Vietnamese-English bilinguals in Melbourne
Social relationships in code-switching of personal pronouns

TUC HO-DAC
MONASH UNIVERSITY

This paper investigates the code-switching of personal pronouns in the speech of Vietnamese-English bilinguals in Melbourne. The highly complex system of person reference in Vietnamese has no counterparts in the English speaking world, and is examined in this paper. Relying on Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (1993), I discuss in some detail the code-switching of English personal pronouns and argue that the switching of personal pronouns is to signal a change in the relationship between the addressor and the addressee.

Introduction

In this paper, I discuss the motivation for code-switching of English personal pronouns occurring in the speech of Vietnamese-English bilinguals in Melbourne. This paper is divided into two main parts. The first part begins with the description of the variation in Vietnamese person reference lexical items, which consist of kinship terms, proper nouns, and personal pronouns. The second part focuses on the code-switching of English personal pronouns in the corpus. The code-switching literature indicates that several approaches have been attempted to explain the phenomenon from the sociolinguistic and pragmatic point of view. As an example of such an approach, Myers-Scotton's concept of Markedness offers a framework to understand how code-switching can be approached as a communicatively- and socially-functional phenomenon (Myers-Scotton 1993). This paper is based on Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model as a linguistic device that can be used for the interpretation of the code-switching of personal pronouns.

Methodology

The present study is based on recordings of interviews and natural conversations. The informants consist of 60 Vietnamese-English bilinguals who came to Australia as adults and adolescents, and live in and around Melbourne. They are post-1975 migrants who had Vietnamese as their first language, and identified themselves as of Vietnamese ancestry. The informants' age on arrival in Australia varied from 5 to 42. The age of the informants varies from 18 to 62 at the time of the interviews. The duration of the interviews ranged from thirty to forty-five minutes. In addition to the face-to-face interviews, some informants were asked to tape their natural conversations which occurred in their home. This forms part of the corpus on which the analysis of this study is based. The interviews were made from May to December 1994.

To condense information about their relevant attributes and to identify individual informants, two symbols forming a sequence of three basic attribute components (age, sex, date of arrival in Australia) were employed. For example, 69F78 identifies a woman born in 1969 who arrived in Australia in 1978, and 33M75 a man born in 1933 who came to Australia in 1975.

The Vietnamese system of person reference

The complex system of person reference in Vietnamese comprises lexical alternatives of common nouns (kinship

and social status terms), proper nouns, and personal pronouns. In general, the three subclasses (common nouns, proper nouns, and personal pronouns) of the person reference system have the following features:

- Firstly, these linguistic forms are structural equivalents. That is, they can substitute for each other in the same syntactic structure. Consider the following example extracted from Thompson (1987: 293):

a. Tại sao con không nói cho má ích lợi của trầu cau?
    'Why did not child talk about the useful aspects of betel chewing for mother?'

The kinship terms con and má can also be replaced by any address terms (i.e. proper nouns or personal pronouns). For example, the addressor in a. could choose other linguistic forms such as con ('child'/common noun), mày ('you'/ personal pronoun), or A (given name/proper noun) without violating the syntactic structure of the utterance.

Secondly, the meanings of linguistic forms in the Vietnamese person reference system are defined in accordance with the speech environment. That is, the use of the same linguistic form in the person reference system in different interactional situations may be decoded differently. The following will clarify this point.

Vietnamese kinship terms
The study of address systems and terminology has long been of central interest to sociolinguists and anthropologists. Many have not only focused on forms of address in a particular language and culture (Brown and Ford 1961; Bates and Benigni 1975; Lambert and Tucker 1976; Bean 1978; Scotton and Wanjin 1983; Luong 1987; Srivastava and Pandit 1988; Sifianou 1992), but also described patterns of usage in various languages and cultures in an attempt to seek generalisations and universals in the field of address (Goffman 1981; Brown and Levinson 1978, 1979; Braun 1988; Clyne 1987, 1994).

Turning to the use of address terms of the Vietnamese speakers, the Confucian doctrine of name rectification has become their metalinguistic awareness. In their daily speech

behaviour they choose certain forms in the system of person reference which they consider as appropriate to indicate the relations among the referents (addressor, addressee, and third party). According to this doctrine, role terms (such as 'king', 'father', 'child') must be appropriately used in association with the social roles of interlocutors (see Tran Trong Kim 1971: 129; Waley 1938: 166–171), and interlocutors must behave in accordance with what the 'name' of their role entails (cf. Russell 1940: 204). Within family contexts, for example, young children are not expected to use the personal pronoun nó (she/he/her/him/it) in reference to older siblings or cousins, as this address form implies the speaker's lack of deference to the addressee or the third party.

