TAGALOG-ENGLISH CODE-SWITCHING REVISITED

Maria Lourdes S. Bautista
De La Salle University

1. Introduction

Fifteen years ago, I completed my dissertation on Tagalog-English code-switching.[1] Entitled *The Filipino bilingual's competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code-switching* (Bautista 1974, summarized in Bautista 1975 and published in full in Bautista 1980), the study attempted to (1) analyze and typologize the Tagalog-English switches appearing in a specific corpus, (2) restate the analysis and typology in the form of phrase structure rules that could be expected to generate an infinite set of utterances with Tagalog-English switches, and (3) on the basis of the typology and the phrase structure rules, construct a model of bilingual linguistic competence using Chomsky's 1965 transformational model as its frame of reference.

During the time I was writing my dissertation in 1973-1974, foreign scholars, especially Gumperz and Fishman and their associates, were looking at code-switching in functional terms, i.e. in terms of its capacity to express changes in the situation (situational switching) or in the feelings of the interlocutors towards each other (metaphor switching). At that time, although there was some reason to think that code-switching was not entirely random and unsystematic, Labov could still come out with a statement like the following: '... no one has been able to show that ... rapid alternation is governed by any systematic rules or constraints, and we therefore must describe it as the irregular mixture of two distinct systems' (1971:457).

In the Philippines, Azores (1967), Marfil and Pasigna (1970), Ramos (1970), and Pimentel (1972) had done studies of Tagalog-English code-switching using radio or newspaper or

---

This paper was originally presented at the international conference organized by the Language Education Council of the Philippines (LEDCO), April 27-29, 1989, Philippine Social Science Center, Quezon City, Philippines.

[1]At the time I wrote the original study, *Tagalog* seemed to be a less controversial term for the language I was describing. I did not want to use *Pilipino* because that language had been repudiated in the 1973 Constitution; I could not use *Filipino* because the 'common national language' was still supposed to be developed. With the 1986 Constitution categorically saying that *Filipino* is the national language, the language descried here, at this point in time, can already be called *Filipino* and not arouse strong sentiments. But to be consistent with the earlier study, I have decided to simply stick to the term *Tagalog*.

observation data. Using different corpora from newspaper or radio broadcasts, Azores, Marfil and Pasigna, and Pimentel formulated descriptions of the code-switches in terms of structural grammar or transformational grammar rules. Ramos gave programmatic statements on how code-switching could be studied and included observation data of code-switching.

Reading the foreign studies, I became intrigued enough to try to discover the functional and linguistic constraints in code-switching, only to find out the methodologically, it was almost impossible to study the situational variables behind code-switching and that only the linguistic constraints were amenable to study at that time. From the local studies, I realized that there was a need to study the linguistics of code-switching; the previous studies had not yet provided an adequate grammar of Tagalog-English code-switching.

Since the preparation of the dissertation, several studies have been published abroad on code-switching. The ones to which I have had access are Pfaff's (1979) and Poplack's (1980) studies of Spanish-English code-switching, Berk-Seligson's study of Spanish-Hebrew code-switching (1986), Boeschoten and Verhoeven's study of Turkish-Dutch code-switching (1987), and Sridhar and Sridhar's study of the psycholinguistics of code-switching (1980). In terms of Philippine studies, it seems that only two later studies have been done on Tagalog-English code-switching, the thesis by Sobolewski (1980, summarized in Sobolewski 1982) that studied the structural constraints in Tagalog-English switches, and the study by Pascasio (1978, 1984) that used data from the business domain and adduced functional reasons for the switching.

New insights from these studies have prompted me to review my data and to evaluate the conclusions I arrived at in 1974.

2. The Data and the Findings of the Original Study

The data used in my original study (and in the re-analysis to be given below) have come from *Pulong-Pulong sa Kaunlaran* 'Meetings for Progress', a developmental communication radio program produced by a government agency, the National Media Production Center, and aired from six-thirty to seven every morning and evening Monday through Saturday. This program was chosen to provide the corpus for the study because its program host code-switched frequently and so did his guests, even though there was tacit agreement that the preferred language for discussion was Tagalog. Ten tapes from the September 1973 broadcasts were chosen, and these were transcribed using normal Tagalog and English orthography, preserving not only everything said but also false starts and hesitations. The resulting transcripts consist of 1508 utterances distributed among 564 turns of speaking and 22 speakers.

My major finding in 1974 can be summarized thus:

First of all, concerning the insertion of L2 words in L1 constructions: There are many more English nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs inserted into Tagalog constructions than the reverse. The Tagalog inversion marker *ay* allows an English subject, an adverb, an object of the verb, etc. to occur in initial position in the utterance. The Tagalog enclitics *po* and *ho* 'respect markers', *daw* 'it is said', *naman* 'on the other hand, instead' appear frequently in English constructions and can be glossed only very indirectly. Certain function words show convergence in the two languages; this is the case with *na* and *that* as linkers, *kaya* and *so*, *sapagkat* and *because* as subordinating conjunctions, *at* and *and*, *o* and *or*, *pero* and *but* as coordinating conjunctions.

Second, concerning the insertion of phrases: Tagalog *ang-* noun phrases and English noun phrases show structural convergence, as do Tagalog and English prepositional phrases, Tagalog *np*-NP-genitives and English PPs, and Tagalog *sa*-NPs and English PPs. However, *ng* used as an indefinite determiner-cum-relation marker indicating complement was not the equivalent of the English determiner *a/an*. The following gaps were revealed: There are no equivalent Tagalog participial and infinite phrases to correspond to such English constructions; there are no English relative phrases, only relative clauses, which may or may not be reduced, while there are both Tagalog relative phrases and clauses.

Third, concerning the switches involving clauses: English and Tagalog noun clauses and English and Tagalog adverbial clauses show striking similarities. Code-switching occurs between L1 adverbial clauses and L2 main clauses, and between L1 and L2 independent clauses. L2 noun classes can be embedded within L1 sentence constructions.

