

Inter- and Intra-Sentential Switching: Are they really Comparable?

Dr. Hilda Kebeya

Department of English & Linguistics
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100, Nairobi, Kenya.

Abstract

Kenya is an African country where English and Swahili serve as the official languages. In addition, there are over forty two indigenous languages spoken in the country, usually as 'home' languages. Some of these ethnic languages are Luo, Gikuyu, Kalenjin, Luyia, Maasai, Kamba, Giriama, Gusii and Pokot. Generally, this paper sought to determine the code switching patterns during Luo/Luyia and Luo /Gusii contact. We found out that both inter- and intra-sentential switching were present in the two language contact situations. The paper also explored conceptual issues relating to intra-sentential switching and found out that there were various challenges analysts faced when trying to determine the Matrix and Embedded languages of code switched utterances. Unlike in the case of inter-sentential switching, certain issues affecting intra-sentential switching are shrouded in controversy. Therefore, this study concluded that inter- and intra- sentential switching are not really comparable.

Key words: matrix/embedded language, inter- and intra-sentential switching

1. Introduction

Speakers in multilingual communities may decide to use only one language (such as English) in the course of a conversation or they may choose to mix two or more languages (for example using English and Swahili words in one conversational turn). This study focuses on the latter phenomenon where speakers alternate between two or more codes. Thus the general objective of this study is to investigate speech samples from bilingual speakers residing along two linguistic border points with a view to establishing the specific code switching types employed by these speakers.

In contrast to choosing only one code (from their repertoire) to use in an interaction, bilinguals may opt to 'mix' two or more codes in the course of an interaction (Savic 1995). Several concepts have been proposed for this linguistic behavior. Agheyisi (1977), for example calls it 'language interlarding' while Scotton & Ury (1977) term it 'code switching.' Bokamba (1988) prefers to call it 'code mixing' and Haugen (1953) calls it 'integration.' However, code switching, is no doubt, the most preferred term in current sociolinguistic study (Wardhaugh 2010), hence the term used in this study

Although, Haugen (1953) is accredited for the original coinage of the term 'code switching,' his definition is no longer in use. In his work, Haugen distinguished between the terms *switching*, *code switching* and *integration*. Whereas *switching* was used to refer to the alternate use of two languages by bilinguals, *code switching* referred to a linguistic situation where bilinguals introduced a single unassimilated word from one language into another by bilinguals (Haugen 1953). The third term *integration* was used in reference to the overlapping of two languages.

It is evident that Haugen's definition of code switching was perhaps too simplistic, as he chose to associate code switching with only 'single words'. Such a micro-view of code switching cannot adequately guide any study; for a lot of data, which deserves to be included as code-switched material may end up being overlooked. For instance, cases where speakers engage in inter-sentential switching may not end up being left out.

Different scholars have different definitions for the term 'code switching.' These definitions are motivated by the approach (pragmatic or grammatical) adopted in analyzing code switched utterances. Myers-Scotton (1993a: vii), for example, defines code switching (hereafter CS) as the use of two or more languages in the same conversation, usually within the same conversational turn, or even within the same sentence of that turn.

While, for Bokamba (1988), code switching is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes and clauses from two distinct (sub) systems within the same sentence or speech event. Additionally, Myers-Scotton (1993b: 3) views code switching as the selection by bilinguals/multilinguals of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation. Myers-Scotton (1993a) takes a pragmatic approach while Bokamba (1988) and Myers-Scotton (1993b) take a purely grammatical approach hence their different perceptions of Code Switching. This study takes a grammatical view hence adopts Myers-Scotton's (1993b) definition of CS.

2. The geographical area

Kenya is a country that is located on the Eastern side of Africa. Like most African states, Kenya is a multilingual country with over forty two ethnic languages being spoken in it. A good number of these languages have dialects. Luyia for example has seventeen dialects (Angogo 1980) while Luo and Gusii have two dialects each (Kebeya 2007). Thus the Kenyan society exhibits linguistic heterogeneity unlike some countries in the West which are generally homogenous (Wardhaugh 2010).

There is clear distinction in the distribution of these ethnic languages with each of Kenya's eight provinces having one or two dominant languages. For example, in the Western province of Kenya Luyia is the dominant code while in Nyanza it is Luo that dominates. This study sought to focus on the outer regions of Nyanza Province, where Luo is in contact with Luyia (in the North) and with Gusii (in the South). Each province in Kenya is made up of several districts. The districts are further made up of divisions. This study focused on two divisions namely; Suneka (in central Kisii district) and Winam (in Kisumu district).

