Motivation for Code-switching in the Chinese Christian Church in the United States

Litong Chen
The Ohio State University

1. Introduction

Although Christianity is not regarded as a part of Chinese culture and traditional ideology, a large number of Chinese immigrants adopt a Christian faith after they come to the United States. Among these immigrants are undergraduate and graduate students, visiting scholars, professionals, and the spouses and parents of these groups of people. These Chinese people come from various areas, but mostly from mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, and other Southeast Asian countries. Other immigrants arrive in the US as Christians. Many Chinese Christians attend Chinese ethnic Christian churches (henceforth, "Chinese churches"). They attend Sunday services, Sunday school, Bible discussion groups, and many other types of gatherings. In fact, Christians comprise a notable portion of the Chinese population in the US, as Yang (1998:240) notes:

> The increase of new Chinese immigrants since the 1960s sparked a period of rapid growth in the number of Chinese churches in America. By 1994 they had increased to 700 (AFC 1994). Some survey data suggest that as many as 32 percent of Chinese in the US today are Christians (Hurh and Kim, 1990:20; Dart, 1997). This high rate is unprecedented in the history of the Chinese in diasporas as well as in China.

Church activities are conducted predominantly in one or two of the major Chinese languages, depending on which is the most common language in a given church community. Mandarin, Cantonese, and Taiwanese are the most commonly-used languages among church staff (e.g. pastors, deacons, Sunday school teachers, etc.), as well as among the laity in the Chinese church.

Although the dominant language in the Chinese church is Chinese, code-switching from Chinese to English is often observed among bilingual Chinese Christians in church settings. That is to say, such code-switching is a type of endo-bilingual interaction as defined by Lüdi (1987, cf. Winford, 2003:102), involving Chinese-English bilingual speakers who are native in one or more Chinese languages and proficient in English.

Texas Linguistics Forum 56:1-11
Proceedings of the 21st Annual Symposium about Language and Society--Austin
April 13-14, 2013

Code-switching is defined by Thomason (2001:132) as "the use of materials from two (or more) languages by a single speaker in the same conversation." She further divides the cover term code-switching into two categories; *code-switching* (in a narrow sense, which equates to inter-sentential switching and "is switching from one language to another at a sentence boundary") and *code-mixing* (which equates to intra-sentential switching and happens "within a single sentence"). Her definitions seem to exclude the phenomenon of switching codes on the discourse level, which happens beyond a single turn of communication and is defined by Myers-Scotton (1997) as *code alternation*.

Winford (2003: 103) provides a more inclusive definition of code-switching as "cases where bilingual speakers alternate between codes within the same speech event, switch codes within a single turn, or mix elements from two codes within the same utterance." "Alternation between codes within the same speech event", "switching codes within a single turn", and "mixing elements from two codes within the same utterance" correlate roughly to *code alternation*, *code-switching*, and *code-mixing*, respectively.

With regard to the motivation behind the phenomenon of code-switching, the ascertainment of which is a crucial pursuit of sociolinguistics, Auer (1995:124, cf. Winford, 2003:103) distinguishes four patterns of code-switching. Pattern I ("discourse-related switching") and Pattern II ("preference-related switching") correlate to *code alternation*. In Pattern III, the switching of codes is an "unmarked choice", and the matrix language (ML) is not clear. Pattern IV, by comparison, shows one language as the ML in which words or phrases from the other language are inserted. These latter two patterns echo either the concept of inter-sentential *code-switching* or that of intra-sentential *code-mixing*, depending on whether the ML is clearly detectable. Table 1 concludes the approximate relationship among these terms.