Fourth, although a sentence (=topmost S in a tree or the initial S in a derivation consisting of several lower Ss) cannot always be identified as an L1 sentence or an L2 sentence, each sentential unit (=lower S or an S on the righthand side of a rewriting rule) more or less can be identified as an L1 S or an L2 S. That is, a sentence with an L1 adverbial clause and an L2 main clause, or with one L1 and L2 independent clause, cannot appropriately be tagged as an L1 or an L2 sentence; perhaps it should simply be labelled 'bilingual sentence'. On the other hand, no matter how many lexical or phrasal insertions from the other language a sentential unit may carry, there is some operational test -- word order, major vs. minor constituents, etc. -- for determining whether it is an L1 or an L2 S.

Fifth, following from the fourth point, it must be assumed that two sets of phrase structure rules are needed to generate the utterances in the corpus -- one set of rules for Tagalog Ss and another set for English Ss. Within each set of PS rules, however, there will be provision for lexical insertion from the other language or for switching to a phrase or sentential unit in the other language.

Sixth, there appears to be a qualitative difference between the insertion of L2 lexical items (words or 'prefabricated' phrases) into L1 utterances and the use of L2 phrases and clauses in L1 utterances. In the first kind, a detour to the Lexicon of L2 is taken, but aside from that modification, the PS rules of L1 can be adopted in their entirety. On the other hand, phrases and clauses involved in code-switching require activating two almost entire linguistic systems. An inference that can be made from this is that, strictly speaking, the term 'code-switching' is not appropriately applied to instances of the use of loanwords, i.e. lexical items from the Lexicon of L2 in L1 utterances. Although there is a branching into the Lexicon of L2, there does not seem to be a switch in code or linguistic system -- the linguistic system is still that of L1. The term 'code-switching' should therefore be reserved for instances when the two linguistic systems are engaged in the production of the utterance.

3. Definitions

My 1974 study initially defined code-switching as any shift between Tagalog and English within an utterance or between utterances. By this definition, the use of an L2 word in an L1 utterance would be counted as a code-switch, just as the shift from an L1 adverbial clause to an L2 main clause would be.[2] Towards the end of my study, however, after I had formulated a model of the linguistic competence of the Tagalog-English bilingual, I excluded the insertion of L2 words and 'ready-made' phrases in L1 utterances as a form of code-switching and limited the application of the term to instances when two linguistic systems were in operation in producing an utterance.

The distinction I made has been corroborated by Pfaff (1979:295-296), who states: 'The two terms [borrowing and code-switching] are usually construed as making vastly different claims about the competence of the individual speaker. "Borrowing" may occur in the speech of those with only monolingual competence, while "code-switching" implies some degree of competence in two languages'. Thus, according to Pfaff, most investigators find it appropriate to

---

[2]Using this definition, I found that 1000 utterances out of the total number of 1508 utterances (66.31%) constituted or contained some kind of Tagalog-English code-switching.

distinguish between the two. However, as a review of the recent literature clearly shows, there has been little agreement as to how the distinction should be made.

Pfaff evaluates the literature attempting to distinguish code-switching from borrowing using such criteria as 'switches begin at clearly discernible syntactic junctures' and 'switches have their own internal syntactic structure' and shows that these criteria do not always apply. She, therefore, comes to the conclusion that perhaps the best way to handle the classification problem is to adopt McClure and McClure (1975) and Wentz and McClure's (1977) practice of using 'code-switching' as a cover term for 'code-mixing' and 'code-changing'. According to Pfaff, these authors suggest that code-mixing occurs because an L2 word or expression is more salient or is unknown in L1, the language of discourse; it takes place within constituent boundaries, and results in sentences which belong fundamentally to L1. Code-changing, however, is principally a stylistic device denoting change in affect, addressee, mode, etc.; it must take place between constituent boundaries, and results in sentences which are sequentially L1 and L2. Even though code-mixing and code-changing are theoretically distinct, these authors show that in practice they are often related, in that code-mixes trigger more extensive code-changes (Pfaff 1979:298).

Like Pfaff, I find McClure and associates' practice to be the best possible solution to the definition problem, and so I have adopted the term 'code-switching' to refer to both code-mixing (which seems to be what I called borrowing or lexical insertion in the latter part of my dissertation) and code-changing (code-switching in my later formulation). Thus I have been able to save 'code-switching' as a cover term in both the original study and this article. It should also be noted that there is more than enough data in my corpus to probe McClure and associates' point 'that code-mixes trigger more extensive code-changes'.

4. Linguistic Constraints on Code Switching

In the recent literature, there has been great interest in formulating the linguistic constraints on code-switching. So far, three linguistic constraints have been identified through the work of several sociolinguists. These are: 91) the Free Morpheme Constraint, (2) the Size-of-Constituent Constraint, and (3) the Equivalence of Structure Constraint. The research work being done at present centers on testing the universality of these linguistic constraints on code-switching data coming from bilingual communities whose two languages are not structurally related. This is needed inasmuch as much of the early formulation was based on data coming from bilingual communities speaking Indo-European languages like Spanish and English.

Since it is the purpose of this paper to apply these constraints to Tagalog-English switches, I should spend some time explaining them.

The Free Morpheme Constraint has been formulated by Poplack (1980:586) thus: 'Codes may be switched after any constituent in discourse provided that constituent is not a bound morpheme'. According to Berk-Seligson (1986:314), repeating an example from Poplack, this would mean that an item such as *EAT-*iendo* '-ing' affixed onto an English root, 'eat', could not occur in the speech of a Spanish-English bilingual, and has never been attested, 'unless one of the morphemes has been integrated phonologically into the language of the other'. Berk-Seligson also cites the definition given by Wentz and McClure (n.d.:245): 'No words with morphology from both languages can exist without first having the stem integrate into the language of the suffix phonologically and semantically'. Berk-Seligson claims that 'the Free Morpheme Constraint would best be defined as the impossibility of code-switching at a point of morpheme binding' [underscoring hers] (315).