Vietnamese kinship terms can be used for addressor, addressee, and third party references. This is not unlike the practice of using kinship terms with small children in English. But while this kind of usage is 'baby talk' in English, it is an integral part of Vietnamese interaction. Examine the following examples from my data. The addressor in (1) is a woman, codenamed 65F80, who was talking to an older woman, codenamed 50F86:

1. Chừng nào chị về để em nói anh đưa (65F80)
    when elder sister [i.e. addressee] leaves younger sibling [i.e. addressor] will ask elder brother [i.e. third party] to take
    'When you go home I'll ask my husband to give you a lift'
2. Thôi, để tui gọi cháu nó tới chở (50F86)
    no, let me call grandchild [i.e. third party] to pick up
    'No let me call my son to pick me up'

In (1), the woman 65F80 used the kinship terms chị 'elder sister', em 'younger sibling', and anh 'elder brother' to refer to the addressee, the addressor and the third party respectively. This highlights the fact that in Vietnamese speech interaction, kinship terms are also used among non-relatives. The addressor chose chị for the addressee reference on the basis that the addressee is older than the addressor. Thus, the use of kinship terms in (1) is to address the hierarchical relation among the referents (the addressor, her husband's friend, and her husband). The use of chị . . . em 'elder sister . . . younger sibling' also implies the acceptance of the addressor's subordinate status vis-a-vis the addressee and reinforces solidarity relation with the addressee.

Similarly, in (2), in referring to her son (third party), the addressor 50F86 used the kinship term cháu 'grandchild' instead of con 'child' as she would if she addressed him. By using cháu, 50F86 not only specified a different relationship between herself and the addressee 65F80 toward the third party, but also indicated hierarchical and solidarity relations with the addressee. At the same time, she defined the hierarchical relation between her son and the addressee. In order to avoid bringing in the incongruence in the contextual relations defined by 50F86, the younger woman (65F80) chose the kinship term cháu in reference to the son of 50F86 for the rest of the conversation. In other words, 65F80 takes the addressee's perspective in reference to the addressee's absent son, i.e. the third party. In this way, 65F80 reinforces solidarity relation with the addressee.

Proper nouns

Proper nouns, including personal names, have received attention in the literature (e.g. Searle 1969; Kripke 1972; Carroll 1983; Marmaridou 1989; among others). In the Vietnamese system of person reference, proper nouns are used frequently for addressee and third party references, but infrequently for self-reference. In practice, the use of other linguistic forms and proper nouns in particular inseparably relates to its usage contexts. This is because proper nouns do not indicate the hierarchy of power. It is not proper nouns but kinship terms that are used in accordance with addressor, addressee, and third party reference to imply the hierarchy of the speech contexts. However, the rule for forms of address, such as proper nouns and personal pronouns, is not unambiguous. For example, the use of a given name can pragmatically imply either less respect for the addressee or more informal solidarity with the addressee. The ambiguity in the use of given names can be attributed to a name taboo, the avoidance of personal name usages in the family domain where junior kin are prohibited from mentioning the personal names of their elder relatives.

Personal pronouns

Similarly to the other two subclasses, personal pronouns in the Vietnamese system of person reference comprise many linguistic forms. In contrast to personal pronouns in English, some personal pronouns in Vietnamese can be used in reference not only to third parties, but also to addressors and

addressees. In general, the meanings and use of Vietnamese personal pronouns are inextricably linked to the pragmatic implications of these linguistic forms (see Luong 1987, 1988), that is, certain forms may pragmatically imply the lack of deference towards the referent, while others imply exactly the opposite. In particular speech environments, terms of personal pronouns may change. It is the inconsistency of rules specifying the relations of personal pronoun forms to the contexts of their usages that underlies certain ambiguity. This ambiguity emerges from the inconsistent meanings of Vietnamese personal pronouns, and is similar to the ambiguity with regard to the choice of kinship terms discussed previously.

