

“Whenever we pull the race card, they can be like: ‘*De quoi vous parlez?*’”: Constructing stance through code-switching in reported speech

Marianne Laplante¹
York University, Toronto, Canada

Abstract: This research focuses on code-switching in reported speech as a tool to construct stance. It has been argued that reported speech can never be recontextualized (i.e., removing fragments of a discourse from its original context to insert it in another one) without changing the meaning of it, thus creating intertextual gaps—discrepancies between the original meaning of a speech event and the meaning of the reported speech in its new context. Speakers can insert their own stance in a quoted speech using a variety of linguistic features such as code-switching, i.e., shifting languages within utterances. My data is drawn from a podcast episode hosted by two women who code-switch between French and English. My results show that the language choice and the code-switching are motivated by their attitude towards the person quoted, more specifically whether they support them or not.

Keywords: *reported speech; code-switching; discourse analysis; construction of stance*

1 Introduction

This paper focuses on code-switching in reported speech as a linguistic resource to construct stance. I will argue that code-switching allows a speaker to add implications about their stance to the quotation. More specifically, the speakers in my data code-switch from French to English to voice someone who they support and reproduce utterances in French when maximizing distance from the person quoted or when criticizing them. Code-switching within the reported speech itself also indexes support for the person quoted. A bilingual podcast episode that is hosted by two Black women from Montreal who code-switch between French and English is investigated to illustrate this phenomenon. The goals of the podcast, entitled *Woke or Whateva*, are to “read, analyze, deconstruct and vulgarize concepts of race” (*Woke or whateva - YouTube*, n.d.). The episode of interest discusses the latest season of a widely popular dating reality TV show from Québec called *Occupation Double* (OD). More specifically, the hosts focus on the journeys of the non-White participants and how they were treated and perceived by the other participants, the production, and the public. The hosts’ main argument is that this season was particularly racist towards the non-White contestants (*Woke or whateva*, 2021). Moreover, this episode includes a lot of reported speech, as the hosts discuss events that occurred during the TV show. As such, we can find *direct* reported speech that can easily be retraced in the TV show. The two hosts’ speech is also full of *indirect* reported speech because they talk freely about events that happened on social

¹ Corresponding author: lapmar@yorku.ca

media or outside of the TV show as conversations about the show are frequent because of its great popularity in Québec. However, here I will focus on direct reported speech.

Previous research has shown that discussions about TV shows have an interesting social function. For instance, Tovares (2006, 2007) argues that talking about TV shows allows speakers to get into personal subjects without getting personal and that they reinforce friendships or relationships with family members and affirm shared values. Thus, focussing on discussion about a TV show enables the linking of identity and stance. Also, as previously mentioned, the podcast is bilingual: Montréal being a bilingual environment, the speech data is full of code-switching between French and English within and across sentences. We will see that code-switching functions as a linguistic resource to take a stance on the speech and that it is tightly related to identity for the hosts.

2 Background

2.1 Reported speech

Voloshinov's definition of reported speech is "speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also speech about speech, utterance about utterance" (1986, p. 115). In other words, reported speech is the practice of a speaker uttering something that was uttered prior to the moment of the speech in which the reported speech is uttered.²

Of relevance to the definition of reported speech is Goffman's (1979) deconstruction of the notion of speaker, suggesting that three different roles can be held by the speakers as participants in a discourse: animator, author, and principal. The animator refers to the individual who physically produces the speech sounds; the author refers to the individual that has selected the words used to express the sentiments of the speech; and the principal is the individual who is committed to those sentiments or beliefs. The necessity to fragment the status of speakers into those three roles is well illustrated by reported speech: while the animator remains the individual who is physically producing the speech, the author and principal of the speech is the individual who previously uttered the speech that is reported by the animator. Goffman's model neatly captures that an animator, even though they physically pronounce the speech, is not committed to what is being said if it is clearly framed as reported speech, which allows the author and principal statuses to be assigned to other external individuals. These role shifts during speech are an example of what Goffman calls changes in *footing*, as the participants in a conversation reattribute roles to different individuals whilst the speech is still ongoing.