The Size-of-Constituent Constraint has been characterized by Berk-Seligson (1986:314) as stating that higher-level constituents, that is, major constituents (e.g. sentences, clauses) tend to be switched more often than lower-level constituents, or smaller ones (i.e. one-word categories such as nouns, determiners, verbs, adjectives, adverbs). This constraint stems from the more general constraint which says that code-switches occur primarily at phrase structure boundaries.

The one regularly found exception to the Size-of-Constituent Constraint is the category noun.

The Equivalence of Structure Constraint has been described by Poplack (1980:586) in the following way: 'Code-switches will tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and L2 elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e., at points around which the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other.' Pfaff (1979:314) says simply that 'surface structures common to both languages are favored for switches'.

5. The Free Morpheme Constraint

If my interpretation of the Free Morpheme Constraint is correct, then the Tagalog-English data are replete with examples that violate the putative universal constraint of code-switching not occurring at the point of morpheme binding.

The best examples of how a free morpheme from L1 and a bound morpheme from L2 can be put together are the English verbs with Tagalog affixes in the data. To enumerate a few: *nagga-graduate* 'is/are graduating', *nag-distribute* 'distributed', *kinommission* [pronounced with English accentuation and the /s/ of English] 'commissioned', *tinest* 'tested', *adapt-in* 'adapted', *fi-fill up-an* 'will fill up', *di-discourage-in* 'will be discouraged'.

In fact, of the 156 English verbs in Tagalog Ss found in the data, only 26 did not bear any Tagalog affixes. Below are examples of such morphologically unadapted English verbs:

(1) At ang committee pong ito ay *involved* din sa pag- - ng tinatawag nating local parks. 'And this committee is also ... in - what we call local parks'

(2)- sapagkat this concerns those who are in the Civil Service at iyon pong hindi pa nakasasali at *covered* ng Civil Service na nais kumuha ng impormasyon. 'because ... and those who have not yet joined and are ... by the Civil Service who wish to obtain information'

(3) A, iyong test na gagamitin ay isang test na *accultured, adapted* dito sa atin. 'A, the test that will be used is a test that is ... to us here'

A good question to ask, in fact, is in what form English verbs have to be in order to be inserted in Tagalog Ss without morphological adaptation. As the examples above show, all these verbs are participles and in fact under a different analysis might even be considered as adjectives. Since they are functioning as participles linked to the nouns they modify (as in (2) and (3) or as a predicate in a Tagalog sentence (as in (1)), they therefore do not carry either the English auxiliary or the Tagalog affixes required of finite verbs.

Another example of the violation of the Free Morpheme Constraint is the nominalization of English verbs using Tagalog derivational affixes, for example, *pag-register* 'act of registering', *pag-a-approve* 'act of approving', *pagdi-determine* 'act of determining'.[3]

Compare the above facts with the statement from Pfaff (1979:302) about Spanish-English code-switching: 'There is no evidence that morphological adaptation of English verbs is at present a fully productive device for mixing in non-periphrastic contexts. All the etymologically English verbs which occur with Spanish inflection are to be found in dictionaries of Mexican-American Spanish ... and appear to be fully incorporated into the Spanish lexicon of the speakers'.

From this evidence, then, we can take the position that the Free Morpheme Constraint does not apply to Tagalog-English code-switching. However, a different perspective can be taken,

---

[3]Yet one more way an L1 free morpheme and an L2 bound morpheme come together in Tagalog-English code-switching is in the use of the Tagalog linker *-ng* with English nouns, for example:

(a) - and *bureau*-ng ito ay iyong dating mga opisina ng Bureau of Forestry Reforestation Administration at Parks and Wildlife Office. 'This ... is [made up of] the former offices of the Bureau of Forestry Reforestation and the Parks and Wildlife Office'

(b) Ang responsibilidad naman po ng *committee*-ng ito ang unang-una ay ang Rizal Park ... 'The responsibility of this ... is first of all the Rizal Park ...'

In Tagalog, the linker used to connect the determiner or adjective of the noun has two forms: the free morpheme *na* for words ending in a consonant and the bound morpheme *-ng* for words ending in vowels.

which is that taken by Sobolewski (1982:40). He has adopted the position that 'the syntactic elements labeled as English in this study ... do not include words to which Tagalog affixes have been attached. ... Words that contain a Tagalog affix or affixes are considered to be Tagalog words'. We can take Sobolewski's position if we assume that the English verbs have been fully incorporated into the Tagalog lexicon; to test whether this is so, we will need to study the language of Tagalog monolinguals -- a difficult thing to do. Barring that, we can be guided by the fact that the English verbs in the corpus still maintain their English phonology. Even if we keep Sobolewski's position in mind, we can tentatively say that the Free Morpheme Constraint does not appear to apply to Tagalog-English code-switching data.

6. The Size-of-Constituent Constraint

Are Tagalog-English switches more common for larger units (clauses and sentences) than for smaller ones (one-word categories), with the possible exception of the category noun? That is what the Size-of-Constituent Constraint predicts for the Tagalog-English data.

To answer these questions it was necessary to categorize all the switches in the corpus. Following Berk-Seligson (1986:321-322), 'a given item was considered to have been code-switched so long as it was not at the same time phonologically, morphologically, and syntactically integrated into the base language'. Thus, as discussed above, *kinommission* 'commissioned' was considered a code-switch because it still carried English accent and English /s/ and thus had not been phonologically integrated into Tagalog in the speaker's utterance.

Excluded from the category of code-switches were proper nouns, i.e. names of persons, places, agencies. I did not count names like *Secretary Estrella, Rizal Park, Family Planning Organization of the Philippines*. These constituted a big number of the English words in Tagalog constructions; the number of code-switches would have been much higher if these proper nouns had been included.

Like Berk-Seligson (323), I took into account in my analysis the changes in turns of speaking, i.e. I counted as a code-switch those instances when a speaker's utterance was in a different language from an immediately prior sentence uttered by another speaker.

Examples (4)-(41) show each type of code-switched in the data:

Tagalog --> English

(4) Noun: Bueno, balik ho tayo sa ating mga *guests*. 'Okay, let's go back to our ...'