Rural populations of Kenya tend to use ethnic languages in most domains while urbanites (because of having different ethnic languages) prefer to use a common language that is understood by all. Thus English and Swahili serve as lingua francas in Kenya, and many urban dwellers can speak either one or both languages. These languages are therefore dominant in most domains for urban dwellers regardless of the province or district under focus. However, at the divisional level, differences in language use tend to emerge with speakers in most divisions opting to use ethnic languages since a majority of them are rural based.

3. The Research Site

Central Kisii district is sub divided into seven administrative divisions: Keumbu, Suneka, Mosoch, Marani, Kiamokama, Kiogoro and Masaba (Central Kisii District Development Plan, 2002-2008). At 126.4 square kilometres, Suneka is the largest division in the district and together with Mosoch and Marani divisions it is situated along the Luo/Gusii border. Suneka is surrounded by two districts (Homa Bay and Migori) that are predominantly occupied by the Luo people. While in the division one cannot fail to notice the busy Suneka market centre. Here people from all walks of life intermingle. Gusii, Luos, Gikuyus, the young/old, the educated/uneducated, females/males and the rich/poor can be seen conversing in various languages. This makes this area a rich research site for linguistic studies. Suneka is a one of the few divisions in the district that has reported some economic growth in the past five years (Central Kisii Development Plan 2002-2008). Although most of the division is still undeveloped, some parts of it have fairly good infra-structural facilities. Piped water, electricity, telephone services, a number of schools, a health centre and several churches are found in this division.

Given its geographical location, the linguistic situation in Suneka is rather interesting. As a boundary for the Luo people and the Gusii people, many inhabitants are bilingual in nature. Generally, individuals in this area have proficiency in the Luo and Gusii languages and use these languages on daily basis in intergroup interaction, which is fairly common in the area. Bilingualism is evident in many homes in Suneka due to high rates of intermarriage. Similarly, in shops, buses, churches, post office, health centres and in primary schools, many individuals are often heard using both Luo and Gusii languages. On important occasions like weddings, funerals, bride price negotiations/payment, both languages are often used. However, just how speakers switch from one code to the other is a matter that is not clear. Hence a gap this study hopes to fill.

Other trading centres along the Luo/Gusii border are: Nyamarambe, Riosiri, Kamagambo, Nyanchange, Riana, Nyakoe, Rongo, Oyugis, Ringa and Sondu. Due to constraints of time and resources the study only focused on respondents drawn from Suneka division, and the Luo/Gusii data analysed in this study was obtained from this area. We used random sampling procedures to select the division studied.

The second research site in this study is located in Kisumu district. This district is bordered by Rachuonyo district to the South, Siaya and Bondo to the West and Nyando to the East, and Vihiga to the North. Kisumu is divided into four administrative divisions namely; Winam, Maseno, Kombewa and Kadibo (Kisumu district development plan, 2002-2008). Winam division holds Kisumu city, and has the largest area as well as the highest population. Its area is 395 square kilometres (Kisumu district development plan, 2002-2008). Some parts of the division are served by modern infra structural facilities such as electricity, piped water, telephone, road and rail network, airport, health and educational institution. However many of these facilities can only be found in the municipality, for the further one moves from the city the less likely they are to access these facilities. Two out of the four divisions of Kisumu district border districts outside Nyanza province. This means that the occupants of these divisions often come into contact with members of other ethnic communities. Winam division borders Nandi and Vihiga districts while Maseno division borders Vihiga district. Instances of intergroup interaction are therefore high in both Winam and Maseno divisions. Due to lack of adequate funds and time this study limited itself to only one division, Winam. This division was randomly sampled.

Intermarriages between Luos and Luyias are common in Winam. In such homes, there is a tendency for parents and their offspring to use both Luo and Luyia. While in Winam division, Luo/Luyia bilingualism may also be observed in buses, market places, shops, health facilities, churches and in schools. Important occasions in Winam such as funerals and weddings are often conducted in the two languages. The high incidences of contact between Luo/Luyia in Winam made it a suitable research site. In addition Winam is the largest division in Kisumu district as well as the most populous, and yet not many empirical studies of language use in the area are available. For this reason we chose to study the area.