However, the lines between animator, author, and principal for reported speech might not be as clear as they seem. Hodges (2015) notes that reported speech relies on some kind of historical accuracy (p. 51), but Tannen (2007) argues that this is not always the case, as reported speech can never be recontextualized (i.e., removing fragments of discourse from its original context to insert it in another one) without changing its meaning. This is emphasized by Hodges (2015) as well, who discusses intertextual gaps, introduced by Briggs and Bauman (1992), who write: "A gap arises because the linking of particular utterances to generic (or prior text) models can never produce an exact fit by virtue of the fact that even prototypical and faithful re-creations always introduce some variation on the theme" (Hodges, 2015, p. 46). In other words, reported speech can

² Although it is beyond the scope of this paper, as the data in this paper consists exclusively of spoken speech, it is important to note that reported speech, and other theoretical concepts raised in the paper such as footing and double-voicing, can also occur in signed languages. Thanks to the WALLY editorial team for bringing this point to my attention.

“WHENEVER WE PULL THE RACE CARD”

never be without intertextual gaps because the context can never be the same as when the utterance was originally uttered. To argue this point, Hodges (2015) brings up an example of a *Saturday Night Live* skit in which the comedian Tina Fey plays a politician. Fey reenacted the words of one of the politician’s speeches verbatim. Hodges argues that even if the speech was exactly reproduced, seemingly only changing the animator from the politician to Tina Fey, the skit effectively undermined the seriousness of the politician, and a certain stance, of either Fey or the writer of the show, was added to the speech, thus creating an intertextual gap as the speech was recontextualized.

This type of footing shift neatly exemplifies the phenomenon defined by Bakhtin as *double-voicing*: “It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author” (1981, p. 324). Double-voicing is without a doubt at play in the SNL example, as Tina Fey, the animator, is at odds with the intentions of the politician, or author of the word she is uttering. This then blurs the lines between Goffman’s three speaker roles: with double-voicing, it seems that two individuals can simultaneously fill two author roles. This phenomenon is even present in legal contexts such as trials, as discussed by Matoesian (2000). Although historical accuracy is crucial in trial contexts, Matoesian argues that attorneys and witnesses use intertextuality to insert ideologies and to recontextualize speech, thus changing the interpretative force of utterances.

In discourse, reported speech is easily identifiable, as it is often introduced by linguistic cues that allow us to differentiate between direct (quotation) and indirect (paraphrasing) reported speech. These cues can be verbs such as “said”, “told”, or “yelled”, and they can be accompanied by nominal expressions such as “the teacher” or “his younger sister” (Hodges, 2015). Referential expressions such as “I” or “my”, for example, can also shift antecedents in parallel with the footing shift in direct and indirect reported speech, as shown below:

- (1) a. Indirect: His younger sister said that *she* was sick.
- b. Direct: His younger sister said: “*I*’m sick”.

In (1a), the pronoun “she” refers to the younger sister, whereas in (1b), the pronoun “I” refers to the younger sister (not the current speaker). Aside from these linguistic cues, “[...] English speakers often operate as if reported speech can be lifted from a prior context and dropped into a subsequent context unchanged” (Hodges, 2015, p. 50). Based on my intuition as a native speaker, French seems to be the same, as the morphosyntactic and lexical cues available to signify direct and indirect reported speech are similar to the ones of English.

Moreover, Günthner (1999) lists prosody and voice quality as linguistic cues for double-voicing. Álvarez-Cáccamo (1996) defines “code-displacement” as the phenomenon where the original speech is in one language and is translated in another language for the reported speech. The shift in language inevitably triggers a change in meaning and can act as a subtle way to insert stance into the reported speech. To argue for the very subtle changes that can occur with translation, Mason (2015) investigates a trial in which an interpreter was present to translate the witness’s testimony:

- (2) Attorney: What items were taken from the home that belonged to you sir?
Interpreter: *¿Cuáles artículos tomaron ellos de la casa que pertenecían a usted señor?* (p. 197)
[Which items did they take from the home that belonged to you sir?]

Mason’s conclusion is that the constant change between passive structures from the attorney to active structures in the interpreter’s speech contributed to shaping the perception of the jury that the defendant was guilty. Example (2) illustrates that while the attorney chose a passive structure, the interpreter chose an active structure, adding the agent *ellos* ‘they’. This subtle change in the syntactic structure, which lay people might not even notice, had so much impact on the jury’s decision, according to the defense, that they motioned for a new trial and it was granted (Mason, 2015, p. 189). Therefore, considering that even an interpreter, who is supposed to faithfully translate speech, can recontextualize speech enough for the hearers’ perception to be drastically impacted, translations cannot be considered as solely shifting the code and leaving the meaning of the original utterance unchanged. In addition, code-switching can be an essential tool to construct identity, a topic we’ll discuss below. Thus, if code-switching is part of shaping identity, the meaning of a reported speech utterance that includes code-switching necessarily changes from its original occurrence.