It should be noted here that the French personal pronouns toi/moi have been transferred into the Vietnamese system of person reference in certain contexts, such as within French-educated Vietnamese circles. The two French personal pronouns toi/moi were also used by Vietnamese speakers when they spoke to people they did not know well. By using toi/moi for self- and addressee references, Vietnamese speakers deliberately avoid taking risk of implying a negative relation in speech behaviour. In other words, Vietnamese speakers neutralise the ambiguous meanings of Vietnamese personal pronouns by replacing alternative forms in the person reference system with French personal pronouns. The phenomenon of avoidance, so to speak, occurs not for structural, but for pragmatic reasons.

The same can be said of English personal pronouns which have been used among Vietnamese-English bilinguals in the corpus. The Vietnamese in Melbourne, or specifically the informants in this study, have incorporated English personal pronouns into their own system of person reference and made use of English pronouns in their speech. From a sociolinguistic point of view, the use of English personal pronouns in the speech of Vietnamese prompts a wealth of intriguing questions. For example, what is the underlying motivation for the switch in the course of verbal interaction? Such a question is posed by Myers-Scotton (1988) as she attempts to provide a theoretical explanation of sociolinguistic aspects of code-switching. The speakers 'are free to make any choices (between codes), but how their choices will be interpreted is not free' (Myers-Scotton 1988:

155). How 'their choices will be interpreted' will be discussed in the second part of this paper.

The Markedness Model

In dealing with the switching of pronouns, some approaches to code-switching of pronouns attempt to determine at what points in a sentence pronouns are located (Timm 1975; Lipski 1977; Bentahila and Davies 1983; Woolford 1983; Eid 1992; Azuma 1993; Jake 1994). In an attempt to provide a general theoretical explanation of the sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of code-switching, Myers-Scotton (1993) proposes a theoretical model called the 'Markedness Model'. In very general terms, Myers-Scotton argues that most code-switching is to negotiate a social situation, and code-switching is viewed as a phenomenon serving a social function, which occurs at the intention of speaker. It remains Myers-Scotton's argument that there are socio-psychological motivations behind code-switching. The basic theoretical assumptions of Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model are that interaction types in every conversational situation are conventionalised and have relatively fixed schemata about the role relations between speakers. The schemata are the unmarked 'rights-and-obligation sets' (RO sets) for particular interaction types. A speaker may comply with the unmarked RO set on the basis of non-linguistic conditions, such as her/his identity, degree of formality, that is, s/he may choose the unmarked code during a conversation; or s/he may wish to establish a new RO set by using a marked one to maintain or change the relations between themselves.

In code-switching, if the speaker uses the unexpected code to achieve a strategic effect in conversation, then this phenomenon is called 'code-switching as a marked choice'. If, however, the speaker conforms to the expected one to maintain a desired situation or meaning, this is called 'code-switching as an unmarked choice'.

In this model, speakers appear to switch between codes in accordance with the purpose of the conversation, and they switch codes as they wish to do 'some social work' (Myers-Scotton 1993, p. 100). In the words of Myers-Scotton: '. . . all code choices can ultimately be explained in terms of such speaker motivations' (p. 113). To a very large extent, Myers-

Scotton wants her model to have validity for all multicultural communities in which code-switching is an aspect of daily linguistic behaviour. The following sections will use the Markedness Model to explain the code-switching of personal pronouns.

As to motivation for code-switching of personal pronouns, it has been observed that a number of the subjects were very adept at avoiding the use of linguistic forms in the Vietnamese system of person reference in certain contexts. Specifically, the subjects frequently used me and you for addressor and addressee references when the status of the referents appears to be ambiguous: between those whose ages are different while (social) status is similar (i. e. engineer/ social worker), or between those who do not know each other well enough to establish a relationship. The significance of the use in personal pronouns can be highlighted in the utterances below:

A. Setting: Exchanges between younger sister and her elder brother:
3. **Anh chở em đi được không? (73F79)**
    elder brother [i.e. addressee] ride younger sibling OK not [i.e. addressor]
    'Can you give me a ride?'
4. **Tối nay anh bận. (65M79)**
    tonight elder brother [i.e. addressor] busy
    'I'm busy tonight.'
5. *You always bận a, me* nói em H *take me then.* (73F79)
    you always busy particle me ask younger sibling H [i.e. third party] take me then.
    'you're always busy, I'll ask H to take me then.'