(5) Noun Phrase: Kayat hindi natin pwede pong i-discuss, ano ho, *the merits and demerits of the case*. 'So we cannot discuss, can we, ...'

(6) Verb: Sila'y nag-*distribute* ng mga forms sa bawat eskwelahan. 'They distributed forms in every school'

(7) Verb Phrase: Sa amin pong estimate dahil nabilang ho namin actually iyong mga young ones na tinatawag, iyong mga yearlings *have an increase of about eight per cent within the reservation* - 'In our estimate because we have actually counted what are called the young ones, the yearlings ...'

(8) Adjective: *Familiar* na sila sa mga pagkuha ng eksamen. 'They are already ... with the taking of examinations'

(9) Adjective Phrase: Taun-taon ho ay mayroon kaming mga tatlong - *about approximately three million five hundred thousand* we use in programs. 'Every year, we have around three - ...'

(10) Adverb: *Presently* po, and duly licensed po sa City of Manila, dalawampu't tatlo pong dormitoryo - '..., the duly licensed [dormitories] in the City of Manila are twenty-three dormitories -'

(11) Interjection: *Well*, mga kaibigan, bago po tayo pagpatuloy sa ating pagtatanghal - '..., friends, before we continue with out program -'

(12) Subordinate Conjunction: ng gusto ninyong minsanan lang, pwede rin. *So* lahat ng

- ng choices e nasa sa farmer. 'If you want [to pay] only once, that's possible too. ... all the - the choices are with the farmer'

(13) Coordinate Conjunction: Ngayon, simula nang adapt-in ng Department of Education ang examination na gagamitin -- na ginagamit namin, mapipilitan na magkaroon ng isang passing mark. *But* ang pagdi-determine ng passing mark ay sa Department of Education. 'Now, since the Department of Education adapted the examination we used - we are using, we will be forced to have a passing mark. ... the determination of the passing mark is with the Department of Education'

(14) Prepositional Phrase: - ito pong mga taong ito ay pwedeng gumawa ng request para po sila ay makakuha ng examination *in their own embassies there*? 'These people can make a request for them to take the examination ...?'

(15) Participial Phrase: Kung sabagay ito po ay, mga kaibigan, dadalhin po - nakadala na po sa korte at pag-uusapan. *Going back to the ano - to the problems of the ano, the boarders*, ano ho, napag-usapan din lamang po itong sa ating mga boarders. 'Anyway, this, friends, will be brought - has been brought to court and will be discussed. ..., since we are talking about the problems of the boarders anyway'

(16) Infinitive Phrase: Pero mayroon po akong alam na ang Office ng City Mayor ay nag-propose ng isang ordinansa *to cover these bedspacers*. 'But I know that the Office of the City Mayor has proposed an ordinance ...'

(17) Relative Clause: Wala hong paraan para maiwasan na magkaroon ng isang examina-tion *which will be fair to everybody.* 'There is no way to avoid having an examination ...'

(18) Noun Clause: Sa ngayon po ang concentration ng aming project to save the monkey-eating eagle ay sa Mindanao po dahil sa Mindanao po - doon lang tayo nakasisiguro na *we have about between forty and fifty birds left*. 'Right now the concentration of our project to save the monkey-eating eagle is in Mindanao because in Mindanao - it is only there that we can be sure that ...'

(19) Adverbial Clause: At iyong iba naman e basta indifferent sila ano? *because they are really afraid.* 'And the others are just indifferent, no?, ...'

(20) Main Clause: - kung magkakaroon po kayo ng comparison, *how would you compare the initial reaction of the people to this* - '-if you could have a comparison, ...-'

(21) Independent Clause: Mayroon pong swimming pool diyan, mayroon pong mga laruan ng mga bata *and there is mountain climbing available.* 'There is a swimming pool there, there are toys for children ...'[4]

(22) Idiomatic Expression: Hindi rin nila iyon kasalanan kung hindi sila makakuha ng exam tapos pagbalik nila rito hindi na pala pwede. Sana nam- *I don't know.* 'It won't be their fault if they cannot take the exam and then when they come back they cannot take it anymore. If it were possi- -...'

(23) Quotation: - dahilan sa noong nagkaroon kami ng interview sa television ni Presidente Marcos, tinanong ko ito. At ang sabi niya, *"Perhaps it may come out this year"*. '- because when we had an interview on television with President Marcos, I asked this. And he said, ...'

English --> Tagalog

(24) Noun: - because of circumstances prevailing during the Old Society where there was the so-called *palakasan*, the so-called *padrino* and *tayo-tayo* systems -
'... using connections, ... having a patron ... keeping the good things to ourselves ...'

---

[4] I have reserved the term 'main clause' for the clause that can stand alone in relation to the adverbial or relative clause. I have used 'independent clause' for the clauses that co-occur with each other in a compound sentence.

(25) Noun Phrase: What I wanted to ask really was *iyong tungkol sa mga questions*, kung - kasi baka masyadong mahirap iyong mga - '... that [thing] about the questions, if - because they might be too difficulty -'

(26) Verb Phrase: - kami po e - we are coordinating, I mean, the DLGCD *at saka ang DAR ay nagko-coordinate nang madalas tungkol dito sa* - '- we - we are coordinating, I mean, the DLGCD and the DAR are coordinating frequently with regard to -'

(27) Adverb: It's not *parang* applicable to our environment, you know, our country *ganyan, iyong mga magiging mga* Stateside *iyong mga questions*. '... like ... like that, the questions will become too Stateside'

(28) Subordinate Conjunction: A, in some - in some areas of the world they had to resort to very drastic measures like vasectomy and just plain IUDs *dahil* they really needed no children. '... because ...'

(29) Coordinate Conjunction: The farmer realizes that self-help will not only help him - his - socially or individually *kundi pwede ring* internationally. '... but also possibly ...'

(30) Relative Pronoun/Linker: - well I was also thinking *na* the Greater Manila area students and those whose teachers are using English as their medium of instruction will have definitely an advantage. '... that ...'

(31) Interrogative Word: Yah, but there ought to be a passing mark *ano*? '... no?'