4. Sampling Technique

The speech of members of eight local households in Winam and Suneka formed the sample for this study. In Winam, we selected four households. Similarly, in Suneka, four households were selected. These households were purposively sampled. The members of the households in Winam had to be bilingual in Luo and Luyia languages while those in Suneka had to be bilingual in Gusii and Luo. This condition was laid down so as to ensure that speakers had the linguistic ability to code switch between the contact languages (Romaine 1989). The study used questionnaires to objectively establish whether or not, a given participant was bilingual. Language death is a reality in many societies (Mesthrie et al 2000) and we did find out that some members of the ethnic groups under study could not speak their ethnic languages. Such individuals were not allowed to participate in the study as they would not make it possible for us to achieve the objectives of this study.

The participants in each household were not limited to any specific number as doing so would make the study too 'artificial;' yet the aim of this study like any other sociolinguistic one was to obtain natural data. Mesthrie et al (2000) caution that exercising too much control on the sample size in sociolinguistic study may result into unnecessary artificiality. By the end of the study we had recorded on tape conversations from a total of seventy-one respondents in eight households.

According to Milroy (1987) samples in interactional sociolinguistic studies, do not generally demonstrate strict statistical representativeness. Practical considerations partly dictate sample size; since, the process of recording conversations and then transcribing them word for word is inevitable. Thus, generalisations regarding a particular group of speakers may be "made even with a very small sample, provided that it is systematically selected" (Milroy 1987: 27). In this study all the conversations that were recorded from respondents were first transcribed phonetically before extracting the examples presented in section 6 below.

5. Data Elicitation

The general aim of this study was to determine the code switching patterns during Luo/Luyia and Luo/Gusii contact. Any study seeking to achieve such goal, may obtain data through two ways: interviews or observational techniques (Gibbons 1987). Considering the strengths of observation methods over interviews, as discussed in Gibbons (1987), the method that was employed in collecting data in this study was participant observation. It entailed the researcher and her assistants visiting different households and recording conversations from the householders. The respondents in the study were required to carry out conversations with other members of their household. Since the selected households were made up of bilinguals, it was assumed that switching between the two contact languages could be take place.

In Winam, for example, it was assumed that the householders could switch between Luo and Luyia languages while in Suneka, Luo/Gusii switching was expected.

In order to examine contrastively the language behaviour of the same speaker in different contexts, two recordings were collected from each of the eight Households in this study. The two recordings were obtained on two different occasions when the participant make-up of the conversations and the topics of discussion had changed (Myers-Scotton 1993a). Like Gal (1979), Gumperz (1982) and Myers-Scotton (1993a), we took advantage of naturally occurring contexts. In interactional sociolinguistics "*context* refers to naturally occurring contexts of use rather than different contexts constructed by the researcher" (Mesthrie, 2000: 214). In total, sixteen audio-recordings of varying length, involving speakers drawn from eight households, interacting with others from a different ethnic group, on different topics were collected.

To reduce the effects of the observer's paradox (which cannot be completely eliminated), the present study adopted Labov's (2006) 'insider' technique. This approach entails using an individual who is a member of the speech community that is under observation to collect data from others in that community. Since there is a tendency for people to be free with those that are familiar to them the 'insider technique' has an obvious influence on the quality of data, natural data is obtained. Consequently, we identified two individuals, one from each study area, who assisted with the collection of data as 'insiders.' Field notes and questionnaires were used to provide additional details.

6. Types of Code Switching in Winam and Suneka

When the recorded conversation from Winam and Suneka were examined, it became evident that the speakers employed Luo/Luyia code switching and Luo/Gusii code switching. In this section attempts are made to determine the points in a sentence where code switching occurs. To do this, we shall adopt the two types of code switching proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993b) thus *intra-sentential* and *inter-sentential* switching. While doing this no effort will be made to find out the motivation behind each type of switching as this issue is outside our scope.

Myers-Scotton (1993b) suggests that there are two types of switches: inter-sentential or intra-sentential and these types of switches can be derived from utterances. Normally, the analyst will try to find out whether the switch from one language to another takes place *within* a sentence boundary (hence intra-sentential switching) or *at* a sentence boundary (hence inter-sentential switching). In sub-section 6.1 we consider instances of inter-sentential switching in our data.

6.1 Inter – sentential switching

In inter-sentential switching a speaker switches from one language to another between different sentences. This implies that when the speech of an individual is divided into sentences, one sentence will be in one language while the other sentence will be in a totally different language. Examples 1a and 1b illustrate this.