At the pragmatic level, the use of the kinship term anh in item 3 implies respect for and solidarity with the addressee. When 'elder brother' turned down his sister's request, the use of the personal pronoun you in item 5 immediately negates the previous implication. At the same time, 73F79 used the kinship term em 'younger sibling' in referring to her younger brother H (third party) to pragmatically imply slightly greater solidarity with the third party than with the addressee. In other words, the shift from the frequent use of the kinship term anh to English personal pronoun you

implies at least a temporary negation of the solidarity and affectionate kinship relation between the addressor and the addressee in this interactional context.

Consider another example from the interview data:

6. Phỏng vấn tôi à mà *you* muốn *me talk about what?*
   (65M80)
   interview me prt. but you want me talk about what?
   'You want to interview me but what do you want me to talk about?'

By replacing the Vietnamese personal pronoun tôi 'I' by English pronouns you and me, the addressor in (6) avoided using the serious implication of the Vietnamese personal pronoun tôi, to indicate, either on a permanent or temporary basis, his preparedness to be interviewed.

Thus, in certain speech contexts, the addressor switches from a Vietnamese address term to English personal pronoun to signal a change in her/his attitude toward the addressee. To further elaborate this point, consider the following examples:

B. Setting: The female informant (66F84) wanted to borrow her friend's (69F78) book:

7. Mày để tao mượn cuốn *manual* đó đi. (66F84)
   you let me borrow classifier manual that
   'Can you lend me that manual?'

8. Tao đang làm *essay* mà. (69F78)
   I func-verb work essay final-particle.
   'I need it for my essay.'

9. Tao *copy* rồi trả liền à. (66F84)
   I copy then return immediately final-particle
   'I just make a copy then return it to you immediately.'

10. Mày chờ hai tuần nữa đi. (69F78)
    you wait two weeks more
    'Can you wait for two weeks.'

11. Cô khó quá thôi khỏi để *me get it from library* vậy. (66F84)
    'miss difficult very don't worry let me get it from library final-particle'
    'How difficult you are, don't worry let me get it from the library then.'

12. Tao đang cần mà. (69F78)
    I func-verb need it final-particle
    'I need it now.'

66F84 is a university student who missed two lectures. She went to her friend 69F78's home to borrow a computer manual. This conversation was recorded by 69F78.

At first, 66F84 uses the personal pronouns tao 'I' and mày 'thou/thee' to construct an informal solidarity with the addressee. It should be recalled that the use of addressor-and-addressee reference pair tao . . . mày can communicate either informal solidarity or the negation of solidarity. Its usage depends on the relationship between the speakers. In (7), 66F84's linguistic usage of tao . . . mày is appropriate in light of her social relationship with 69F78, who is expected to comply with 66F84's request. When 66F84's request is turned down, 66F84 uses the common noun cô (aunt/miss) instead of the previously used personal pronouns tao and mày. The use of cô immediately implies at least a temporary negation of the affectionate friendship relation. 66F84 also attempts to distance herself from her friend by switching to the English personal pronoun me, which is followed by an English sentence.

This is not the end of the story. At this point, one may wonder: Why is it that 66F84 did not switch to another term of Vietnamese reference system, which in itself is rich in both lexical items and meaning, instead of switching to the English personal pronoun me which is pragmatically neutral? The possible answer lies in the regularities in the use of Vietnamese personal reference.

As seen in setting (B), 66F84 sets off the conversation by using the personal pronouns tao . . . mày for addressor and addressee references. The use of these linguistic forms implies not only stable solidarity but also the congruence between the participants because the first person tao in its self-reference use co-occurs with the second person mày, not with any common noun or any other personal pronoun. In the light of the rule regulating the use of these linguistic forms, 66F84's use of cô for addressee reference would indicate the denial of the co-membership of the addressor and the addressee. As a matter of fact, the use of such common nouns as cô 'Miss' or bà 'Mrs' between speakers of equal status, such as between friends or husband/wife, for addressee reference is usually to negate the solidarity nature of a closed relation. In general, the shift from one personal

reference term to another marks the change in the addressor's attitude. Along the same lines, the switch from cô — a term which had already marked the negation of the closed relation in this speech context — to English personal pronoun me can be seen as a device that is used to emphasise the intense conflict between the speakers.