(32) Substitute Word: Going back to the *ano*, to the problems of the *ano* - the boarders - '... whatchamacallit ...'

(33) Enclitic: - beer *daw* is considered as a beverage- '... according to some ...'

(34) Prepositional Phrase: - in a way we have been told of what the Department of Agrarian Reform has been doing *para po sa ating bansa*. '... for our country'

(35) Relative Phrase: I think this has something to do now with the pattern of education *na sinusunod sa mga kolehyo na* - 'which is being followed in the colleges that -'

(36) Relative Clause: I think that's very important and it's good no? that the schools themselves maybe through the principal and the guidance programs point out to the students their subject areas *na magaling sila*. '... where they are good'

(37) Noun Clause: Rumors have been getting around *na ang mga contraceptives daw na ito, ang iba'y nakaka-cause ng cancer*. '... that these contraceptives, according to some people, that some can cause cancer'

(38) Adverbial Clause: - later on I will ask Dr. Romulo to explain all of these methods no? *dahil siya'y bilang isang manggagamot e mas maalam siya dito sa mga bagay na iyan ano*? '... because being a doctor, she's more knowledgeable about these things no?'

(39) Main Clause: - if you're going to tell the Mayor and titillate him in doing so, *papayag ho siguro*. '... perhaps he'll agree.'

(40) Independent Clause: Well, we all know that this is a State University *at lumalakad sa pamamagitan ng pondong nanggagaling sa ating pamahalaan*. '... and it operates by means of funds coming from the government'

(41) Idiomatic Expression: Well, Atty. Pen~a, *kung sabagay po* ay since - inasmuch as you come from the examination department of the Civil Service Commission, *palagay ko* ay we would put in more interest - '... as a matter of fact ... I have a feeling ...'

The table below shows the frequency and percentages of the code-switches in the data:

Table 1. Syntactic categories of code-switching, by language

Syntactic Category	Tag -> Eng		Eng -> Tag		Total CS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Intrasentenial:						
(Single) Noun	637	33.11	3	15.00	640	33.26
Noun Phrase	374	19.43	15	.78	389	20.21

Verb	156	19.43			156	8.11
Verb Phrase	14	.73	1	.05	15	.78
Adjective	80	4.16			80	4.16
Adjective Phrase	10	.52			10	.52
Adverb	23	1.20	5	.26	28	1.45
Interjection	5	.26			5	.26
Subordinate Conj	4	.21	7	.36	11	.57
Coordinate Conj	8	.41	4	.21	12	.62
Rel Pro/Linker	4	.21			4	.21
Interrog Word	12	.62			12	.62
Substitute Word	6	.31			6	.31
Enclitic	20	1.04			20	1.04
Prepositional Phr	98	5.09	10	.52	108	5.61
Participial Phr	14	.73			14	.73
Infinitive Phr	6	.32			6	.32
	650	12	12	15.00	640	12.00
Relative Phr	3	.15			3	.15
Relative Cl	13	.68	1	.05	14	.73
Noun Clause	8	.42	15	.78	23	1.20
Adverbial Cl	20	1.04	19	.99	39	2.03
Main Clause	23	1.19	20	1.04	43	2.23
Independent Cl	28	1.46	20	1.04	48	2.50
Intersentential:						
Sentence	57	2.96	122	6.34	179	9.30
Idiomatic Exp	48	2.49	6	.31	54	2.80
Quotation	5	.26			5	.26
Total	1631	84.77	293	15.23	1924	100.00

One finding, which may have been expected, is the preponderance of code-switches involving English nouns -- 33% of the total. This is in line with the findings of Berk-Seligson for Spanish-Hebrew code-switching but not in line with those of Poplack for Spanish-English, where the sentence and the tag accounted for almost 43% of the code-switches and only 9% were code-switches involving the noun. In my data, the second most often code-switched single constituent was the verb (8%), and this is in marked contrast with the data of Berk-Seligson, who did not come across a single code-switched verb in her data, and also with the data of Poplack, where only 1% of switches involved verbs.

Let us now consider whether it was the longer units rather than the shorter ones that were frequently code-switched. One way of counting is to consider all the categories that are longer than one-word categories to be 'large constituents'; these are the noun phrase, verb phrase, adjective phrase, prepositional phrase, participial phrase, infinitive phrase, relative phrase, relative clause, noun clause, adverbial clause, main clause, independent clause, sentence, idiomatic expression, and quotation. All one-word switches would then be considered to be 'small constituents'. By this definition, the results show that 950 out of the 1920 switches (or 49%) involved large constituents. If the category noun is excluded from the counting (since the noun is the one exception found in the Size-of-Constituent Constraint), then the resulting percentage is 74%, i.e. 950 out of 1284 switches. This is overwhelming evidence that the Size-of-Constituent Constraint is robust for Tagalog-English switching.

However, if a stricter definition of 'large constituent' is used, i.e. by adopting the criterion that every large constituent has to come from an underlying S (and thus restricting the definition to participial phrase, infinitive phrase, relative phrase, relative clause, noun clause, adverbial

clause, main clause, independent clause, sentence, idiomatic expression, quotation), then the result would be 443 code-switches out of a total of 1284 (here excluding the category noun), or 33%. Although this does not give support to the Size-of-Constituent Constraint, it can be said that 33% is a respectable figure.

I am inclined to believe that the Size-of-Constituent Constraint is indeed applicable to Tagalog-English switching. Independent support comes from Sobolewski (1980), who tested the constraints involving pronouns and the relationship between verbs and other elements in clauses and sentences. To do this, he used data from song and movie magazines and data reported in previous studies of Tagalog-English code-switching, and also tried to construct hypothetical data to test possible constraints. Consider these findings from Sobolewski (1982:58):

1. A subject pronoun phrase of two or more words can be code-switched with respect to the verb, but a single word subject pronoun apparently cannot.
2. An object pronoun phrase of two or more words can be code-switched with respect to the verb, but a single-word object pronoun apparently cannot.
3. A pronoun phrase of two or more words that is the object of a preposition can be code-switched with respect to the preposition, but a single-word object that is a pronoun apparently cannot.
4. A prepositional phrase consisting of a preposition and a single-word pronoun can be code-switched, but the pronoun by itself apparently cannot.
5. While there are instances of code-switched infinitive phrases in my data and in the data of Bautista (1974), there were no instances in which only an infinitive was switched.[5]

The explanation offered by Sobolewski for these constraints is derived from two rules presented by Gumperz (1977:24, 27): 'On the whole, the longer ... [syntactic structure], the more natural the switch [from one language to another]', and '[Code] switching is blocked where it violates the speaker's feeling for what on syntactic or semantic grounds must be regarded as a single unit'.