Table 1. Concepts under the general term "code-switching"

	Category	Definition in Winford (2003)	Auer's (1995) Pattern
1	*Code alternation*	Alternation between codes within the same speech event	I and II
2	a.*Code switching*	Switching codes within a single turn (inter-sentential)	III (ML is unclear); IV (ML is clear)
	b.*Code mixing*	Mixing elements from two codes within the same utterance (intra-sentential)	

Few studies have been conducted on the topic of code-switching in a church-related context. Shin (2010) explores the functions of Korean-English bilingual children's code-switching in a Korean Sunday school in Los Angeles through an analysis of code-switching data collected through audio recordings and interviews. He identifies situation-related code-switching by analyzing subjects' speech and specific situations which elicit the use of Korean. Shin shows that Korean is used in particular conversational acts and proposes that in the Korean church context, "the use of Korean in bilingual discourse may index Korean ethnic identity by evoking the traditional social ideology of relative status and increasing solidarity." (pp.91)

Another study was conducted by Albakry and Ofori (2011). They investigate code-switching between English and indigenous languages at Sunday services and in informal social interactions by believers in some Catholic churches in Accra, Ghana. Using data collected through the participant observation method, the authors find that English

dominates church activities in urban Accra, and is used extensively in combination with local languages. The authors argue that social settings, communicative purposes, linguistic abilities, and social relationships all influence the churchgoers' linguistic choices according to the communicative demands of the occasion. In the formal context of church services, Standard English tends to be used exclusively. In less formal church settings however, language alternation and the switching/mixing of English with local languages are widely observed.

The present study may be the first research effort to study Chinese-English code-switching phenomena in a church-related context in the United States. In this paper I investigate the motivation for code-switching in the Chinese church. The term code-switching is used here in a general sense, despite the fact that the main type of switching, as we will see later, is intra-sentential code-mixing, and inter-sentential code-switching is also seen(both terms used as defined by Thomason 2001). In Auer (1995)'s terminology, both belong to Pattern IV for the reason that the ML is without doubt Chinese.

2. Methodology

This research project began with a pilot study. I collected data by recoding conversations and discussions through the "participant observation" method (Blom and Gumperz, 1972). Over the course of a month, I observed and recorded more than four hours of Bible discussions among Chinese Christians. During the same period I observed Sunday services in a local Chinese church. Many cases of code-switching were identified; however, it was very difficult to identify relationships between code-switching and social factors like gender, education, dialect background, etc. Despite this vagueness, an empirical impression through preliminary observation was that code-switching in the Chinese church is most likely associated with the style of speech, with a more casual style containing more code-switching and a more formal style containing less code-switching. The aim of the remainder of this paper is to test this hypothesis.

The follow-up study, which comprises the main body of this paper, consists of two parts: video analysis and interview. The first part is video analysis. The site of this study is G Chinese Christian church (a pseudonym), located a major city in the Western United States. The church has posted many videos of both sermons and Sunday school discussions from the past seven years on its website, and all of these resources are accessible to the public. I investigated code-switching in the sermons alongside code-switching in the Sunday school discussions, with the sermon representing a more formal and serious context and the Sunday school discussions being more casual and relaxed.

To compare the two, I counted the occurrence of code-switching in both situations. To better control potential variables such as interpersonal differences and diachronic change, I focused on only one G church pastor. This pastor, Pastor Y (a pseudonym), is also a Sunday school teacher at the same church. I only studied in juxtaposition his sermons and Sunday school teachings from October to December 2008. I examined some cases of code-switching in the sermons and Sunday school discussions through discourse analysis.

The second part of this study is an in-depth thirty-two-minute-long telephone interview with Pastor Y.[1] Given my observations and interpretations from the video analysis, I directly asked Pastor Y for his own opinion on code-switching, mainly his explanation of his motivations for using or not using code-switching, as well as his attitude towards these linguistic behaviors. The purpose of the interview is to compare the pastor's (insider's) interpretation with my interpretations from an observer's (outsider's) perspective. With Pastor Y's consent, I recorded the entire interview. In later discussions in this paper, either rephrasing or direct quotation, depending on necessity, is provided to demonstrate Pastor Y's opinion. Since the interview was originally conducted in Mandarin Chinese, I also translated his words into English.