EXAMPLE 1a

Three speakers are talking about the recent harvest by farmers in a small village in Western Kenya. Speaker A is a twenty-two year old Luyia woman and is visiting her maternal aunt's home (Speaker C). The Luyia aunt is married to a Luo man and they have a son (speaker B). From the extract, it is apparent that all the speakers are of the view that there has been a decline in the amount of food harvested lately. Both speakers, A and her cousin speaker B, (a thirty – three year old man) seem to blame it on the drop in the amount of rainfall. However, speaker C, a fifty-seven year old woman who is B's mother, seems to blame the decline in the harvest on the laziness of the young people in the community! Here is the exchange. Note that in order to distinguish the two codes, the Luyia data is in upper case while the Luo data is presented in lower case. The translation is presented in brackets.

Turn 1 A: Tinde chiemo oonge. (Nowadays there is no food).

Turn 2 B: Ka ere chiemo? MADIKU GANU CHUKURIA CHAVE KOGEGA. (Where is food? Nowadays food production has really gone down).

Turn 3 C: Inge'yo ni ndalo machon chiemo ne chiek ahinya to sani ni chiemo ok chiek ahinya. (You know in the good old days our harvest was huge but now you know that our harvests have reduced very much).

Turn 4 B: Nikech ing'eyo ni koth chwea chwea to matinotino. (Because you know it rains very little.)

Turn 5 A: Ee ee. (Yes)

Turn 6 C: An kaaneno, aneno ni koth chwea chwea kaka pile. SUVIRI ISHIDA EVE MU VARIMI. VANA VA KARUNU MAKONO GAKORA ZA NDI. VANDU VAKARE VAGUMIRA IRIGEMBE, VARIMA KABISA. (I am of the view that it still rains the way it used to. I think the problem is with those who plough the land. The young people of today are pampering their hands. Older people used to grip their hoes energetically, they used to till the land more seriously).

Turn 7 A: Okwanyal wacho ni ji ok ti matek, pidho gik moko, emamiyo onge chiemo. (We cannot say that people do not work hard, tilling and planting, that is why we do not have a huge harvest).

When we consider the syntactic structure of Turn 2 in example 1a, it is evident that this turn consists of two sentences. The first sentence, in lower case, is in the Luo language while the second one, which is in upper case, is in Luyia. Thus the speaker has used the Luo language in the first sentence and Luyia in the second sentence. Since this instance of switching involves different sentences, it is a case of inter-sentential switching.

A second case of inter-sentential switching may be seen in Turn 6 of example 1 a. In the turn, it is evident that speaker C begins her conversation in the Luo language as seen in the first sentence but in the next sentence, she switches to the Luyia language. Thus this is another case of inter-sentential switching because the switching takes place at a sentential boundary.

EXAMPLE 1 b

Speaker A is a neighbour to B. Both are elderly men as they are in their sixties and are Luo/Gusii bilinguals. However in terms of ethnic group membership A is a Luo and B is a Gusii. Speaker A has passed by B's home to say hallo. As the two are conversing, B reveals that his wife has gone on a journey for a few days. On further inquiry, A tells B that in fact his wife has gone to attend a wedding of one of their relatives at Rongo, a small town nearby. It is at this point of the recording that both speakers realize that they both know the bridegroom's father, James. Gusii data is in upper case while the Luo data is presented in lower case.

Turn 1 A: Kara ing'eyo James, ne akiya. NAKI OMANYETE JAMES BUYA? (So you know James, I did not know that. How come you know James very well?)

Turn 2 B: NARE GOKORA EBIASARA SEINO. (I used to do business in that place.)

Turn 3 A: ARARI? Kar ang'o? (Where ? When was this?)

Turn 4 B: NARE GOKORA EBIASARA AARIA RONGO. James be netimo ohala kanyo ema newangere. (I used to do business in Rongo. James also used to do business in the same town so we got to know each other).

In Turn 1 of example 1b speaker A uses Luo in the first sentence and then switches to Gusii in the next sentence. Since the shift has taken place at the boundary of the two sentences, we treat this as a case of inter-sentential switching.

Turn 3 of 1b is made up of two questions. The first question (ARARI?) is in Gusii and the second (Karang'o?) is in Luo. Again, this is an instance of inter-sentential switching because the switching involves two different sentences. Each question is posed in a different language. However, unlike in Turn 1 where the switch is from Luo to Gusii, the switch in Turn 3 is from Gusii to Luo.