It should be noted that this is precisely what the Size-of-Constituent Constraint claims, i.e. larger constituents are more frequently code-switched (Gumperz's first rule above) and code-switches typically occur at phrase structure boundaries (Gumperz's second rule).

7. The Equivalence of Structure Constraint

The 'surface structures common to both languages are favored for switches' (Pfaff 1979:314) is true is demonstrated amply by the ease with which switches are done between English adverbial clauses and Tagalog main clauses or vice-versa, and between English and Tagalog main clauses or vice-versa, and between English and Tagalog independent clauses. Tagalog noun clauses can be embedded within English sentence constructions or vice-versa. It seems that a sentence construction can be in Tagalog or English and the speaker can just as easily use a Tagalog

---

[5]Examples for each one are given by Sobolewski in different parts of his presentation. Illustrative sentences can be given here for each item; for each item, the first example is a hypothetical sentence 'constructed' by Sobolewski and the second example comes from his data set.

For 1.: *He* ay pumunta sa Maynila. 'He went to Manila' vs. Ang panganay namin ay nag-asawa na at may dalawang anak while *the other two* ay nahinto sa pag-aaral. 'The eldest child in our family is married already and has two children while the other two [my other two brothers] have stopped going to school'

For 2.: *Kumain ako ng *it*. 'I ate it'; *Nagbisita *him* ako. 'I visited him'; *Nagbisita ako sa *him*. 'I visited him' vs. Happy love-day *sa iyong lahat*. '...to you all'

For 3.: *Bumoto ako para sa *him*. 'I voted for him' vs. - nagkaroon ng immediate changes talagang beyond control *ng anybody else* '... there were immediate changes [that were] certainly beyond the control of anybody else'

For 4.: *I voted for *siya*. 'him/her' vs. ... some schools are conducting review classes *para sa kanila* '... for them'

For 5.: I am not too sure of this constraint because it seems to me that just as Ano ho ang dapat kong gawin *to win their love*? 'What should I do ...' is perfectly acceptable, so would be Ano ho ang dapat kong gawin *to win*? 'What should I do ...'.

prepositional phrase or an English prepositional phrase.

The application of the Equivalence of Structure Constraint can be shown in the following set of sentences with Tagalog NPs appearing as subjects:

(43) Ito pong mga areas na ito *ang intensyon* talaga is to maintain it in the original state. 'In these areas the intention really ...'

(44) Na iyong mga halaman at mga plants and animals na nandoon po sa lugal na iyon pabayaan lang at magkaroon sila ng tinatawag na natural interaction at parang *ang tao* will find a way to be able to enjoy and recreate in these areas. 'That the plants and animals in those places should be left alone and so they can have what is called natural interaction and so human beings [literally, man] ....'

(45) *Ang stand po kasi noong Church noon,* bago noong talagang lumaki iyong population ng buong mundo ano? was that really *ang procre- - ang marriage act, iyong sexual act in marriage* was basically number one for procreation and education of children ano? 'Because the stand of the Church then, before the population of the whole world really grew no? ... procre- - the marriage act, the sexual act in marriage ... no?'

These examples easily illustrate the Equivalence Constraint. It is clear that the structure of Tagalog NPs is like that of English NPs: NP is rewritten as Det (+ Adj) + N + (S). The switch between a Tagalog subject and an English predicate is possible because of the congruence of Tagalog subjects and English subjects: From the Tagalog subject, it is just as easy to continue with a Tagalog *ay*-inverted-construction-as-predicate as with an English predicate.

However, the Equivalence Constraint has been refined by Sridhar and Sridhar (1980:208-209), who found a problem with Poplack's formulation of it. According to them, 'although Poplack claims that the surface structures of the two languages must map on to each other at the point of the switch, she does not specify what degree of correspondence must obtain for·two structures to be considered equivalent'. In her example, [repeated below as (42)],

(42) Eng. I told him that so that he would bring it fast
     Sp. (yo) le dije eso pa'que (el) la trajera ligero
     Mixed I told him that pa'que la trajera ligero

although *told him* and *le dije* on the one hand and *would bring it* and *la trajera* on the other are equivalent at a certain level of analysis, they do, of course, differ with regard to the order of elements within the constituents, and to that extent, 'they are not equivalent'.

The solution they propose is to incorporate what they call the Dual Structure Principle into the constraint, which they have formulated thus: 'The internal structure of the guest constituent need not conform to the constituent structure rules of the host language, so long as its placement in the host sentence obeys the rules of the host language' (209).

The constraint that I noticed in my dissertation is different from the Dual Structure Principle. It appears that it is not simply the guest constituent's 'placement' in the host sentence that should obey the rules of the host language; even the guest constituent's structure at the switching point should follow the rules of the language of the host sentence. This is how I stated it in my dissertation: 'The norms of the base-language for the sentence serving as the matrix of the code-switch dictate the form of the code-switched construction' (1977:14).

My evidence for the previous statement comes from the set of data involving Tagalog NPs appearing as complements in English Ss:

(46) At kagaya po ng ating napasimulang paksa, we'll still discuss *ito pong mga details na may kaugnayan sa National College Entrance Examination* - 'And like the topic we started with, ... these details that are related to the National College Entrance Examination -'

(47) Kung hindi po ninyo - we have discussed during the first session *ito pong subject areas na inyo pong pipiliin.* 'If you don't - ... these subject areas that you will choose'

(48) Ano po - kung magkakaroon po kayo ng comparison, how would you compare the initial reaction of the people to this at saka *iyon pong pagtanggap nila ngayon sa kapanahunang*

ito? 'What - if you will make a comparison, ... and their acceptance of it at this time?'

