translation services. The pastor’s main goal is to provide an inviting, welcoming space for everyone, and he considers “going bilingual” during church services an “experiment” which he hopes will help the church accomplish these goals.

Method

The research was carried out within an ethnographic framework. After obtaining IRB approval to conduct the research, I attended Sunday church services as a participant-observer at San Juan United Methodist church from September through December 2015. Though I was not a member of the church prior to the study, I had previously attended bilingual church services in a different city. I analyzed recordings of four, one-hour services from April, May, and June 2015—the first three months the church offered bilingual services—which were available publicly on the church’s website. I fully transcribed the recordings (n=20,569) and determined

the frequency of each language using Myers-Scotton’s (1998) markedness model. In addition, I conducted a 45-minute, audio-recorded interview with the pastor of the church, and two 30-minute interviews with members of the congregation. I did not transcribe these interviews. Because certain sections of the services, such as announcements, tended to vary in length from week to week, frequency of each language was determined overall and in the sermon, prayer, and announcements portions of the service. Other portions of the service, such as baptisms or communion, which did not occur each week, were not analyzed separately, but were included. Proper nouns and the word “Amen” were excluded in cases of ambiguity. Otherwise, these words were counted as part of the language in which they were uttered. In addition, the frequency of codeswitching was calculated. Myers-Scotton’s (1983, 1998, 2000) markedness model was used to determine patterns that seemed to govern each of these codeswitches. Finally, the author spoke with the pastor to understand more about the church, the community in which it is situated, and motivations for deciding to codeswitch as part of the service.

Single-word alternations are counted as lexical borrowings, not codeswitches. Lexical borrowing and codeswitching are distinct processes. Distinguishing codeswitching from lexical borrowing can be especially challenging when only single words are involved. Because codeswitching involves alternation from one distinct language variety to another, Poplack and Meechan (1998, p. 129) argue that “(single-word) codeswitches should show little or no integration into another language. Lexical borrowing, on the other hand, refers to the incorporation of a lexical item from one language into another, with only the recipient system operative.” For these reasons, single words, such as “potluck” or “quinceañera” were counted as lexical borrowings, and not codeswitches.

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

As described in the introduction, the goal of this research was to explore the frequency of each language, identify the marked language according to Myers-Scotton’s (1998) markedness model, and examined the patterns of language alternation and factors that contribute to these patterns in the bilingual services. Both qualitative and quantitative results, presented below, contribute to these goals. Qualitative findings, discussed first, contribute to the field by providing insight into why and how the participants in these services choose to codeswitch.

Since the services usually included monolingual English and Spanish speakers as well as bilingual speakers, the pastor and other leaders in the church codeswitched regularly throughout announcements, prayer, and the sermons. Written materials, including church bulletins and sermon PowerPoints, were carefully translated into both English and Spanish. Sermons were also prepared, as evidenced by notes the pastor referred to, but they were not scripted. Very little ritual talk took place during sermons, although the pastor did read scripture passages in both English and Spanish, and the pastor and congregation often repeated the salutation “God is good / All the time / All the Time / God is Good. Dios es Bueno / Todo el tiempo / Todo el tiempo / Dios is Bueno” at the beginning or end of services. The pastor otherwise used codeswitching as a stylistic resource and to accommodate his audience during sermons. When asked how he made decisions about codeswitching, the pastor ascribed his choices mainly to his goal of linguistically accommodating all people attending the services. He reported that he knew regular attendees’ language preferences, but when new participants showed up, he did not always know from the pulpit what their linguistic preferences were.

Myers-Scotton (1983) notes that codeswitching itself can be an unmarked choice (p. 122). This appeared to be the case during sermons and prayers. Though the pastor did not use ritual

language during the prayers and sermons, except when reading scripture, he systematically codeswitched as he spoke. (Alfaraz, 2009, P. 440, would possibly attribute this alternation to the planning that sermons require at the macro level). However, despite the fact that the pastor states each segment of language in English and in Spanish, the utterances are not word-for-word translations, but flow as one, unified text. In fact, he sometimes initiates a codeswitch with a discourse marker. In one example, he uses the conjunction “but” to initiate the codeswitch, saying, “No exactamente yo les voy a dar lo que Ustedes quieren / **But** what you need.” The use of these conjunctions creates cohesion between the codes. In Example 1 below, he says (8) “Este es el día de salvación / (9) **So** thank you Jesus for being in our hearts, in our minds.” The following maxims fulfilled by codeswitching will be illustrated through examples extracted from transcriptions.