In Turn 4 of 1b the speaker changes to Luo towards the end of the turn after having begun in Gusii. Since the switch is found at a sentential boundary, this is another example of inter-sentential switching. Like in Turn 3, the switch in turn 4 is from Gusii to Luo. Let us now consider intra-sentential switching.

6.2 Intra –sentential switching

In this type of switching, speakers switch from one language to another within the same sentence. Thus a sentence will be made up of two or more languages. When considering intra-sentential switching it is important that the analyst also establishes the matrix and embedded languages in the code switched material. The matrix language (hereafter ML) is the main language of code switched utterances unlike the embedded language or languages (EL) which is the less dominant language and plays a lesser role. According to Myers-Scotton (1993b) there are two principles that may guide one in determining the ML and EL. They are:

- (1) The ML provides the largest proportion of lexical items in the CS text while the EL provides fewer items.
- (2) It is the ML that sets the morpho-syntactic frame of the sentences in code switched material.

In example 1c and 1d attempts are made to test these claims.

EXAMPLE 1c

The speakers are talking about the current water shortage in the area. According to speaker A, a fifty –two year old Luo man, the community is short of one pipe, and that is what is causing the current shortage. Speaker B is a thirty – year old, Luyia woman who is newly married in the village where the research was being conducted. Both speakers are Luo/Luyia bilinguals but can also speak English and Kiswahili as well because they are educated and are primary school teachers in Winam division. Towards the end of the conversation, the topic shifts from water problems to the techniques used in drilling this water. All the Luyia data is presented in upper case while Luo data is in lower case. English data is italicized and Kiswahili is underlined.

Turn 1 A: Koro pokwatie kode ma waneno kode kamo odhi. Necha wa –*test* to waneno ni *one pipe* emorem mondo ogochi. Kawagoyo *a little* to orumo. Koro jogi no onego obi to *malaria* omaka gi *Christmas*. (Now we have not worked and seen its [referring to the water’s] direction. Recently we tested it and found that we are short of one pipe in order for water to be pumped. Whenever we pump a little it gets finished. Now those people [referring to the water technicians] were to come during Christmas but contracted malaria).

Turn 2 B: NA MAZI GENAGA, MWARIMA NAKI? (And this water, what did you use to drill it?)

Turn 3 A: KWATUMIKIRA *hand drilling* (We used hand drilling)

Turn 4 B: *Hand drilling?* MWARIMA ZI –*foot* ZIANGA? (hand drilling? How many feet did you drill?)

Turn 5 A: VARIMA ZI–*foot* ZIZIIZA *eighty–five* na mawe ilikuwa futi ishirini na inne hapo. Mawe. Walikuwa wana–drill na ku–pump maji wana–drill na ku–pump maji MPAKA NIZIDUKA. (They drilled more than eighty-five feet and the ‘rocky area’ was twenty –four feet. They were drilling and pumping water, drilling and pumping water until they attained the number of feet they wanted).

Turn 1 of example 1c is made up of four sentences. The first sentence is in the Luo language only, hence lacks code switching. However, when we get to the second sentence, we see speaker A using both Luo and English in one sentence hence a case of intra-sentential switching. This can be seen from the following analysis:

‘Necha wa–*test* to waneno ni *one pipe* emorem mondo ogochi’
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

(Recently, we tested it and found that we are short of one pipe in order for water to be pumped.)

In the above sentence, two and half words out of ten are in English and the rest, which are seven and a half, are in Luo. On the basis of the number of lexical items from each language, it is possible to say that Luo is the ML while English is the EL. It is also interesting to note that in this sentence, switching takes place at the word level since the first part of the word ‘wa –*test*’ ‘wa-’ (the Luo first person plural pronoun) is from Luo while the second part ‘*test*’ is from English. This kind of switching is very delicate and as Romaine (1989:113) puts it ‘involves arguably, the greatest syntactic risk and may be avoided by all but the most fluent bilinguals.’ Some scholars refer to this kind of intra-sentential switching as code mixing.

Scholars like Kachru (1992) and Bokamba (1988) prefer to use the term code mixing to refer ‘the code switching that takes place at the word level.’ However, other scholars such as Gumperz (1982) and Myers – Scotton (1993b) use the general term intra-sentential switching. Like Myers – Scotton (1993b), we simply used the general term intra-sentential switching to refer to switching of codes within one word or one sentence.