According to the basic assumption of the Markedness Model, the meaning of code-switching arises as either a conventional (unmarked) or unconventional (marked) choice for the speech context in which it occurs. To Myers-Scotton, code-switching is at the service of individual's intentions, and individual's intentions are the basis of all communicative meaning. In line of Myers-Scotton's argumentation, in setting (B), 66F84's knowledge of the unmarked RO set can be seen through the use of personal pronouns tao . . . mày at the outset of the conversation. The regularities in the use of address terms in Vietnamese require that a specific pair of address terms (personal pronouns with personal pronouns, kinship terms with kinship terms) should be consistently co-concurrent to maintain the established relations between speakers, or can be changed at the addressor's intention to create a desired situation. When 66F84 switched to English, she tries to establish a new role relationship between herself and her friend. Thus the function of marked choice noted by Myers-Scotton is fulfilled in this conversational context.

The following examples render support to Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model:

C. Setting: A son (76M88) tells his father (40M88) about a car accident in which he hit another car.

13. Chả ló ra trước mà con đang chạy thẳng đường
    chính mà. (76M88)
    he pops up while child is running on the main road
    'He popped up while I was on the maid road.'

14. Cũng tại con chạy dữ quá. (40M88)
    because child runs too fast
    'Because you drove too fast.'

15. Không dữ thằng chả ló cả cái đầu còn cãi. (76M88)
    no he pops up the whole head and then even argues
    'No the whole front of his car popped up yet he even argued.'

16. Ông ta già chưa. (40M88)
    he old yet
    'Is he old?'

17. Chả *he's about your age dad* ổng hỏi bằng lái
    con nữa. (76M88)
    he he's about your age dad he even asked for child's license
    'He is about your age he even told me to show my driving license.'

D. Setting: A woman (72F79) describes a fictional story to the interviewer.

18. Cuốn sách này có cái cô này bị tạt a-xít nguyênmết
    cái mặt bên trái cổ bị hư hết. (72F79)
    this book has this miss [who] was splashed with acid the left
    face was scarred
    'This book tells about a girl who was attacked with the
    solution of acid, the left part of her face was scarred.'

Interviewer: Sao bị tạt đánh ghen à?
'Why, is she involved in an affair'

19. Chẳng phải lúc đó cô *she's about seven or*
    eight one time her dad về nhà bắt gặp mẹ *she with*
    athoner man nên ba *she* lấy a-xít tạt mẹ *she* nhưng .
    mà trúng *she*. (72F79)
    not that at time when miss she's about seven or eight one
    time her dad went home catching mother she with another
    man therefore father she throws acid at mother she but it
    gets her.
    'No when she was about seven or eight years old one day
    her dad went home just to witness her mother was with
    another man, her father attacked her mother with the
    solution of acid but unfortunately it ended up at her face.'

The third party reference in setting (C) is the man to whom the reference by the personal pronoun chả implies the hostility to him by the addressor 76M88. The form chả is either rude, or denotes a greatest deference to the referent. In comparison to any other form of third person reference, chả indexcically marks the speaker's deference to the third party.

To reinforce his negative perception of the man whose fault caused the accident, 76M88 a moment later adds the form thứng to chả (thứng chả). Thứng is exclusively used to refer

to young boys. The combination of thẹng and chä underlies the strong deference to the third party in this conversation. According to the rule of name rectification which regulates the choice of verbal behaviour, the younger must use appropriate address terms for reference to the older. His father (40M88) notices the usage of this combined form, and wants to clarify the identity of the man by asking about his age. Being aware of the inextricable relations of person reference terms to interactional contexts, 76M88 switched to the English personal pronoun he. 76M88's code-switching may have a dual purpose: firstly, to deliberately negate the address terms he has just used and secondly, to avoid repeating using an inappropriate terms in reference to an older person. In this way, 76M88 places himself in a lower status vis-a-vis the third party in terms of age distance.

76M88's awareness of the pragmatic effects of linguistic usage is further evidence in that he switched from he to the form ±ng for the third party reference. The code-switching in setting (C) is clearly indicative of some kind of 'social motivation', to use Myers-Scotton's terms, and is an instance of 'code-switching as a marked choice'.