Example 1: Codeswitching as fulfilling the unmarked choice maxim during a prayer

- (1) If you are calling us we want to obey.
- (2) Señor si tu nos esta llamando en esta mañana queremos obedecerte. [*Lord if you are calling us on this morning we want to obey you*]
- (3) We just want to come back to You oh Lord
- (4) queremos regresar de nuevo ante ti [*we want to return before you again*]
- (5) Thank you Jesus for giving us another opportunity. We don’t know if we are going to have another opportunity so we just want to take it right now. And we just want to say yes, here I am Lord
- (6) Señor no sabemos si vamos a tener otra oportunidad. Esta es la oportunidad. [*Lord we don’t know if we are going to have another opportunity. This is the opportunity.*]
- (7) This is the day of salvation
- (8) Este es el día de salvación. [*This is the day of salvation.*]
- (9) So thank you Jesus for being in our hearts, in our minds
- (10) Gracias Señor por entrar nuestras vidas, nuestras corazones [*Thank you Lord for entering our lives, our hearts*]

Although the codeswitching in the examples above was cohesive and illustrate codeswitching as an unmarked choice, the pastor draws attention to the two individual codes when he follows the virtuosity maxim, which states that a speaker may choose to “[s]witch to whatever code is necessary in order to carry on the conversation / accommodate the participation of all speakers present” (Myers-Scotton, 1998, p. 123). The pastor drew upon this maxim when he knew members of his audience were monolingual speakers. The excerpt below takes place during a baptism of a child with a monolingual English-speaking family, which was performed in front of an audience which included Spanish monolinguals. Unlike the excerpt above, in which the pastor simply switched codes, the pastor announces to whom the speech will be directed ((5) “Now I’m talking to you”) and includes speech tags ((6) “lo que dije hermanos es que”) to describe what he or others have said or will say. These speech tags, unlike the conjunctions, draw attention to the separate codes, instead of unifying them. In the example below, the pastor uses English to speak to the parents of the child getting baptized, and Spanish to tell the congregation what he has said or is going to say to the family.

Example 2: Codeswitching fulfilling the virtuosity maxim during baptism by the pastor

- (1) Amen oh look at that. It’s a big family.
- (2) Veán hermanos una familia muy grande. Amén. Amén. Ahora yo les pregunto [*Look brothers, a very big family. Amen, Amen. Now I am asking you.*]
- (3) I am going to ask you okay, the mother and I’m going to ask the godparents and all part of the family here I’m going to ask you a few questions
- (4) Ahora les voy a pedir primeramente a la madre que esta aquí y también a todos a todos los que están aquí todos los que son parte de la familia o los padrinos okay? [*Now I am going to ask first the mother that is here and also everyone that is here, all that are part of the family and the godparents*]
- (5) Now I’m talking to you. You Marla and to all of you. Do you renounce the spiritual course of wickedness reject the evil powers of this world and repent of your sins? (Amen!) Amen.
- (6) Lo que dije hermanos es que si estos hermanos han renunciado a los esfuerzos espirituales de maldad y a los poderes de este mundo de maldad y si arrepienten del pecado y ellos han dicho que sí. Sí Porque [*What I said brothers is whether these brothers have renounced the spiritual forces of evil and the powers of evil in this world and if they repent from their sins, and they said yes. Yes, because*]
- (7) Do you accept the freedom and power that God gives you to resist evil injustice and oppression in whatever forms they present themselves? (yes) Okay.
- (8) También se han aceptado el poder y la gracia de Dios para resistir a la mala la injusticia y la opresión en cualquier forma que se presenta [*They have also accepted the power and the grace of God to resist evil, injustice, and oppression in whatever forms it presents itself.*]

At other times in the service, the speaker would direct him or herself to one specific person, instead of to the entire congregation, typically to ask a question or make a request. During these times, the speakers sometimes codeswitched to establish multiple identities for themselves, with each identity having a separate set of rights and obligations. In the excerpt below, the pastor’s wife was giving announcements when she noticed one of the church’s bilingual youth was talking instead of listening to announcements. She pauses to tell him to pay attention, then codeswitches again and continues with announcements. She does not switch from Spanish to English to reprimand the young man because he cannot understand Spanish. Instead, she does it to assert herself not only as the giver of announcements, but as an authority figure capable of disciplining him. In other words, she is making an exploratory choice to “[establish] or [affirm] multiple identities by using more than one code” (p. 123).