The third and fourth sentences of Turn 1 in example 1c also contain instances of intra-sentential switching. Thus in ‘Kawagoyo *a little* to orumo’ the speaker begins the sentence in Luo then switches to English and then back to Luo. Two lexical items are in English and three are in Luo, hence the Luo items are more than the English ones. This implies that Luo is the ML and English is the EL. In the next sentence ‘koro jogi no onego obi to *malaria* omaka gi *Christmas*’ the initial part is in Luo then the speaker switches to English then back to Luo before finishing in English. Since large portions of this sentence are in the Luo language, it is possible to assume that the ML of this text is Luo while the EL is English.

There is no code switching in Turn 2 of example 1c as the entire turn is in one language only, Luyia. However, in the third and fourth turns of 1c, we witness more intra-sentential switching involving Luyia and English. Considering that two of the lexical items in turn 3 are in the English language (*hand drilling*) while one lexical item (KWATUMIKIRA) is in Luyia, it is possible to assume that English is the ML! However, for obvious reasons this may not be practical as this conversation takes place in a rural context where the most unmarked code would be an ethnic language. Thus it would be ridiculous to consider English the ML and Luyia the EL. Perhaps if one takes cognizance of the technical nature of the topic then English may well be the ML and Luyia the EL. This contradiction therefore casts doubts on the roles of the ML and EL in CS studies.

In Turn 4 of 1c, we have three lexical items from Luyia and three from English. None of the languages contributes more lexical items to the sentence hence posing a challenge in determining the ML and EL. However, when we consider the second parameter (which proposes that the ML is the language that projects the morpho-syntactic structure of the sentences in CS material) then it becomes clear that the ML in this sentence is Luyia and the EL is English. In the word *ZI-foot* the word 'foot' is pluralized using the Luyia affix 'ZI-' and not the English one. (Probably, because of the irregularity of this noun's plural in the English language). This instance of CS therefore reveals one of the challenges analysts may face if they attempt to rely only on quantities of lexical items that a language contributes to the CS text to determine the ML and EL.

Finally, Turn 5 of example 1c comprises of three sentences. In the first sentence '*VARIMA ZI-foot ZIZIIZA eighty five na mawe ilikuwa futi ishirini na inne hapo.*' the speaker switches between Luyia, English and Swahili. A total of three languages are used in one sentence. This perhaps demonstrates just how complex a sentence from a bilingual speaker can be structurally. There is no code switching in the second sentence as it is made up of only one word, '*Mawe*' which is in the Swahili language. The third sentence of Turn 5 '*walikuwa wana -drill na ku-pump maji* MPAKA NIZIDUKA' is also in three languages; Swahili, English and Luyia.

In the case of the first sentence of Turn 5 of 1c, if we consider this sentence (*VARIMA ZI-foot ZIIZA eighty five na mawe ilikuwa futi ishirini na inne hapo mawe*) it is evident that there are nine lexical items from Swahili, four from English and three from Luyia. Therefore, based on this criterion, a majority of the lexical items are in Swahili making it the ML. English and Luyia are the ELs of this sentence. But if we assume that the code which projects the morpho-syntactic structure of the sentence is the ML, then Luyia takes up this role. In the word '*ZI-foot*' it is the Luyia morpheme *ZI-* which is affixed to the English noun 'foot' to mark plurality and not the English. So of the two languages which is the *real* ML? Is it Swahili, Luyia or both? This perhaps is one of the weaknesses of this principle.

Finally, the third sentence of Turn 5 (*Walikuwa wana-drill na ku-pump maji wana-drill na ku-pump maji* MPAKA NIZIDUKA.) demonstrates further code switching at the word level. Both '*wana-drill*' and '*ku-pump*' are partly in Swahili and partly in English. In this case it is Swahili and not English which projects the morpho-syntactic structure of the sentence. The verbs 'drill' and 'pump' take Swahili inflectional morphemes namely *wana-* (w- marks third person plural, while *-ana-* marks past participial aspect) and *ku-* (ku- marks past infinitive) respectively. As regards the number of lexical items contributed by the various languages, it is Swahili that contributes the highest number of lexical items to the third sentence. In the sentence, there are nine lexical items from Swahili, four from English and two from Luyia. Thus Swahili is the ML whereas English and Luyia are the ELs. This is a good scenario as the two parameters seem to work in unison in justifying why Swahili should be considered the ML and English and Luyia as the ELs.