3. Video analysis

I compared three of Pastor Y's sermons with two of his Sunday school teachings in autumn 2008. The three sermons are: "The Meaning of Offerings" (奉獻的真意 *Fengxian de zhenyi*, October 5), "The Reward of Offerings" (奉獻的獎賞 F*engxian de jiangshang*, October 12), and "Dislocated Heart" (錯置的心靈 *Cuozhi de xinling*, October 26). The two Sunday school teachings are: "Genesis 2" (創世紀 2 *Chuangshi Ji 2*, December 14) and "Genesis 3" (創世紀 3 *Chuangshi Ji 3* December 28). The frequency of code-switching in each video file is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Frequency of code-switching in Pastor Y's sermons and Sunday school teachings

Category	Title	Length	Code-switching cases
Sermon	The Meaning of Offerings	36:13	1
	The Reward of Offerings	37:17	1
	Dislocated Heart	36:33	1
Sunday school teaching	Genesis 2	1:05:40	>37
	Genesis 3	1:13:15	> 18

The most noteworthy phenomenon is that in these three Sunday sermons, about 1 hour 50 minutes long in total, only three cases of code-switching are found. The first one is a translation of the sermon title into English ("Dislocated Heart"); the second one is a proper noun (SARS [Severe acute respiratory syndrome]); and the last one is "kid's corner" (a special classroom which typically does not exist in Chinese elementary schools).

In marked contrast, in the Sunday school teaching videos, during the total 2 hours and 19 minutes, there are no less than 55 cases of code-switching from Chinese to English, including both inter- and intra-clausal switching. In counting the cases, I did not count code-switching for the same words multiple times. For instance, "somehow" is used twice in "Genesis 2" and twice in "Genesis 3", but is only counted as one case. Below are some code-switching examples from the Sunday school classes. In order, I provide the original sentence transcribed in Chinese characters, then in *Pinyin* (standard romanized Chinese), then a word-by-word translation, and finally a complete English translation. Underlined words denote code-switching from Chinese to English.

[1] Although his real name is not given in this paper, I would like to express my deep gratitude towards Pastor Y. Without his kindness and patience in answering my questions during the interview, this paper may not have been possible.

(1) 這是個 good question, 但是我没有 answer, 啊, 没有 answer.
Zhè shì ge good question, dàn shì wǒ méi yǒu answer, a, méi yǒu answer.
This COP MW good question, but I not-have answer, yeah? not-have answer[2]
"This is a good question; but I don't have an answer, right? I don't have an answer."

Example 1 is a case of intra-sentential code-switching (or *code-mixing*). This case is from "Genesis 3", approximately 0:19:45. Pastor Y is making a comment about a question raised by one of the adult students during the discussion. He comments that it was a good question, but he does not have an answer to it. The teacher continues smiling, and sporadic giggles are heard among the students. The entire atmosphere is relatively relaxed.

(2) 你只要做好, 你可以變成神—no way, [pause] 不可能的事情.
Nǐ zhǐ yào zuò hǎo, nǐ kě yǐ biàn chéng shén—no way,bù kě néng de shì qing
You only need do well, you can change as God—no way, not possible DE thing
"If (as long as) you live right, you can be God—no way, it is impossible."

Example 2 is a case of inter-sentential code-switching. This case is taken from "Genesis 2", approximately 0:43:00. Pastor Y is explaining the difference between the Creator and the created, that there is no way for human beings to become God. He raises his voice slightly when he says "no way", and then there is a short pause. He uses both strategies to attract the audience's attention and convey the serious nature of his statement.