Example 3: Codeswitching as the exploratory choice (multiple-identities) maxim

- (1) la última cena que tuvo con sus discípulos, y no va a estar aquí en el te. Vamos a tenerlo en el Educational Building. [*The last supper that he had with his disciples, and it is not going to be in the te- We are going to have it in the Educational Building*]
- (2) George are you listening to me? Pay attention you are talking at the same time as me.

Myers-Scotton (1983) suggests that an individual may flout the maxims to disidentify him/herself from the unmarked rights and obligations set (p. 127). Speakers may also choose to

use the marked code to “establish a new rights and obligations set as unmarked for the current exchange” (Myers-Scotton, 1998, p. 128). In the excerpt below, a member of the church tells a joke in English during announcements. He codeswitches to announce that he made a joke, but then goes on to say that the joke wouldn’t sound the same in Spanish. Thus, he is flouting the unmarked code (which involves codeswitching during the service) in order to establish a new rights and obligations set, one in which jokes do not need to be repeated if they would not make sense in the other language.

Example 4: Codeswitching as the marked choice by member of congregation during prayer

- (1) You know, there was a pastor, at the end of the, at the end of the service he went to the lobby and he ran into this gentleman and he said, you know, I need you in the army of Christ. And the guy turned to him and said, “I am in the army of Christ.” He said, “No, but I only see you on Easter, I only see you on Christmas. He said, “yeah but I’m in the secret service” (laughs). So I think we have a lot of secret service people in our church. Thank you, father.
- (2) Perdón, dije un chiste pero no creo que si lo digo en español lo va a ser igual. Pero, me va a decir Mari que sí pero yo creo que te va a decir Mari más tarde [Sorry, I told a joke but I don’t think that if I say it in Spanish it will be the same. But Mari is going to tell me it will be, but I think that Mari will tell it to you later.]

Example 5: Codeswitching as the exploratory choice maxim by pastor’s wife

- (1) It’s a blessing to have kids,
- (2) Es una bendición tener niños [*It’s a blessing to have kids*]
- (3) And they supposed to be here right now
- (4) Vamos a pedir todos los niños que vengan para acá enfrente [*We are going to ask all the kids to come here, up front*]

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

While the qualitative findings discussed above provide examples of how speakers in the study codeswitch at the local level, the quantitative results contribute to the field by providing an objective count of how often and in what context they codeswitch, as well as how long they speak each language before initiating a codeswitch. The tables below present data from the four transcribed services. Table 3 shows the total number of words (n=20,569) in English and Spanish. All of the services included music, announcements, greetings, offering collection, a sermon, and a prayer. Music was excluded from the analysis. The third service included a baptism, and another service included communion. Tables 4 and 5 represent the total number of words in Spanish and English during the sermon and prayer portions of the service, respectively. Sermons and prayers were delivered by the pastor. The pastor typically had a PowerPoint to accompany the sermons, indicating that they were carefully prepared, but he spoke freely, referring occasionally to notes. Prayers were not ritualistic. Table 6 displays the total number of words spoken in Spanish and English during announcements. Announcements varied in length each week and were delivered by the pastor, his wife, or another member of the congregation. Other aspects of the service, such as baptism or communion, were counted in Table 3 as part of the overall church services but not analyzed separately.