A similar case is in the speech of 72F79 in setting (D). In this example, 72F79 relates a fictional story about a girl whose face is badly scarred for life after having been attacked with the solution of acid. By asking if the girl in the story is a victim of an affair, the interviewer wants to know whether it is a reason for which someone throws acid at the girl. The question was raised because at the outset of the conversation 72F79 uses the third person cô, which would refer to a young female, not to a girl aged seven or eight. 72F79 immediately corrects her speech by switching to the English personal pronoun she, which is understood as a general term for a female regardless of age in English. 77F79 then keeps repeating the English personal pronoun she to the girl for the rest of the conversation. It seems as if the repetition of she can be conceived as being purposeful and rational to reaffirm the principal character in the story: the seven year old girl, not anyone else who is qualified to be addressed as cô. In other words, the use of she is the linguistic equivalent of creating the position of the girl without taking a risk of violating the regularities in the use of Vietnamese person reference terms.

The overall interpretation of code-switching from examples (1) to (19) would indicate the usefulness of Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model. Firstly, the Markedness Model concerns the negotiation of identities by means of code-switching indexing RO sets. In this theoretical model, code-switching is indicative of some kind of consensus about mutual relationships between the referents (addressor, addressee, and third parties) in a conversational interaction.

Secondly, another premise of Myers-Scotton's Model is the Co-operative Principle based on Grice (1975). Applying this principle to account for her theory of code-switching, Myers-Scotton argues that speech participants usually make their communicative choices between codes in accordance with the expected purpose of the conversation. To Myers-Scotton, when each switch starts, it is produced with an intention from the speaker because the speaker wants to do 'some social work' (p. 100). Upon hearing a switch, the addressee will reconstruct the speaker's intention. In this way, the meaning of code-switching is intentional meaning.

In general, Myers-Scotton relates the co-operative principle to code-switching by stating that this principle underlies all code choices, and 'all code choices can ultimately be explained in terms of such speaker motivations' (p. 113). Understandably, for co-operation to occur, it is assumed that the speakers know the rules of verbal behaviour operating in their community. In this view, speakers enter conversation with mutual role-relationships which are based on the 'relatively similar experiences' (Myers-Scotton 1993: 88). In fact, the view that holds that there is an association between speech activities and language varieties is put in doubt. As Auer (1995: 118) states: 'In modem bilingual societies, the relationship between languages and speech activities is by no means unambiguous. Many speech activities are not tied to one particular language, and even among those which have a tendency to be realised more often in one language than in another, the correlation is never strong enough to predict language choice in more than a probabilistic way'.

Indeed, the relationship between language varieties and speech activities is not a clear-cut one. However, given that there is to a certain extent a shared knowledge of expectations in conversation between interlocutors with

regard to the regularities in the use of person reference forms in Vietnamese, Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model provides a theoretical framework, and the most salient feature of the Markedness Model is that interlocutors are assumed to have common knowledge for appropriate sociolinguistic behaviour. In this view then, the norms and regularities in the use of address terms in Vietnamese are the shared knowledge of speakers of Vietnamese. To put it differently, the Vietnamese system of person reference is a shared linguistic resource. This resource is equally accessible by most speakers of the language. Given this available resource and the knowledge of how to use it, the speaker will retrieve appropriate address terms in accordance with the conversation in which the speaker enters.

To further clarify this point, I will attempt here to compare the notions of resource and access in different speech situations: Vietnamese-English bilinguals in this study and people of African nations in Myers-Scotton's study (1993). Myers-Scotton claims that '. . . because everyone [speakers in African nations] starts with the same equipment (the markedness metric) and has relatively similar experiences, a consensus emerges within the community' (p. 88). Her claim indicates that the communicative resource (e.g. English) in African nations is somehow equally distributed among groups and individuals by means of social mechanism such as education or law. But Myers-Scotton also notes that access to English is dependent on access to higher education ('. . . real access to this language comes through extended formal education, and such education is tied to privilege' p. 28), therefore access to linguistic resources is quite limited and as a result of this it is unequally distributed among groups and individuals.

Turning now to the Vietnamese-English bilinguals, knowledge of the regularities in the use of person reference terms is undoubtedly shared among themselves. In other words, this knowledge is an available resource to which the participants in the conversation have access. As demonstrated in examples in examples (3) and (6), when a new speech situation arises during the conversation, the speakers shift from one type of Vietnamese address term to another or switch to English personal pronouns. Their code-switching is in line with what Myers-Scotton's Markedness

Model would expect: code-switching signals the addressor's intention to change the social relationship with the addressee. In Myers-Scotton's view, it negotiates identities by means of code choices. Similar interpretation can be applied to example (7). In this example, the Vietnamese personal pronouns mày . . . tao prevailed at the outset of the conversation can be seen as an instance of informal exchange between friends. When 66F84 switches to English, she wants to change the role relations. In Myers-Scotton's term, 66F84 switches to 'negotiate' greater social distance than is normative in this situation whereas 69F78 keeps using the informal (Vietnamese) form of address (tao) to maintain the role relationship which she prefers.