(3) 我不曉得神有没有什麽特别的一個…一個 boundary, I…I don't know.
Wǒ bù xiǎo de Shén yǒu méi yǒu shén me tè bié de yí gè…yí gè boundary, I… I don't know.
I not know God have-not-have what special DE one MW…one MW boundary, I… I don't know
"I am not sure if God sets any special boundary (for the Garden). I…I don't know."
[gesturing, pantomiming a box in the air with both hands]

Example 3 is a combination of intra- and inter-sentential code-switching, with the insertion of the word *boundary* as an intra-sentential type of code-switching and the use of the phrase *I don't know* as an inter-sentential code-switching. This case is taken from "Genesis 3", approximately 0:40:30. Pastor Y is responding to a question raised by one of his students about the boundary of the Garden of Eden. He is explaining his uncertainty regarding the existence of a boundary for the garden. Before he says the English word *boundary*, he hesitates briefly, seeming to search for this word in his brain. In the meantime, he gestures with both his hands, attempting to convey the concept of a box.

Another phenomenon that bears mentioning is the repetition of the same word or phrase after code-switching. In his Sunday school teachings, Pastor Yang switches to English several times. After saying a word or a phrase in English, he immediately proceeds to say the same word or phrase again in Chinese. Example 4 illustrates such a phenomenon. This is a sentence excerpted from "Genesis 2", approximately 0:36:35.

[2] Abbreviations: COP-copular; MW-measure word; DE-prenominal modification marker *de* 的.

(4) 這個其實都是 imply, 暗示著, 啊……三位一體的這種講法.
Zhè ge qí shí dōu shì imply, àn shì zhe, a..... Sān wèi yī tǐ de zhè zhǒng jiǎng fǎ.
This MW actually all COP imply, imply-ING, hmm…… Three-person-one-body DE this kind explanation.
"These actually all imply the explanation of the Trinity."
[pause, flipping his lecture notes]

Based on the video analyses, my preliminary proposal is that the differing speech styles expected to be used in different situations should account for the code-switching occurrence frequency difference. Sermons and Sunday worship services, on the one hand, are more formal, with religious rituals and larger numbers of attendees. The attendees usually do not know each other well, and there is no direct communication between the person giving the sermon and the audience. The Sunday services are held in a large room (usually in an auditorium), and sermons are focused on specific and detailed topics. Sunday school, on the other hand, provides a much more casual atmosphere. Far fewer people are gathered together, and the teaching and discussion take place in a smaller room (usually a classroom). The topics of discussion are more spontaneous, more general, and constantly changing. In addition, the relationship among attendees is closer, both between teacher and students as well as among the students. Many interactions take place, including questions and answers, and even jokes and laughter can be heard.

Blom and Gumperz (1972), based on their analysis of code-switching in a Norwegian city, argue that speakers are conscious of and able to take initiative to make choices regarding language use. Their language choice is constantly adjusted with changes in location, social relationship, and/or topic. Specific language choice helps bilingual speakers construct specific identities for themselves. Blom and Gumperz distinguish between situational code-switching and metaphorical code-switching. Despite the weakness in justifying the juxtaposition of metaphorical code-switching with situational code-switching (the former can arguably be defined as a kind of the latter), their study makes it clear that language choice is not only decided by language background, but is also determined by social network.

For Pastor Y, there are at least two groups of people in his church network: one in the Sunday service, and the other in Sunday school. Therefore, I propose that Pastor Y's code-switching in the G church which represents a more casual, natural, informal, spontaneous, easy-going, everyday manner of speech, is attached to his social network of Sunday school attendees. The motivation is for the pastor to either construct a certain identity for himself, to elicit a specific reaction from the audience, or to exert a particular influence on the audience. This proposal is tested by the interview with Pastor Y in the subsequent section.

4. Interview

According to Pastor Y's feedback, it is natural for him to switch to English when speaking Chinese. This is the case both in teaching Sunday school and in many other everyday life situations. While both he and his wife are from a Mandarin Chinese-speaking community in East Asia, they have lived in the United Stated for over thirty years, and Pastor Y has been working as a pastor in Chinese churches for more than twenty years. They speak to each other in Mandarin Chinese but predominantly use

English when addressing their children at home. Even in the G church, the working language among church staff is English. All these factors contribute to Pastor Y's fluency in English, both in daily life and as a working language. It has been his habit to use English. He also notices that other pastors and staff members at G church, as long as they are Chinese-English bilingual, also use code-switching when speaking Chinese in everyday life.