Table 3: Total numbers of words in Spanish and English during church services

	Spanish		English		Total
	%	n	%	n	
1	30.96%	1,691	69.04%	3,771	5,462
2	30.18%	1,245	69.82%	2,880	4,125
3	43.25%	2,384	56.75%	3,128	5,512
4	52.72%	2,884	47.28%	2,586	5,470
Total	39.89%	8,204	60.11%	12,365	20,569
Average		2,051		3,091.25	5,142.25

Table 4: Total numbers of words in Spanish and English during sermon

	Spanish		English		Total
	%	n	%	n	
1	38.35%	1,321	61.65%	2,124	3,445
2	30.05%	843	69.95%	1,962	2,805
3	42.77%	1,178	57.23%	1,576	2,754
4	52.13%	1,545	47.87%	1,419	2,964
Total		4,887		7,081	11,968
Average	40.83%	1,221.75	59.17%	1,770.25	2,992

Table 5: Total numbers of words in Spanish and English during prayers

	Spanish		English		Total
	%	n	%	n	
1	32.88%	144	67.12%	294	438
2	48.71%	132	51.29%	139	271
3	46.87%	352	53.13%	399	751
4	45.40%	222	54.60%	267	489
Total		850		1,099	1,949
Average	43.61%	212.5	56.39%	274.75	487.25

Table 6: Total numbers of words in Spanish and English during announcements

	Spanish		English		Total
	%	n	%	n	
1	12.52%	179	87.48%	1,251	1,430
2	26.20%	273	73.80%	769	1,042
3	45.86%	266	54.14%	314	580
4	54.55%	1,067	45.45%	889	1,956
Total	34.78%	446.25	65.22%	3,223	5,008
Average		111.56		805.75	1,252

Table 7 presents the total number of codeswitches overall and during sermons, prayers, and announcements. A codeswitch was counted when a speaker alternated from one language (English or Spanish) to the other for more than a single word. In addition, the table presents the

average number of words in each utterance. For example, in Sermon 1, there were 5,462 total words spoken (see Table 3) and 227 total codeswitches. This means that utterances contained an average of 21.93 words before the speaker codeswitched.

Table 7: Total number of codeswitches in each service

	Services		Sermons		Prayers		Announcements	
	# of Switches	Average # of words	# of Switches	Average # of words	# of Switches	Average # of words	# of Switches	Average # of words
1	227	24.06	151	22.81	24	18.25	43	33.26
2	159	25.94	107	26.21	16	16.94	32	32.56
3	250	22.05	144	19.13	28	26.82	30	19.33
4	302	18.11	146	20.30	28	17.46	120	16.3
Total	938		548		96		225	
Avg.	234.5	21.93	137	21.84	24	20.30	56.25	25.36

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to understand the patterns of codeswitching during bilingual church services in South Tucson using Myers-Scotton’s (1998) markedness model, which uses frequency to quantitatively establish the marked code in a bilingual interaction. The frequency data reported above reveal that Spanish was the marked code in the observed services, comprising 39.89% of bilingual services. Spanish was particularly marked during announcements portions of the service, where it comprised only 34.78% of utterances. During sermons and prayers, however, the frequency of Spanish increased to 40.83% and 43.61%, respectively. In other words, in more formal, planned speech events, such as sermons and prayers, Spanish was more frequent than in less formal church events, such as announcements, though English was more frequent overall. These overall frequency results were remarkably similar to what Alfaraz (2009) found in an observation of bilingual Catholic masses, in which Spanish, the marked code overall, was spoken 40.1% overall. However, in Alfaraz’ study, the frequency of Spanish varied significantly depending on whether the discourse was ritual or non-ritual. In ritual language, Spanish was the unmarked code, comprising 57.7% of the interactions, but in non-ritual talk, it was marked, making up only 23.4% of the interactions on average. In the current study, which did not include any ritual language, Spanish was the marked code throughout all parts of the service, although it was more frequent in less spontaneous speech, such as prayers and sermons.

Even though data analysis revealed that English was the unmarked code and Spanish was the marked code for this speech event, codeswitching was found to be the unmarked—or expected—choice given the RO set of the participants in the bilingual service. The church service was advertised as bilingual, and as a result, even monolingual speakers of both languages expected codeswitching as a means to include speakers of both languages in each component of the service. In this bilingual community, codeswitching allows linguistically mixed families to participate in services together. Monolingual (mostly English) speakers also consider the bilingual services as an opportunity to become more familiar with the language that others in their community speak. According to the pastor, linguistically accommodating everyone in the community was a motivation for maintaining bilingual services, instead of offering separate

English and Spanish language services, as the church had done the previous year. The participants in the church include families in which spouses have different native and preferred languages, and in which certain children prefer English while their parents or grandparents prefer Spanish. In these cases, the bilingual services provide an “unmarked” context for all family members. It is unclear whether the bilingual service contributes to language maintenance, as institutional support can (Cashman, 2009; Jaramillo, 1995). In any case, interviews with the pastor revealed that the intention of the bilingual service is not to promote maintenance or teaching of English or Spanish, but rather to include as many people from the community—regardless of generation or language preference—in the church.