EXAMPLE 1d

Three female speakers are busy talking about the help some farmers in Kamwango and Nyanchege areas of Suneka division received recently from a Non-Governmental Organization when a new entrant joins the conversation. From the discussion, these farmers have benefited in several ways: seminars, free gumboots, overcoats, overalls and even tomato seedlings. The topic of discussion later shifts to a farm that seems to be doing so well. It is alleged that this farm belongs to Mr. [Simeon] Nyachae, a very prominent Gusii politician who attempted to run for the presidency of Kenya in 2002. It is in the process of discussing Mr. Nyachae's farm that a new respondent [Speaker D] arrives. Speaker A and B are Gusiis females in their late thirties and are primary school dropouts. Speaker C is a Luo female aged thirty-four and is a high school drop-out.

The new entrant, Speaker D, is a Luo female aged thirty-one and is also a primary school drop-out. Speaker C is married to a Gusii man and is the owner of the house where the recording takes place. The other speakers are her neighbours. All the participants are Luo/Gusii bilinguals. The Gusii data is presented in upper case while Luo data is in lower case. English data is italicized and Kiswahili is underlined.

Turn 1 A: GOCHIA ARIA NKORORANDE ABANTO BAKOREMA? (Towards that side do I really see people cultivating?)

Turn 2 B: NGOCHI KAMWANGO BAKOREMA MONO. (Towards Kamwango they cultivate a lot).

Turn 3 C: NI CHI-seminar NKOGENDA BARE. (It is seminars that they go to).

Turn 4 B: GOCHI KAMWANGO BARE ABAREMI ABAKONG'U. (Towards Kamwango, those are very hardworking farmers).

Turn 5 C: EE! BAETWE EBINTO. Hata walipewa vitu. Walipewa boot free, CHIANGA CHIOKOREMA NE CHIKABUTI, *overalls*. Walipewa CHI-nyanya na wakapanda. (Yes! They were given things. They were given things. They were given free boots, clothes for farming with [meaning over-coats] and boots, overalls. They were given tomatoes and they planted them).

Turn 6 A: OMONTO NARE ONTEBI NG'A NOBOREMO BWA NYACHAE. (Someone told us that that is Nyachae's land).

Turn 7 B: EE! GOCHAKERA KAMWANGO MPAKA NYANCHENGE. (Yes! Starting from Kamwango up to Nyanchenge).

Turn 8 C: BONO YABAGANIRWE. (Now it has already been sub divided).

Turn 9 B: RERO NEBINGE BIROO. (Nowadays there are many things).

Turn 10 C: HAIYA! OYONDE OCHIRE AIGA OGOTOTEBI ONSI BI. Donji Nyamwalo. Donji donja. Bi bed ka. (Wow! Here comes another person who will tell us everything. Come in Nyamwalo. Come in, come in. Come and sit here).

Turn 11 D: Asedonji. [laughter] Erokamano thurwa. Koro mlikuwa mnasema nini? NKI MOKOTHEBA? (I have already come in. [Laughter]. Thank you my kinsmen. Now, what is it you people were saying? What were you saying?)

In example 1d it is evident that intra-sentential switching can be seen in three turns namely; turn 3, 5 and 11. Turn 3 is made up of one sentence [NI CHI-seminar NKOGENDA BARE]. In this sentence, four lexical items are from the Gusii language while only one is from English. This therefore means that Gusii is the ML while English is the EL. This study also hypothesized that the ML sets the morpho-syntactic frame of sentences in code switched material. Since in CHI-seminar the English noun 'seminar' has inflected for plurality by taking a Gusii plural prefix CHI-, it is possible to assume that it is Gusii rather than English which is the ML in this sentence. English is the EL. There is no controversy in this instance of intra-sentential switching.

Turn 5 of example 1d, is made up of four sentences. The first sentence [EE! BAETWE EBINTO] is in Gusii while the second [Hata walipewa vitu] is in Swahili. There are no instances of intra-sentential switching in these two sentences. However as we get to the third sentence 'Walipewa CHI-boot free, CHIANGA CHIOKOREMA NE CHIKABUTI, *overalls*' we witness intra-sentential switching. The first word of this sentence is in Swahili while the second is partly in Gusii and partly in English. As regards the entire sentence, five lexical items are in Gusii, three are in English and one is in Swahili. Considering that most of the words in this sentence are from the Gusii, then it is possible to conclude that the Gusii language is the ML of the third sentence of turn 5 of example 1d. Additionally the Gusii language sets the morpho-syntactic structure of this sentence as witnessed in the word CHI-*boot*, where plurality is marked by a Gusii morpheme rather than the regular plural morpheme of English. Again this is a good scenario where there is no controversy.