Pastor Y even finds that sometimes it is not clear how to translate some expressions into Chinese. That is to say, some concepts, words, or phrases are probably stored in his lexicon primarily in an English phonological shape. Therefore, these concepts, words, and phrases, therefore, could have a natural output in English even in an otherwise Chinese sentence. This may be the reason for code-switching. Another reason Pastor Y feels comfortable switching to English when teaching Sunday school is that people around him all do this. I translate his comments on this subject below:

> *"About Sunday school—it is more relaxed, since in Sunday school there are usually two-way interactions and discussions. So, ……, (I) don't pay too much attention (to my speech), and (I am) relatively relaxed. That is how English comes out—because in daily life (we also) use English…… Chinese living here (in the US) basically all do this. That is, (they will) all say "(this is my) point", "anyway"—(they'll) all say things like these…… When talking to each other, all (Chinese) people use English (when speaking Chinese). Therefore when I answer questions (in Sunday school) I will also use English, inserting English into Chinese. Since (Chinese) people all interact in this way, this (code-switching) happens a lot (in my Sunday school teaching)."*[3]

On the other hand, Pastor Y makes a conscious choice to not use English in sermons on Sundays. To illustrate this, he introduces in detail the demographic structure of the G church in terms of population, age, occupations, people's English proficiency levels, and spiritual maturity. In the Mandarin Chinese congregation[4], over 400 people regularly attend Sunday services. The majority are professionals, who are generally proficient in English, but there are also some olds, often the parents of the professionals, who barely understand English. Others who experience difficulties with English include spouses of the professionals, Chinese restaurant workers, and some illegal immigrants. In total, the number of people who cannot use English in daily communication is roughly 150, approximately one third of the Mandarin Chinese congregation. When I confirmed with him if choosing not to use English when speaking to these groups is related to their low English proficiency, Pastor Y gave me a strongly positive answer:

> *"Oh ya ya (choosing not to use English and the audience's English skill level are) absolutely related. For instance, I also (teach) at our so-called Elders' Fellowship, or Evergreen Fellowship. Every week I teach there too. But in teaching I do not use English at all. This is because I……I am very careful, since*

---

[3] "主日學呢, 就比較放鬆, 因為主日學常常有一些的雙向交流、討論. 所以呢, ... , 就不是那麼的在意, 比較放鬆. 那樣就會講出英文出來, 因為平常的講話當中也會講英文..... 在這邊生活的中國人基本上也都是這樣, 就是會用像 Point 啊, anyway 啊, 都會講這些東西..... 在互相講話的時候大家都會帶英文, 所以我回答的時候也會帶英文, 中文帶英文. 因為大家都是這樣子互動, 所以就比較常發生."

[4] There are also Cantonese and English congregations.

English for them—they are not able to understand (it). As a result, I am very careful not to use English."[5]

Pastor Y concluded by saying that he consciously restrains himself from switching to English when preaching in Chinese on Sundays. He does this to meet the needs of the members of the church community who lack proficiency or are less proficient in English.

It is especially important that Pastor Y mentioned his weekly teaching in the elders' fellowship, which is approximately a same context as the Sunday school setting: Informal Bible teaching in a smaller room to a comparatively small group of people (as compared to Sunday services) who know each other relatively well. This being the case, location, social relationship, and topic—all three elements which Blom and Gumperz (1972) argue as determining situational code-switching—are mostly the same in both the elders' fellowship and Sunday school. However, while in Sunday school Pastor Y frequently uses code-switching, he does not switch from Chinese to English at all when teaching at the elders' fellowship. His language choices in this latter situation are identical to those he uses in Sunday services, where both the location and the social relationship are different. This three-way relationship is shown in Figure 3. Note that "formality" is used in a very general sense, loosely indicating how formal/serious or casual/relaxed the atmosphere of an event is. For instance, a "Sunday school-like" event has low formality, while a "sermon-like" event has high formality.