In cases in which codeswitching is the unmarked choice between bilinguals, the overall pattern of codeswitching indicates the implicature more than individual code switches (Myers-Scotton, 1983). The pattern of the observed services, which included short, sentence-level codeswitches throughout all components of the service, demonstrated that the pastor mainly juggled the congregation’s different rights and obligations sets and language preferences by trying to make the content accessible to everyone. During observed sermons, speakers (mainly the pastor) uttered an average of 21.93 words before switching codes. This was consistent during all components of the service, ranging from 20.30 words on average spoken during prayers before a codeswitch to 25.36 words during announcements uttered before a codeswitch. The pastor was not aware of this trend, attributing his language use merely to the fact that he wanted everyone to understand the services. In other words, the pastor prepared bilingual services not for bilinguals—who would understand the service even if codeswitches occurred after longer utterances—but for monolinguals or bilinguals who were not fully proficient in one language. The results were quite different than Alfaraz (2009) reported in a study of codeswitching in bilingual Catholic masses, in which codeswitches occurred more at the discourse level, between sections of the mass, prompting Alfaraz (2009) to ask why monolinguals would sit through services which included entire sections they did not understand (p. 441).

Due to the ritual language that characterizes Catholic masses, sentence-level utterances before each codeswitch may not have been possible for the priest that Alfaraz observed. Alfaraz’ reported highly ritualized language, comprising 48.67% (n=10,872) of the masses (Alfaraz, 2009), while the services at San Juan (n=20,569) did not involve any ritual language, even in the sermons and prayers. Although the current study does not include ritual language, many aspects of the service, particularly prayers and announcements, were carefully planned, semi-spontaneous speech events. Future studies should investigate the differences between codeswitching in ritual speech events as compared to formal speech events that are neither completely spontaneous nor ritualistic. The current study admittedly includes a small sample size of four, one-hour bilingual services at a single church. This small, United Methodist Church in South Tucson cannot be expected to represent codeswitching patterns in all Protestant bilingual church services. Data were taken from services in the first three months of offering bilingual services, and it would be interesting to compare the trend over a longer period of time.

Future investigations should examine the use of ritual and nonritual languages in a variety of religions/denominations in order to determine how the conventions of different types of religious services may influence bilingual religious leaders’ RO set and the choices that they make when they codeswitch. In addition, these patterns should be examined in speech events occurring in other institutionalized settings involving semi-ritual or planned speech, such as service encounters in bilingual or tourist communities. After all, speakers do not just negotiate RO sets with their interlocutors, but also according to specific conventions of speech events.