2.2 Code-switching

Code-switching is defined as the “juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (Gumperz, 1982, p. 59), as exemplified in (3) below (Poplack, 1980):

(3) Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in English *y termino en Español*.

In (3), the sentence begins in English, as we can determine by the English lexical words and morphosyntactic features and finishes in Spanish, as the lexical words and morphosyntactic features shift to those of Spanish.

Moreover, it has been argued that code-switching can construct social meaning (Auer, 1995). For example, Frick & Riionheimo (2013), who looked at code-switching in Finnish and Estonian, found that code-switching can be used as a contextualization cue to show distance and disagreement with the author of the reported speech.

2.3 Construction of stance

Linguistic cues such as reported speech and code-switching can constitute tools to shape, affirm and construct stance. This section will look at how reported speech and code-switching can be related to construction of stance, and more specifically how they are relevant to the data analyzed in this research.

2.3.1 Reported speech

Reporting the speech of another person is a great tool to perform a variety of social acts. As Buttny writes, “Reported speech can serve various functions: to dramatize a point, to give evidence for a position, to epitomize a condition, and so on” (1997, p. 478). Not only can it be “a marvelous opportunity to comment on [another’s voice] subtly—to shift its wording, exaggeratedly mimic its style, or supplement its expressive features” (Hodges, 2015, p. 51), but it can also be used “as a way to reconstruct events and to criticize them” (Buttny, 1997, p. 503).

2.3.2 Code-switching in Québec

The bilingual context of Québec inevitably leads to a high use of code-switching, which is tightly linked to identity issues. Indeed, younger generations in Québec, being less prone to perceive bilingualism as a threat, seem to use code-switching of French and English as some sort of code to distance themselves from older Francophone generations (Valenti, 2014). Valenti (2014) also argues that Anglophones in Québec don’t code-switch as often as Francophones do because

of the lack of Anglophone representation in Québec’s media and cultural landscape. As such, representation in cultural and media productions matters in shaping identity and results in code-switching. Although Valenti’s work does not show that the inverse is true, i.e., that Francophone code-switching is driven by linguistic representation in media, the hosts of the podcast analyzed in this paper argue that representation has influenced their linguistic behavior. In fact, in another episode of the podcast, the two hosts talk about how Québec’s media and cultural landscape severely lacks Black representation, thus leading the hosts to switch from watching Québec’s TV shows and movies to watching Anglophone cultural content from Canada or the U.S. (Woke or whateva, 2020). I thus infer that the hosts’ code-switching between French and English derives from the fact that their shaping of identity through cultural content could only be possible in English, as most of North American cultural products featuring Black people and culture are Anglophone, which results in their frequent code-switching between French and English.

3 Methodology

This section details the data used for this analysis as well as the methodology. The data consists of a bilingual podcast episode that discusses the Québec dating reality TV show *Occupation Double* (OD). The two hosts of the podcast are called Titi and Beck. Although quantitative analysis was beyond the scope of this paper, it seems that whereas Titi uses more English than French, Beck has the opposite distribution. They are both Black women from Montréal, but Titi’s origins are from Africa, whereas Beck’s family immigrated from Haiti. As mentioned before, even though this podcast episode is interested in the events that took place in OD, it focuses on race and racism within the show, using some publicly discussed events to tackle social issues. As Buttny (1997) notes, many discourse analyses of discussions about race and racism are made through a narrative standpoint. However, the podcast used as our data barely includes any narration, as the hosts take for granted that the listeners have watched OD, thus enabling more focussed consideration of the reported speech used to reference the show’s narratives which is presumed to be shared background knowledge.

All direct reported speech in the podcast, which is 1 hour, 42 minutes and 40 seconds long, was manually annotated and timestamped by me. I transcribed all instances of reported speech that I could trace back to the original context to account for concerns of historical accuracy (except for the public’s reactions, which would be almost impossible to trace back), and which had an author/principal that was explicitly criticized or supported by the hosts so that their stance towards the author/principal was clear and unambiguous. The transcriptions focus on the overall syntax and lexical choices in the speech so as to facilitate determination of which parts are in English or French as well as to delimit the instances of reported speech. The code-switching analysis, which consisted of coding the language before, within and after the reported speech, follows a sequential analysis of code-switching that considers the language in which the code-switch is embedded (Auer, 1995).