(49) They are given *iyong tinatawag na academic appointments*. ' ... what are called academic appointments'

In (46) - (49), the Tagalog NPs are objects of the verb -- and yet the determiner is *ito/iyon*, the determiner for subject NPs, rather than *nito/noon*, the determiner for Tagalog objects of the verb. This seems to be due to the fact that the matrix-sentences (or host sentences, in Sridhar and Sridhar) for the complements are English and thus the norms for English dictate the unacceptability of a *ng*-marked NP as complement. A Tagalog NP-complement inserted into an English S cannot bear the determiner *nito* because that will incorporate the relation-marking associated with *ng*, a signalling feature not found in English grammar. 'In other words, the *ng* determiner immediately marks an as complement, but this kind of marking is not needed in English, there the determiner *the, a* or *an* marks only definiteness or indefiniteness, not syntactic relationship between verb and noun' (Bautista 1980:237).

The difference stemming from the presence of relation-marking in *ng* is also reflected in what happens to an English NP-complement inserted into a Tagalog S:

(50) Maari po bang bigyan nyo kami *ng the facts of the matter*? vs. *Maari po bang bigyan nyo kami *the facts of the matter*. 'Is it possible for you to give us ...'

The unacceptability of the asterisked form shows that the English NP, the guest constituent, although already possessing the determiner *the*, still has to be introduced by the Tagalog determiner *ng* because the structure of Tagalog, which is the host sentence, requires *ng* as a relation-marker.

From the above discussion, it is clear that Equivalence of Structure Constraint, modified in some way although perhaps not in the current reformulation as a Dual Structure Principle, is a valid one in Tagalog-English code-switching.

8. Conclusion

We have come a long way in our attitudes towards, and our knowledge of, code-switching. Sridhar and Sridhar (1980:203) remind us that Weinrich, in 1963, characterized the ideal bilingual as an individual 'who switches from one language to the other according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topic, etc.), but not in an unchanged speech situation, and certainly not within a single sentence' (73). But now we know that code-switching is very common bilingual behavior and that it is rule-governed behavior. The search continues for what these rules are.

In this paper I have tried to apply the findings of the recent code-switching literature on my Tagalog-English data. I did this by considering the three linguistic constraints often mentioned in the literature: the Free Morpheme Constraint, the Size-of-Constituent Constraint, and the Equivalence of Structure Constraint. The findings indicate that the Free Morpheme Constraint does not seem applicable to Tagalog-English code-switching, as evidenced by the numerous instances of an English free morpheme (a verb root, for example) being given Tagalog bound morphemes (affixes for focus and aspect, or for nominalization). However, the Size-of-Constituent Constraint has validity for this set of data, with 'large constituents' (the noun phrase, verb phrase, adjective phrase, prepositional phrase, participial phrase, infinitive phrase, relative phrase, relative clause, noun clause, adverbial clause, main clause, independent clause, sentence, idiomatic expression, and quotation) constituting 49% of the code-switches in the corpus. Furthermore, the Equivalence of Structure Constraint also seems applicable, especially if the constraint is modified to incorporate the requirement that the norms of the matrix sentence determine the shape of the guest constituent in a code-switched sentence.

The findings concerning the application of these three constraints are similar to those obtained for the Spanish-English case of Pfaff and Poplack, with the exception of the findings for the Free Morpheme Constraint. However, they are different from Berk-Seligson's findings, which

are the mirror image of mine. Berk Seligson found the Free Morpheme Constraint robust but the Size-of-Constituent Constraint and the Equivalence of Structure Constraint inapplicable to Spanish-Hebrew switching. The findings are also different from those of Boeschoten and Verhoeven, who found that all three constraints could not be generalized to the Turkish-Dutch language mixing of Turkish children growing up in the Netherlands. There obviously are several factors to account for the differences in findings; to name two, structural convergence, where the particular closeness or distance of the word-classes and syntactic rules of the two languages are critical; and the symmetrical or asymmetrical nature of the code-switching case, whether going from L1 to L2 or from L2 to L1 is easily done because the two languages have co-existed in the community for a long time or whether it is a case of an immigrant language and a well-established language in the community.

In the Tagalog-English code-switching situation, the switching is generally symmetrical, going one way or the other, and it is difficult to explain why bilinguals switch from one language to the other just when they do. Although Pascasio (1978, 1984) has tried to give reasons for the code-switches in her data from the business domain using Gumperz's conversational functions of code-switching (1977), it can be stated that attempts to provide functional explanations have generally not been successful. A better approach is suggested by Poplack (1980:614), who says that code-switching is an over-all discourse *mode* and it is 'the choice (or not) of this mode which is of significance to the participants rather than the choice of switch points'. Thus, we should not try to look for reasons or social motivations behind each and every code-switch; we should simply accept code-switching as a style of speaking which is part of the verbal repertoire of a particular speech community, such as the Tagalog-English bilingual community described in this paper.

Given this facility of switching from one language to the other, can we then say that there is only one grammar to account for code-switches? The psycholinguist Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) say that a 'merged' grammar does not seem likely, since even habitual code-switchers produce entirely monolingual discourse in switched speech, a large number of turns of speaking in one language or the other. They instead suggest the possibility of an 'interactionist model of overlapping systems. They think that the likeliest possibility is 'that mixed sentence production involves an "assembly line" process, where individual components (guest constituents) are put together separately and inserted into appropriate slots in the syntactic frame of the host language. ... [T]he syntactic constituency of the guest constituents and their external patterning with the host sentence ... is checked at the comparison stage' (211). Their suggestion is a more precise formulation of what I merely indicated in my dissertation. In my 1974 study, I proposed a model which had two separate grammars for Tagalog and English and which allowed for a path from one grammar to the other. I also spoke of prefabricated structures that could be easily inserted into the grammar of the other language.