CONCLUSION

In addition to contributing to the quantitative literature on codeswitching in church communities, this research highlights the creativity that Spanish-English bilinguals use when they codeswitch, celebrating bilingualism in a city whose English-Only policy often fails to legitimize bilingual speakers' vast linguistic resources. In addition, the study highlights the linguistic wealth of this community of practice, which is situated within an impoverished neighborhood. In the long-term, a robust body of research documenting these linguistic resources—and particularly how they are used to build solidarity in a diverse community— may be used as evidence against language policy that discriminates against languages other than English. The juxtaposition between English only policies in public spaces (schools) and private spaces (churches) is also an important topic for future investigations, especially in Arizona. Although the pastor of San Juan was “not happy” when his supervisor told him he needed to start a bilingual church service, he considers “going bilingual” an experiment that has helped the church meet the needs of the people in the surrounding neighborhood, and his linguistic choices during bilingual church services reflect his intent to make services linguistically accessible to monolingual and multilingual Spanish and English speakers alike.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Ana Carvalho for supporting and advising me during this project. Thank you, also, to the staff and congregation of Santa Rosa Church for a warm welcome on Sunday mornings. Finally, I gratefully acknowledge the Editors at Arizona Working Papers and the anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Alfaraz, G. (2009). Language alternation and choice in formal register: Spanish and English in bilingual Catholic services. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13, 419-455.
- Auer, P. (1998). Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 1-24). London and New York: Routledge.
- Austin, J., Blume, M. & Sánchez, L. (2015). *Bilingualism in the Spanish-Speaking world: Linguistic and cognitive perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blom, J. P., and Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Cashman, H. R. (2009). The dynamics of Spanish maintenance and shift in Arizona. *Spanish in Context*, 6(1), 43-68.
- Elster, J. (1989). *Nuts and bolts for the social sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fasold, R. (1987). *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gimenez, M. E. (2014). Latino/“Hispanic”—Who needs a name?: The case against a standardized terminology. In A. D. Darder & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *Latinos and education: A critical reader* (2nd ed.) (pp. 93-104). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). “Logic and conversation.” In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (3rd ed.) (pp. 41-55), New York and London: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Han, H. (2009). Institutionalized inclusion: A case study on support for immigrants in English learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43, 643-68.
- Han, H. (2011). Social inclusion through multilingual ideologies, policies and practices: A case study of a minority church. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14, 383-398.
- Jaramillo, J. (1995). The passive legitimization of Spanish. A macrosociolinguistic study of a quasi-border: Tucson, Arizona. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 114, 67-92.
- King, J. & Chetty, R. (2014). Codeswitching: Linguistic and literacy understanding of teaching dilemmas in multilingual classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 25, 40-50.
- Kramsch, C. (2006) From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90, 249-252.
- Kramsch, C. & Whiteside, A. (2008). Language ecology in multilingual settings. Towards a theory of symbolic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 645-671.
- Moro, M. (2015). The universality of syntactic constraints of Spanish-English codeswitching in the USA. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 15, 391-406.
- Muysken, P. (2005). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal the Sociology of Language*, 44, 115-136.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). A theoretical introduction to the markedness model. In C. Meyers-Scotton (Ed.), *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties* (pp. 18-40). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Myers-Scotton, C. (2000). Explaining the role of norms and rationality in codeswitching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1259-1271.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). Frequency and intentionality in (un)marked choices in codeswitching: 'This is a 24-hour country'. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 6, 205-219.
- O'Leary, A. O. and Sanchez, A. (2011). Anti-immigrant Arizona: Ripple effects and mixed immigration status households under 'policies of attrition' considered. *Journal of Borderland Studies*, 26(1), 115-133.
- Poplack S. (2004). Code-switching. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Soziolinguistik: An international handbook of the science of language and society*, 2nd ed., 589–96. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Poplack, S., & Meechan, M. (1998). Introduction: How languages fit together in codemixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2(2), 127-38. Pratt, M. (2012). "If English was Good Enough for Jesus...": Monolinguisimo y mala fe. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 1(1), 12-30.
- Rampton, B. (1999). "Language crossing and the redefinition of reality." In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 290-320). London: Routledge.
- Sebba, M. (2011). Societal bilingualism. In R. Wodak, B. Johnstone, & P. Kerswill (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 445-460). Los Angeles/London: Sage Publications.
- Souza, A. (2014) Technology and language planning: The case of a Brazilian faith setting in London. In D. Mallows (Ed.), *London: British Council ESOL Nexus* (pp. 135-150). Available from http://esol.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/Language_issues_migration_integration_perspectives_teachers_learners.pdf
- Souza, A. (2015). Facebook: A medium for the language planning of migrant churches, Working Paper 145 in *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies*. Available from www.tilburguniversity.edu/research/institutes-and-research-groups/babylon/tpcs/item-paper-145-tpcs.htm
- United States Census Bureau. (2010). Census 2010 demographic profile. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>.
- Villa, D. J. & Rivera-Mills, S. V. (2009). An integrated multi-generational model for language maintenance and shift: The case of Spanish in the Southwest. *Spanish in Context* 6(1), 26-42.
- Wei, L. (2013). Codeswitching. In R. Bayley, R. Cameron, and C. Lucas (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 360-378). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woods, A. (2006). The role of language in some ethnic churches in Melbourne. In T. Omoniyi and J. Fishman (Eds.), *Explorations in the sociology of language and religion* (pp. 197-212). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Woolard, K. A. (2006). Codeswitching. In Duranti, A. (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 72-94). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.blackwellreference.com.ezproxy1.library.arizona.edu/subscriber/uid=73/toconode?id=g9781405144308_chunk_g97814051443087
- Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.