4 Results

In this section, I will present some excerpts³ from the podcast that display code-switching in direct reported speech to discuss code-switching as a linguistic resource used by the speakers in my data to construct stance.

³ The transcription excerpts include the line numbers and the speaker, either Titi or Beck. When there is a change in turn-taking, the name of the speaker will change in the second column. An arrow (\Rightarrow) indicates lines in which there is reported speech that will be further investigated in the following discussion. The bodies of the excerpts themselves

4.1 Language choice and stance

In excerpt 1, Titi talks about a story that Rasheeda—an OD contestant the hosts support—told, in which she was the victim of racism: some kids from her school tried to drown her when she was younger. This story is told three different times in the relevant OD episode and Titi argues in excerpt 1 that this was intentional on the part of OD’s production team in order to protect themselves from any rebuke of racism on their part.

Excerpt 1

- 01 Titi And I think that was for a reason, they put emphasis on that story to
 02 let everyone know
 03 ⇒ “yo, check, *comme, on parle du racisme, yo, check, l’histoire à Rasheeda*
 [“yo, look, like, we talk about racism, yo, look, Rasheeda’s story]
 04 is put on the spotlight” whatever. So whenever we want to pull the race
 05 card talking about Rasheeda, they can be like
 06 ⇒ “*non, de quoi vous parlez? Y’a pas de... quel racisme? Genre on a fait*
 [“no, what are you talking about? There isn’t... what racism? Like, we]
 07 *attention pour euh...*
 [made sure to, hum...]
 08 Beck Highlight that.
 09 Titi ... highlight that”. ‘Cause they talked about it three times in that episode
 10 *Trois fois, ça a été mentionné! Et c’est pas pour dire que*
 [Three times, it was mentioned! And it’s not to say that]
 11 that’s not a story worth highlighting, but three times in one episode, that’s
 12 not done because they give a fuck. That’s strategy. That’s strategic, ‘cause
 13 now, we’re pulling the race card and they can pull it Uno-reverse and be like
 14 ⇒ “*Non, actually, comme, Rasheeda, on a parlé de son expérience raciste*
 [“No, actually, like, Rasheeda, we talked about her racist experience]
 15 *et tout*”.
 [and everything”.]

In lines 3-4, 6-9 and 14-15, there is direct reported speech from Titi as she impersonates the production, imagining how they would use Rasheeda’s story to defend themselves from accusations of being racist. These utterances never occurred on the show; however, Titi code-switches from English to French as she utters reported speech, framing the production as the author/principal of the utterance she reports. The production team consists mainly of French speakers, which could explain why Titi chooses to code-switch here. However, because the reported speech never occurred, the desire to be faithful to what was actually said is not at stake. It is thus interesting to see Titi code-switching to French regardless of this. Considering the following excerpts, I would argue that the reason for the code-switch from English to French is for

include transcriptions and translations of French segments, which are bracketed. The French segments are all italicized, except for English borrowings which are embedded in French utterances. The translation lines are not numbered and directly follow their French counterpart. Quotations marks indicate reported speech.

“WHENEVER WE PULL THE RACE CARD”

the construction of stance, as the use of French within the reported speech seems to be preferred when Titi and Beck criticize the author/principal of the original utterance.

Excerpt 2 below shows Titi reporting an utterance that hasn't been said directly: in lines 1-4 and 8-10, she frames the author/principal to be Joli-Ann, an Indigenous participant in OD and a contestant for whom Titi explicitly expresses her support. The reported speech presented here was never uttered on the show. Moreover, this participant exclusively uses French in the show. Like in excerpt 1, Titi doesn't report speech that was uttered in OD but nevertheless is voicing someone connected to the show. However, unlike in excerpt 1, in excerpt 2, she uses code-switching and English within the reported speech.