The remaining examples can also be interpreted as instances of code-switching as a marked choice. In settings (C) and (D), the speakers switch to English personal pronouns to negotiate the status of the referred third parties. In (C), status refers to the age of the referent whereas in (D) it refers to the third party's gender.

Conclusion

It has been recognised in the code-switching literature that code-switching is a universal phenomenon in multilingual communities, but its functions vary between communities. Taking into account this observation and the specific characteristics of the overall picture of speech interaction in Vietnamese bilingual speakers in Melbourne, this paper has attempted to explain the occurrence of pronoun code-switching in the following ways:

Firstly, it has presented the rule-governed uses of linguistic forms in the Vietnamese system of person reference. In Vietnamese, as in a number of other languages (see Sifianou 1992), the use of appropriate address terms is indispensable to every utterance in all speech contexts. Its use is inextricably related to extralinguistic factors such as personal identity, age, gender, degree of solidarity and co-operation. Not only does its use designate the participants, but it also concurrently creates interactional contexts. In terms of Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model, the appropriate use of person reference forms is the unmarked rights-and-obligations set. The presentation of the Vietnamese system of person reference is thus an important step towards

applying the Markedness Model in analysing the code-switching of personal pronouns in this study.

Secondly, this paper has applied Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model. The model offers a framework to obtain an insight into how code-switching of personal pronouns fulfils one of the communicative functions associated with Vietnamese language and culture. The model makes sense in that it considers code-switching in any conversation as a strategy to negotiate identities. Although the model's claim of universality does not, as expected, receive entire support from other studies of code-switching, for example Swigart's study of Wolof-French code-switching in Dakar (1992), the examination of my corpus demonstrates that the model is a useful approach to code-switching. This is because of the following factors: (1) the approach rests on the principle that code-switching signals the addressor's intention to change the social relationship with the participants in the conversation. Considering the important function of the use of address terms in the Vietnamese language, the model is suitable for explaining how in Vietnamese a change in address terms signals a change in relations between the participants; (2) Following from the first factor, Myers-Scotton's Model is specifically useful if it is applied in conjunction with a special focus on the sociolinguistic aspects of the particular society in which code-switching occurs. In fact, the idea that any linguistic phenomena should be treated along with ts sociocultural context in which it takes place is suggested in the literature (e.g. Hymes 1966). In this respect, the social motivation behind the code-switching of personal pronouns presented in this paper is the indispensable regularities in the use of Vietnamese system of person reference.

References

Auer, P. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (eds.) *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 115–35.

Azuma, S. 1993. The frame-content hypothesis in speech production: evidence from intrasentential code-switching. *Linguistics* 31: 1071–1093.

Bates, E. and Benigni, L. 1975. Rules of address in Italy: A sociological survey. *Language in Society* 4: 271–88.

Bean, S. 1978. *Symbolic and pragmatic semantics: A Kannada system of address.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bentahila, A. and Davies, E. E. 1983. The syntax of Arabic–English code-switching. *Lingua* 59: 301–30.

Braun, F. 1988. *Terms of address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures.* Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, R. and Ford, M. 1961. Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62: 375–85.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1978. Universals in Language usage: politeness phenomena. In Goody, E. (ed.) *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 56–310.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. 1979. Social structure, groups, and interaction. In Scherer, K. R. and Giles, H. (eds.) *Social markers in speech.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 291–341.

Carroll, J. M. 1983. Toward a functional theory of names and naming. *Linguistics* 21: 341–71.

Clyne, M. G. (1987) Discourse structures and discourse expectations: implications for Anglo-German academic communication in English. In Smith, L. E. (ed.) *Discourse across culture: strategies in World Englishes.* New York: Prentice Hall. 73–83.

Clyne, M. G. 1994. *Inter-cultural communication at work: Cultural values in discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coughlan, J. E. 1989. A comparative study of the demographic profile of Australia's three Indochinese-Born communities: 1976–1986. *Australia–Asia Papers No. 50.* Nathan: Griffifth University.