Figure3. Pastor Y's code-switching in three G church activities

	Sunday school	Elder's fellowship	Sermon
Formality	Low		High
Code-switching	Yes	No	

This suggests that Blom and Gumperz's (1972) framework, which satisfactorily explains bilinguals' language choice, is insufficient in interpreting a bilingual's (in this paper, Pastor Y's) linguistic behavior while addressing monolinguals (the elders who know only Chinese). In the same way, it appears my hypothesis that Pastor Y's code-switching is motivated by concerns for style and identity construction does not hold. At least, the hypothesis is contradictory to Pastor Y's own interpretation.

Giles and Ogay's (2007) Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) sheds much light on the motivations for using code-switching amply in Sunday school teaching and yet rarely in sermons and elders' fellowship gatherings. The key conception of CAT is that interlocutors mutually adjust their speech and other forms of verbal/non-verbal communication to accommodate their conversation partners. There are two major mechanisms, namely, convergence and divergence, with the former as the strategy adjusting toward the other party's speech and the latter as the strategy shifting away from the other party's speech. In Pastor Y's case, he obviously converges with his audience both in sermons and in teaching the elders' fellowship. In the interview he mentions multiple times that the elders, as well as some other groups of churchgoers (e.g. Chinese restaurant workers), are not able to communicate in English. To accommodate these

[5] "噢 yaya 非常有關係! 譬如說, 我也在我們所謂的長輩團契, 也就是常青團契, 我每個禮拜也教課. 但是在教課當中我完全不用英文. 因為我..... 我很注意, 因為講英文對他們來講, 他們沒辦法瞭解. 所以, 我就很注意不用英文."

monolingual groups, he consciously shifts from code-switching, which is his normal way of speaking, to using Chinese only.

This convergence is independent of the formality or informality of the situation. Regardless of the location, topic, or social relationship with his audience, as long as the audience lacks sufficient English skills, Pastor Y will use Chinese without switching to English. Considering that roughly a third of Sunday service attendees belong to groups with low English levels and the elders' fellowship by definition consists of elderly individuals, it is understandable that only Chinese is used in both settings. Particularly worth noting, again, is the word *restrain (himself from using English)*, which Pastor Y uses in the interview. This is strong evidence that his code choice in sermons is not only conscious, but also with a clear intention.

CAT explains well Pastor Y's convergence towards the audience in sermons and elders' fellowship gatherings, and in the same way, this theory also provides an explanation for his convergence towards his English-Chinese bilingual audience in Sunday school. Recall that in the interview, as I directly quoted earlier, Pastor Y says that *in speaking of the Sunday school, it is more relaxed, since in Sunday school there are usually two-way interactions and discussions….. When talking to each other, all (Chinese) people use English (when speaking Chinese). Therefore when [he] answers questions (in Sunday school) [he] will also use English, inserting English into Chinese. Since (Chinese) people all interact in this way, this (code-switching) happens a lot (in [his] Sunday school teaching)*. Although one cannot claim that CAT is the decisive reason for code-switching in Sunday school teaching since switching from Chinese to English is Pastor Y's natural and *habitual* way of speaking, it would be reasonable to infer that CAT at least facilitates code-switching on the basis of his default way of speaking, for the reason that his interlocutors in Sunday school all speak with code-switching.

5. Conclusion

This paper studies the motivation for code-switching from Chinese to English in the Chinese Christian church in the United States. As a case study, this paper examines online videos of sermons and Sunday school teachings given by the same pastor. On a micro-level, in terms of individual linguistic behavior, this paper employs Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) and argues that the motivation for code-switching is for the pastor to accommodate the audience's speech. In particular, when the audience is not proficient in English, the pastor only speaks Chinese most of the time, regardless the formality of the context; in contrast, he switches to English frequently when most of the audience is bilingual. It is important to note that in the pastor's case, code-switching is the default, and non-code-switching is marked. In such a case then, the question "Why not code-switching?" deserves more attention than "Why code-switching?"