Excerpt 2

- 01 Titi ⇒ “Y'all fake. Y'all are racist. Y'all trying to kick me and my shorty out and
02 my man on the other side?
03 *Non, genre je vais être sur les nerfs, comme je vais snap sur toi pis c'est*
[No, like, I'll be on edge, I'll snap and it's]
04 *chill*”
[fine”]
05 and I love to see it. And I love that she's going against
06 *ce que Vanessa lui a dit, de*
[what Vanessa told her]
07 ⇒ “*j'adore quand tu montes pas*”.
[“I love it when you're not mad”]
“No, Imma be pissed off. Imma be pissed because this is my response to
08 ⇒ the
09 violence I've been enduring since I've step foot in this house. Imma be
10 pissed off and it's a normal reaction.”
11 So for those who are like
12 ⇒ “*Joli-Ann je la feel pas parce qu'elle est pissed*”
[“Joli-Ann, I don't like her, because she's pissed”]
13 *toi, tu réagirais comment?*
how would you react?

The hypothesis that French is used in excerpt 1 because the author/principal is Francophone cannot hold with excerpt 2, as the author/principal is also Francophone, but English is nonetheless used. In fact, the crucial difference between the author/principal in excerpts 1 and 2 is the attitude that Titi has towards them; she criticizes the production (and uses French to voice them) but supports Joli-Ann (and uses English to voice her).

In line 7, Titi directly reports a segment of speech told by Vanessa, another highly criticized contestant in OD. The utterance is inaccurately reported, and Titi code-switches to French when voicing her. Shortly thereafter in line 12, Titi frames the author/principal as being the public. This one is harder to pin down, as it could be the case that this exact utterance was said or written somewhere without my knowledge. Thus, I can't say if it is directly and accurately reported from somewhere, which would explain the code-switch to French, or if the code-switch is explained by Titi wanting to distance herself from the viewers who don't like Joli-Ann.

As previously mentioned, although no quantitative analysis was conducted on the data, as it is beyond the scope of this paper, it seems that whereas Titi uses more English than French, Beck has the opposite distribution. However, excerpt 3 shows that Beck displays similar linguistic patterns to Titi in terms of how she uses language choice within reported speech to construct stance.

Excerpt 3

- 01 Beck *Je me souviens quand Naomi et Kayshia étaient là, Kayshia, y'avait*
 [I remember when Naomi and Kayshia were there, Kayisha, there was]
 02 *un gars qui la trouvait intéressante, mais*
 [guy who thought she was interesting]
 03 they just never put the clips of him saying like
 04 ⇒ *“Oh, Kayshia est vraiment intéressante”*
 [“Oh, Kayshia is really interesting”]
 05 *Naomi, à la fin de OD, les gars quand ils ont commencé à apprendre c'était*
 [Naomi, at the end of OD, the guys started to get to know]
 06 *qui Naomi, ils étaient comme*
 [Naomi, and they were like]
 07 ⇒ *“Oh wow she’s actually nice, she’s actually cool”*
 08 *Parce qu’il avait comme une activité où ils devaient genre parler aux gars*
 [Because they had a date in which they had to talk to the guys]
 09 *parce qu’ils étaient tout seuls, pis tout le monde était comme*
 [Because they were alone, and everyone was like]
 10 ⇒ *“Oh shit, Naomi elle est intéressante, elle est fun⁴” et tout.*
 [“Oh shit, Naomi is interesting, she’s fun” and all]

Even though Beck reports the speech in French in lines 4 and 10, she code-switches from French to English in line 7 to report an utterance that i) was said in French in the show, and ii) that she also reports in French in lines 4 and 10. Naomi is a Black contestant who receives explicit support from Beck, so it is once again coherent with the hypothesis about code-switching in reported speech that both hosts use code-switching when voicing the speech of an author/principal whom they support.

4.2 Concerns for historical accuracy

As previously mentioned throughout this discussion, reported speech can sometimes imply historical accuracy, as discussed by Hodges (2015). In the following excerpt, Titi reports something that Sabrina said in the exact words we heard in the show.

Excerpt 4

- 1 Titi Sabrina talking about some
 2 *“tu peux même pas me regarder dans les yeux”*

⁴ Although English borrowings are not italicized when embedded in a French utterance, the word “fun” here is considered a French word according to the Québec French dictionary *Usito* (Usito, n.d.-b). Therefore, it remains italicized.

“WHENEVER WE PULL THE RACE CARD”

[“you can’t even look at me in the eyes”]

However, we can’t argue that French is always chosen for historical accuracy, as Titi code-switches and uses English in her reported speech for utterances that were said in French, such as in excerpt 5 below. Sabrina being highly criticized throughout the whole podcast, it is not surprising that the use of French is preferred in order for Titi to index her criticism towards this participant.