What are the implications of Tagalog-English code-switching on the further development of the national language Filipino? It is clear that the affix used for English verbs in actor focus is *mag-* and never *-um-* (perhaps because it is easier to use a prefix than an infix), and therefore this reinforces the predominance of *mag-* over *-um-*. In the data, the nominalization of English verbs using the nominalizing affix *pag-* freely varies between the reduplication and the unreduplicated forms, e.g. *pag-develop* and *pagdi-develop, pag-secure* and *pagsi-secure*. It seems the strict distinction for nominalizing pointed out by Otanes (1970) -- *pag-* + reduplication of the first syllable of the root for *mag-* verbs and *pag-* only for *-um-* verbs -- is no longer being observed. In short, fewer distinctions will probably be made in the Filipino of the future. It also goes without saying that the influence of English and Tagalog-English code-switching has been pervasive in the phonology, where English consonants like /j/ and /s/ and /z/ and /f/ and /v/, just to take a few examples, have been incorporated into Filipino phonology, to a certain extent, and the letters representing them will already appear in the proposed Filipino alphabet.

Language convergence between English and Filipino because of symmetrical switching is obviously an area for further investigation.

Two final observations: As far as I know, there has been no study of 'colegiala English' (the variety of English used by sophisticated female students) yet. Thus I should point out that one feature of 'colegiala English' might be the unrestrained use of English verbs in Tagalog constructions, when such English verbs do not fill lexical gaps in Tagalog, e.g. *nag-pray* 'prayed', *magwe-wait* 'will wait', *ka-i-eat* 'has/have just eaten', *paki-help* 'please help'. This observation should be tested further. Another feature is the presence of enclitics like *daw* 'according to others', *na* 'already', *naman* 'on the other hand', and the all-purpose use of *kasi* 'because', *bale* 'like', and *parang* 'like' in English sentences.

It has frequently been pointed out that there appear to be two kinds of code-switching in the Filipino speech community: (1) the code-switching of a person who is not fully adequate in L2 but is forced to use L2, who thus flounders from time to time, and who therefore has to keep switching to L1, and (2) the code-switching of a person who is fully competent in both languages and who therefore uses the code-switching mode as a style of speaking. Looking now at academic or public discourse, it seems to me that the Tagalog-English bilinguals who used to code-switch a lot in the past (because they lacked the competence to explain the subject matter fully in Filipino) have not become so used to using Filipino even in formal discourse that they no longer need to resort to code-switching. The bilinguals who are just now discovering the need to start using Filipino more in their non-casual speech are the ones who have to resort to code-switching. Thus it seems that in academic and public discourse at least, Filipinos are moving towards the use of more Filipino, meanwhile using code-switching as a way station to that destination. But for a certain group of Filipinos, at this point in time and perhaps for some time to come, code-switching in casual speech certainly is a mode, or style, of speaking.

REFERENCES

AZORES, FORTUNATA M. 1976. A preliminary investigation of the phenomenon of language change in the Philippines. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

BAUTISTA, MA. LOURDES S. 1974. The Filipino bilingual's linguistic competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code-switching. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo de Manila University-Philippine Normal College Linguistics Consortium. Published in Pacific Linguistics Series C-59. 1980. Canberra: The Australian National University.

_____. 1975. A model of bilingual competence based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code-switching. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 6.1.51-89. (A condensed version of the doctoral dissertation.)

_____. 1977. The noun phrase in Tagalog-English code-switching. Studies in Philippine Linguistics 1.1.1-16.

BERK-SELIGSON, SUSAN. 1986. Linguistic constraints on intrasentential code-switching: A study of Spanish/Hebrew bilingualism. Language in Society 15.3.313-348.

BOESCHOTEN, HENDRIK E. and LUDO TH. VERHOEVEN. 1987. Language-mixing in children's speech: Dutch language use in Turkish discourse. Language Learning 37.2.191-215.

GUMPERZ, JOHN J. 1977. The sociolinguistic significance of conversation code-switching. RELC Journal 8.2.1-34.

LABOV, WILLIAM. 1971. The notion of 'system' in creole languages. In Pidginization and creolization of languages, ed. by Dell Hymes, 447-472. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MARFIL, ALICE E. and AIDA L. PASIGNA. 1970. An analysis of shifts from Tagalog to English in printed materials. Unpublished M.a. thesis, Philippine Normal College.

McCLURE, ERICA and M. McCLURE. 1975. Ethnoreconstruction. Mid-America Linguistics Conference Papers, 327-337. Lawrence: University of Kansas.

OTANES, FE T. 1970. Some transformational rules for noun derivation in Tagalog. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 1.1.33-73.

PASCASIO, EMY M. 1978. Dynamics of code-switching in the business domain. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 9.1-2.40-50.

------------------------------. 1984. Philippine bilingualism and code-switching. In Panagani: Essays in honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his sixty-seventh birthday, ed. by Andrew Gonzalez, 122-134. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

PFAFF, CAROL W. 1979. Constraints on language mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. Language 55.2.291-318.

PIMENTEL, SERAFIN V. 1972. A study of the patterns of mixing English and Tagalog in radio broadcast: A descriptive analysis. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, University of the Philippines.

POPLACK, SHANA V. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. Linguistics 18.581-618.

RAMOS, TERESITA V. 1970. Bilingualism: Suggested directions for its study. Philippine Education Quarterly 2:37-56.

SOBOLEWSKI, FRANK A. 1982. Some syntactic constraints in Tagalog-English language mixing. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii.

_____. 1982. Some syntactic constraints in Tagalog-English language mixing. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 13.2.35-62. (A condensed version of the thesis.)

SRIDHAR, S.N. and KAMAL K. SRIDHAR. 1980. The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-mixing. Studies in the Linguistic Sciences 10.203-215.

WEINREICH, URIEL. 1963. Language in contact. The Hague: Mouton.

WENT, JIM and ERIKA McCLURE. n.d. As cited on p. 315 of Susan Berk-Seligson's article (1986).

_____. 1977. Monolingual 'codes': Some remarks on the similarities of bilingual and monolingual code-switching. Chicago Linguistic Society 13.706-713.