Eades, D. 1982. You gotta know how to talk: Information seeking in South-East Queensland Aboriginal society. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 2: 61–82.

Eid, M. 1992. Directionality in Arabic–English code-switching. In Rouchdy, A. (ed.) *The Arabic language in America: A sociolinguistic study of a growing bilingual community.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 50–71.

Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of talk.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Grice, H. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Cole, P. and Morgan, J. L. (eds.) *Syntax and semantics.* New York: Academic Press. 41–58.

Gumperz, J. J. 1976. The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. *University of California Working Papers 46*. CA: University of California.

Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. (ed.) 1988. *Code-switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Hymes, D. H. 1966. Two types of linguistic relativity. In William, B. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA sociolinguistics Conference*. The Hague: Mouton. 115–67.

Indo-Chinese Refugee Association. 1987. *Life chances*. Rosewater East South Australia: Indo-Chinese Refugee Association.

Jake, J. L. 1994. Intrasentential code-switching and pronouns: on the categorical status of functional elements. *Linguistics 32*: 271–98.

Kipp, S., Clyne, M. G. and Pauwels, A. 1995. *Immigration and Australia's language resources*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Kripke, S. F. 1972. Naming and necessity. In Davidson, D. and Harman, G. (eds.) *Semantics of natural language*. Dordrecht: Reidel. 253–355.

Lambert, W. E. and Tucker, G. R. 1976. *Tu. vous. usted: a sociopsychological study of address patterns*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lipski, J. M. 1977. Code-switching and the problem of bilingual competence. In Paradis, M. (ed.) *Aspects of bilingualism*. Columbia: Hornbeam Press. 250–63.

Luong, V. H. 1987. Plural markers and personal pronouns in Vietnamese person reference: An analysis of pragmatic ambiguity and negative models. *Anthropological Linguistics 29* (1): 49–70.

Luong, V. H. 1988. Discursive practices, ideological oppositions, and power structure: Person-referring forms and sociopolitical struggles in Viet Nam. *American Ethnologist 15*: 239–254.

Lyons, J. 1981a. *Language and linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. 1981b. *Language, meaning and context*. London: Fontana Paperbacks.

Malinowski, B. 1971. Kinship. In Graburn, N. H. H. (ed.) *Readings in kinship and social structure*. New York: Harper and Row. 95–105.

Marmaridou, A. S. 1989. Proper names in communication. *Journal of Linguistics 25*: 355–72.

Matsumoto, Y. 1988. Re-examination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics 12*: 403–26.

Matsumoto, Y. 1989. Politeness and conversational universals: Observations from Japanese. *Multilingua 8*: 207–21.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1988. Code-switching as indexical of social negotiations. In Heller, M. (ed.) *Code-switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 151–86.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Russell, B. 1940. *An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth*. London: George Allen and Urwin.

Saussure, F. D. 1959. *Course in general linguistics*. Bally, C. and Sechehaye, A. (eds.) and Baskins, W. (transl.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Scotton, C. M. and Wanjin, Z. 1983. Tongzhi in China: Language change and its conversational consequences. *Language in Society 12*: 477–94.

Searle, J. 1969. *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sifianou, M. 1992. *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A cross-cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Srivastava, R. N. and Pandit, I. 1988. The pragmatic basis of syntactic structures and the politeness hierarchy in Hindi. *Journal of Pragmatics 12*: 185–205.

Swigart, L. 1992. Two codes or one?: The insiders' view and the description of codeswitching in Dakar. In Eastman, C. M. (ed.) *Codeswitching*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters. 71–82.

Thompson, L. 1987. *A Vietnamese reference grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Timm, L. A. 1975. Spanish–English code-switching: El porque y how-not-to. *Romance Philology 28*: 473–82.

Tran, Trong Kim. 1971. *Nho giáo* (Quyen Thuong). Sài Gòn: Bo Giáo duc, Trung tâm Hoc lieu.

Waley, A. 1938 (trans.). *The Analects of Confucius*. New York: Vintage Books.

Woolford, E. 1983. Bilingual code-switching and syntactic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry 14*: 520–536.

Tuc Ho-Dac holds an MA in Applied Linguistics from the University of Melbourne, and has taught at School of Languages at Deakin University. He has recently completely a doctorate in Linguistics at Monash University, and is currently undertaking research on Vietnamese and Khmer literacy with Dr. Lotherington of the Department of Linguistics, Monash University.