Excerpt 5 is an example of Titi code-switching within a report of speech whose author/principal is Rasheeda. This utterance was said in French in the TV show but is not accurately reported in the podcast, as it contains code-switching within it. Therefore, it strengthens the claim that historical accuracy cannot predict the language used in the reported speech.

Excerpt 5

- 1 Titi And it did kind of seemed like it was out of nowhere a little bit, like
2 ⇒ “*Ok, Fred je le trouve cute*⁵
[“Ok, I think Fred is cute]
3 so let me go holla at him”
4 whatever. And then she kind of like went for it.

The code-switching found within the reported speech here—as well as in lines 1-4 of excerpt 2—seems to index support for the author/principal, similarly to the use of English.

Now, consider excerpt 6, in which Titi and Beck discuss a specific utterance that was said by Patrice, a Black contestant, when he defended another Black contestant in the show. This piece of data shows Titi and Beck having to juggle code-switching to support a well-loved contestant, Patrice, with the need for historical accuracy, as they are commenting on the exact words that Patrice used in the TV show.

Excerpt 6

- 01 Beck *Mais, lui, Patrice?*
[But Patrice?]
02 Titi ⇒ “*C’est ma petite sœur! C’est ma petite sœur, elle bouge pas.*”
[“That’s my little sister! That’s my little sister, she’s not budging.”]
03 Beck ⇒ *Il a dit “c’est ma petite sœur”.*
[He said: “That’s my little sister”]
04 ⇒ *Il a dit “tant que je peux la défendre, je vais la défendre.”*
[He said: “I’ll defend her as long as I can”]
05 *Il a mis son potentiel amoureux... Parce que lui, il aurait pu avoir deux*
[He put his love interests... Because he could’ve had two]
06 *potentiels amoureux et être good. Pis là, plot un peu, pis après il aurait*
[potential love interests and be fine. And plot a little, but he would’ve]
07 *eu trois potentiels amoureux avec Inès. Il aurait pu vraiment faire ça, là.*

⁵ The word “cute” appears in *Usito* (Usito, n.d.-a), therefore remains italicized.

- [had three potential love interests with Inès. He could have, you know.]
- 08 ⇒ *Pis lui il était comme “Non, j’ai pas de connexion avec Kathleen*
 [But he was like “No, I don’t feel a connection with Kathleen,]
- 09 ⇒ like, my sis is right there”.
- 10 *Est-ce que... yo, ça, c’est... j’étais comme “non”. Après ça, j’étais comme*
 [Do you... yo, that was... I was like “no”. After that, I was like]
- 11 “Non, you got me. *Pour de vrai*, you got me, *parce que...* ”
 [“No, you got me. For real, you got me, cause...”]
- 12 Titi This is my man.

In line 2, Titi reports word for word what Patrice said in the show in French: “*C’est ma petite soeur. Elle bouge pas.*” (“That’s my little sister. She is not budging.”) Beck repeats that same utterance in line 3, then adds line 4 in French, which is another utterance said by Patrice in the TV show. Those utterances are in French in the data, because they’re explicitly discussing the words that Patrice chose, namely “*petite soeur*” (“little sister”), thus needing the reported speech to be faithful to the original utterance, i.e., historically accurate. However, in lines 8 and 9, Beck code-switches during her reported speech about a similar utterance. She goes from only reporting Patrice’s words in French to commenting on them, using code-switching from French to English within the reported speech. After the exact words used by Patrice have been established, thus clearing the concern for historical accuracy, Beck can now index her support for the author/principal even more clearly by using English.

A look at excerpt 7 recaps the main argument of the analysis, because it includes reported speech that has two contestants as the authors/principals: one that the hosts support (Patrice) and one that they heavily criticize for instigating a smear campaign on Patrice among the contestants (Kathleen). The comparison of the language use in the reported speech when voicing Patrice or Kathleen makes the argument even clearer.