Finally, the fourth sentence of turn 5 of example 1d [Walipewa CHI-nyanya na wakapanda] is made up of lexical items from two codes. Four of the lexical items in this sentence are from Swahili and one is from Gusii. It is therefore clear that the ML of this sentence is Swahili as more lexical items come from it. Since Gusii only contributes one lexical item, it is the EL of this sentence.

But if we bring in a second parameter (that it is the ML that sets the morpho-syntactic frame of a CS sentence) then obviously the Gusii language is the one that serves this role. It is the Gusii inanimate plural prefix [CHI-] that is affixed to noun nyanya in order to mark plurality. On this basis then Gusii is the ML. In this instance we witness confusion regarding the ML. If the first parameter is applied then Swahili qualifies to be the ML whereas Gusii is the EL but if we apply the second parameter Gusii emerges as the ML and Swahili may be considered the EL. So which analysis is correct? In turn 11, the third sentence [Koro mlikuwa mnasema nini?] may be regarded as an instance of intra-sentential switching since two languages are used in the same sentence. The first word of this sentence is in Luo while the other three words are in Swahili. This type of switching is also classified as tag switching (Appel & Muysken 1987). In this case, the question is in Swahili, but it is introduced with a Luo tag 'Koro.' If we consider the first parameter, then Swahili is the ML (since three out of four words in this sentence are from Swahili) and Luo is the EL. It is, however, difficult to apply the second parameter (which states that it is the ML which sets the morpho-syntactic structure of sentences in CS material) as there is no CS at the word level in sentence 3 of turn 11 in 1d.

Conclusion

This study set out to investigate the patterns of code switching during Luo/Luyia and Luo/Gusii contact. Both inter- and intra-sentential switching were observed. Attempts were made to describe the grammatical structures of utterances in both instances of inter- and intra-sentential switching. From the analyses carried out it was evident that there was less controversy regarding inter-sentential switching as compared to intra-sentential switching. This study established that attempts to apply the two principles proposed in determining the Matrix and Embedded Languages of Code Switched utterances were problematic in some cases of intra-sentential switching. Thus the reason why it is not really possible to compare the two types of code switching. We therefore recommend a rethinking of the proposals regarding intra-sentential switching.

References

- Agheyisi, R. N. (1977). Language Interlarding in the Speech of Nigerians. In P. Kotey and H. Der-Houssikian (eds.). *Language and Linguistic Problems in Africa*. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press, 99-110.
- Angogo, R. (1980). Linguistic and Attitudinal Factors in the Maintenance of the Luluyia Group Identity. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Texas.
- Bitutu, T. (1991). A Study of Syntactic Patterns of Ekegusii/English Code switching. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Kenyatta University.
- Bokamba, E. (1988). Code Mixing, Language Variation and Linguistic Theory: Evidence from Bantu languages. *Lingua*, 76, 21-62. *Central Kisii development plan, 2002-2008*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Fishman, J. (1965). Who speaks what language to whom and when? *Linguistics*, 2, 67-88.
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gibbons, J. (1987). *Code-mixing and Code Choice: A Hong Kong Case Study*. Clevedon Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1953). The analysis of linguistic borrowings. *Language*, 26, 210-231.
- Kachru, B.B. (ed.) (1992). *The Other Tongue*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kebeya, H. (2007). Linguistic Accommodation and Code Switching during Luo/Luyia and Luo/Gusii contact. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis: Kenyatta University. *Kisumu district development plan, 2002-2008*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Labov, W. (2006). *The Social Stratification of English in New York*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., and Leap, W.L. (eds.) (2000). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing and Analysing Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). *Social Motivation for Code-Switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993 b). *Duelling Languages*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. United Kingdom: Basil Blackwell.
- Savic, J.M. (1995). Structural Convergence and Language Change: Evidence from Serbian/English Code Switching. *Language in Society*, 24, 475-492.
- Scotton, C.M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: The Social functions of code switching *Linguistics*, 193, 5-20.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). 6th edition. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.