On a macro-level, in terms of social structure and the social function of code-switching, this paper reiterates the classic notion that language as a code system conveys literal meanings. Nowadays, many sociolinguistic studies focus on the indexical functions of language, by which the speaker consciously and actively constructs his or her own identity within a certain social network. This beyond doubt is a valuable method of research. At the same time however, one must not forget the very basic function of language, viz. enabling people to communicate verbally. If verbal communication is unavailable in the first place (unless the said unavailability is deliberate), investigations of

concepts such as "style" and "personae" may lack practical foundations. In this paper, for instance, my hypothesis is that the motivation of code-switching is concerned with style and the building-up of identity. It is later rejected by the simple truth that if the pastor employs code-switching in some circumstances (for example, in sermons), he may fail to convey his literal meaning in the first place. The necessity of executing communication is primary to elaborating the communication. Without noting this, an analysis of style might still be theoretically reasonable; yet it is simply not in accordance with fact.

A final remark is that the methods of data collection used in this paper have both advantages and disadvantages. The advantage is in studying existent online videos, a method in which observers are not physically involved with, nor bring any interruption to the communication that he or she observes.[6] This type of observation at a distance can effectively avoid influence, if there would be any, on the observed community. At the same time however, this method presents disadvantages as well. Only able to see what the camera captures and presents, there is a substantial chance that the observer would miss much important information that would otherwise aid his or her analysis of the communication context. The incorrect hypothesis in this paper is largely the result of lack of information about the demographic structure of the G church, especially the linguistic backgrounds of the congregation. If this piece of information were known to me before the interview was conducted, it is very possible that my hypothesis would have been different. This, then, is the reason why the interview with Pastor Y is included and comprises a critical part of this study. It is only after comparing my (the outsider's) observation with the pastor's (the insider's) interpretation that the explanation of the motivations for code-switching and non-code-switching in the Chinese church become clear.

References

Albakry, Mohammed A. and Dominic M. Ofori. (2011). Ghanaian English and code switching in Catholic churches. *World Englishes: Journal of English as an International and Intranational Language*, 30(4), 515-532.

Auer, Peter. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, pp. . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blom, Jan-Petter and John J. Gumperz. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code switching in northern Norway. In J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 407-434.

Giles, Howard and Tania Ogay. (2007). Communication accommodation theory. In Bryan B. Whaley and Wendy Samter (eds.), *Explaining Communication: Contemporary Theories and Exemplars*, pp. 293-310. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lüdi, Georges. (1987). Les marques transcodiques: regards nouveaux sur le bilinguisme. In G. Lüdi (ed.), *Devenir bilingue-parler bilingue. Actes du 2e colloque sur le bilinguisme, Univ. de Neuchâtel, 20-22 sept. 1984*, pp. 1-21. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer.

[6] It bears mentioning again that the G church records its sermons and Sunday school teachings nearly every week, at least for the past seven years. It would be reasonable to assume then that the pastors and churchgoers there are fairly accustomed to the presence of the camera. Therefore, we should be able to assume that their communication represents a spontaneous (normal and unpretentious) type of speech.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. (1997). Code switching. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, pp. 217-237. Oxford: Blackwell.

Shin, Sun-Young. (2010). The functions of code-switching in a Korean Sunday school. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(1), 91-116.

Thomason, Sarah G. (2001). *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh & Washington, DC: Edinburgh University Press & Georgetown University Press.

Winford, Donald. (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Yang, Fenggang. (1998). Chinese conversion to evangelical Christianity: the importance of social and cultural contexts. *Sociology of Religion: A Quarterly Review*, 59(3), 237-257.

Litong Chen
398 Hagerty Hall,
1775 College Road,
Columbus, OH-43210, USA
chen1883@osu.edu