Excerpt 7

- 01 Titi And there’s big sense of entitlement coming from the viewers, and coming
 02 from the contestants.
- 03 *On va parler de Kathleen, ok? On va parler de Kathleen*
 [Let’s talk about Kathleen, ok? We’ll talk about Kathleen.]
- 04 and how she reacted to him eliminating her.
- 05 *Parce que*, look. *Le gars, là,*
 [Because, look. That guy,]
- 06 he kept it a hunnit.
- 07 ⇒ *Il l’a pas drag along, comme “Nous y’a pas de... Y’a rien qui va se passer.*
 [He didn’t drag her along, like “There’s no... Nothing’s going to happen”]
- 08 ⇒ There’s no chemistry,
 09 ⇒ *on clique pas.*”
 [we’re not clicking”]
- 10 *Pis on le voyait que ça cliquait pas, là.*

“WHENEVER WE PULL THE RACE CARD”

- [And we could see it wasn't clicking.]
- 11 They were not vibing at all. It was very much giving friendzone. So,
12 *il l'a éliminée. Elle,*
[He eliminated her. Her,]
- 13 I think, her ego was bruised because she got eliminated by 23-year-old Black
14 guy who chose an Indigenous woman over her, who chose to protect a Black
15 woman over her. I think her ego was bruised. I think she was embarrassed and
16 I think that's why she decided to create a group to plot against him. And that
17 has to be one of the most pathetic thing I've ever... she's pathetic. Kathleen is
18 pathetic.
- 19 Beck She really is.
20 Titi Kathleen is pathetic.
21 Beck *Non seulement t'es pathétique, mais t'es même pas pathétique avec ton chest.*
[Not only are you pathetic, but you're not pathetic with your chest.]
- 22 ⇒ *T'es comme "Non, c'est pas ça. Non, j'ai pas fait ça."*
[You're like "No, that's not it. No, I didn't do that."]
- 23 Girl.
24 *Y'a des caméras*
[There are cameras]
everywhere. We saw it.
- 25
26 Titi Yeah.
27 Beck *Pis le fait que... Un homme noir t'a dit non.*
[And the fact that... a Black man said no to you.]
- 28 Titi *Yeah. T'as honte.*
[Yeah. You're ashamed.]
- 29 Beck *T'as honte.*
[You're ashamed.]
- 30 And you got all the other White girls. All of them.
31 ⇒ *"Ouais, on va éliminer Patrice."*
[“Yes, we're going to eliminate Patrice.”]
- 32 *Et les personnes qui parlent de Patrice comme*
[And the people who talk about Patrice like]
- 33 ⇒ *"ben ouais, c'était valide".*
[“yes, that was valid”]
- 34 Titi For what? For what? Because he hurt your shorty's feelings?

Lines 7-9 show Titi code-switching within an utterance of reported speech of which Patrice is the author/principal (“*Nous y'a pas de... Y'a rien qui va se passer. There's no chemistry, on clique pas*”). Patrice being explicitly supported, the code-switching within the reported speech is

reminiscent of the utterance in lines 2-3 of excerpt 5. This language use contrasts with line 22, in which Beck voices Kathleen in French. As the excerpt shows, both Titi and Beck heavily criticize Kathleen, calling her “pathetic” in lines 17-21.

Lines 31 and 33 show Beck voicing the “other White girls” in OD and the public, respectively, in French. She code-switches from English in line 30 to French in line 31 for the reported speech. Both authors/principals in those lines are people who wanted or supported Patrice’s elimination, which is contrary to Beck’s opinion. It thus seems clear that the stance, attitude, and sentiment towards the author/principal of the reported speech is the main deciding factor for code-switching and for the language choice, namely English, when supporting the author/principal or French when maximizing distance from the author/principal.

5 Conclusion

The analysis of the reported speech in the podcast episode of *Woke or whatever* about *Occupation Double* offers clear evidence of the importance of code-switching as a linguistic resource to shape and affirm stance in the bilingual context of Montreal. Considering how reported speech can be recontextualized to comment on the speech of another, the data here show that the hosts choose to voice the words of a contestant using French in reported speech utterances when voicing a contestant whom they are criticizing, and English for a contestant whom they support. This pattern also holds true when concerns for historical accuracy are at play.

One of the remaining questions is if the linguistic choices are indicated by the hosts’ stance or by the race of the author/principal. Indeed, I haven’t found any occurrence of the hosts voicing a White person whom they support. Thus, I can’t state with certainty which one is prevalent. We could hypothesize that stance and identity are not that distinct from one another and that they are intertwined in a complex way, especially in the data chosen, as the discussion focuses heavily on race and racism. It would be interesting to support this argument with sociolinguistic interviews and discussions with the hosts regarding their point of view of how code-switching, French, and English are linked with their identity as Black women in Montreal. Although the data indeed show that this seems to be the case, shedding light on Black women’s experience of bilingualism and code-switching in their community and linguistic environment is of crucial importance. Titi and Beck provided some metalinguistic comments on their own relationship with French and English, especially when seeking Black representation in media. However, while existing research focuses on the Montreal bilingual context in *White* communities, it would also be interesting to offer an overview of the code-switching phenomenon in reported speech in other sociocultural communities. For instance, one study looked at French and Haitian creole code-switching in hip-hop music in the Haitian community (Sarkar et al., 2005). A broader account of the phenomenon in reported speech specifically would shed light on how language use affirms identity depending on the status of the language (e.g., an official language vs. a non-official language; endangered and non-endangered languages) or other linguistic characteristics, as well as provide a better understanding of the different factors at play when reported speech meets bilingual contexts.

In any case, the findings of this paper are coherent with the tight relationship between bilingualism and identity in Montreal. Studies such as Valenti (2014) show how politically charged using French and English in some contexts can be. Further investigation of the linguistic habits of young bilingual Black communities in Montreal would substantially improve our understanding of the data analyzed in this paper.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Susan Ehrlich for the valuable comments, as well as those who attended the 2022 YorkU Graduate Symposium in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics for the feedback. I am also thankful to the WALLY editorial team for their help and guidance. Any remaining oversights and errors are my own.

References

- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115–135). Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson, Trans.; 18. paperback printing). Univ. of Texas Press.
- Briggs, C. L., & Bauman, R. (1992). Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 2(2), 131–172. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.1992.2.2.131>
- Buttny, R. (1997). Reported speech in talking race on campus. *Human Communication Research*, 23(4), 477–506. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1997.tb00407.x>
- Frick, M., & Riionheimo, H. (2013). Bilingual voicing: A study of code-switching in the reported speech of Finnish immigrants in Estonia. *Multilingua*, 32(5). <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2013-0028>
- Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, 25(1–2), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1979.25.1-2.1>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Günthner, S. (1999). Polyphony and the ‘layering of voices’ in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(5), 685–708. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00093-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00093-9)
- Hodges, A. (2015). Intertextuality in Discourse. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (Second edition, pp. 42–60). Wiley Blackwell.
- Mason, M. (2015). The role of interpreters in adjudicating blame: An examination of clitics and active-passive voice in a Spanish-English bilingual criminal trial. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 10(2), 187–202. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.10.2.02mas>
- Matoesian, G. (2000). Intertextual authority in reported speech: Production media in the Kennedy Smith rape trial. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(7), 879–914. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00080-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00080-6)
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I’ll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18(7–8). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581>
- Sarkar, M., Winer, L., & Sarkar, K. (2005). Multilingual code-switching in Montreal hip-hop: Mayhem meets method or, “Tout moune qui talk trash kiss mon black ass du nord.” *ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 19.
- Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2nd ed). Cambridge University Press.

- Tovares, A. (2006). Public medium, private talk: Gossip about a TV show as ‘quotidian hermeneutics.’ *Text & Talk - An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse Communication Studies*, 26(4–5), 463–491. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2006.019>
- Tovares, A. (2007). Family members interacting while watching TV. In D. Tannen, S. Kendall, & C. Gordon (Eds.), *Family Talk* (pp. 283–310). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195313895.001.0001>
- Usito. (n.d.-a). Cute. In *Usito*. Retrieved August 15, 2022, from <https://usito.usherbrooke.ca/définitions/cute>
- Usito. (n.d.-b). Fun. In *Usito*. Retrieved August 15, 2022, from <https://usito.usherbrooke.ca/définitions/fun>
- Valenti, E. (2014). “Nous autres c’est toujours bilingue anyways”: Code-switching and linguistic displacement among bilingual Montréal students. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 44(3), 279–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02722011.2014.939423>
- Voloshinov, V. N. (1986). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Harvard University Press.
- Woke or whateva. (2020, September 14). *Finding our identity as Black Montrealers/Trouver notre identité de Noir.e.s Montréalais.e.s*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MXZzOkPbN_U
- Woke or whateva. (2021, October 22). *La saison la plus raciste d’OD/The most racist OD season yet*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cAsRTv3lYJw>
- Woke or whateva—YouTube. (n.d.). Retrieved December 21, 2021, from <https://www.youtube.com/>
- Wokeorwhateva. (n.d.). *Woke or whateva* [YouTube Channel]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/c/Wokeorwhateva>