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DEFINITION OF TERMS

IN-GROUP  Refers to *matatu* crew/workers not limited to touts and drivers but also includes ‘idlers’ supposedly working at bus termini

OUT-GROUP  All those involved in public means of transport: touts, drivers, porters and the passengers.

ARGOT  A register used by touts, drivers and other *matatu* workers to prevent the passengers from understanding their conversations.

CODE  A linguistic variety used amongst *matatu* workers and between *matatu* workers, passengers and the general public.

LOCAL LANGUAGE  Indigenous language, in our case, Kimeru.

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS  These are factors that account for the choice of Argot, Kimeru, Kiswahili and English in terms of interlocutor motives, attitudes, perception and group loyalties.

MATATU  public means of transport viz; *Nissans*, Touring’s and mini-Buses

STAGE  Bus terminus

TOUTS  Other *matatu* workers apart from drivers
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

SAT  -  Speech Accommodation theory
CS   -  Code switching
ML   -  Matrix Language
EL   -  Embedded Language
P    -  Passenger
T    -  Tout
ABSTRACT

This study was carried out to explore the implications of in-group and out-group language use among Matatu crew/workers in Meru town. It sought to find out why Matatu crew use in-group and out-group language and its social implications on the passengers. The study has given structural morpho-syntactic analysis of the argot used as in-group language by the crew and related it to Kimeru, Kiswahili and English. The study targeted matatu crew at Mikinduri bus termini and their passengers. The researcher used tape-recording, direct observation and unstructured interviews to analyze the in-group and out-group languages. The study utilized qualitative research techniques. Speech accommodation theory (SAT) theoretical approach was applied. The study sought to add to the growing knowledge of code switching and provided insights on the motivating factors behind the use of argots.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In this section, a background of the study was presented highlighting on the pattern of language use in Africa followed by a statement of the research problem. In addition, the rationale of the study, objectives, research assumptions and finally scope and limitations was also given.

The study focused on the following code choices; Kimeru, Kiswahili, argot and occasionally English. A brief description of the morpho syntactic structure of the argot was also given.

The term argot according to Ager (1990), was applied to any specialized jargon used by a particular group who carry out specific activities like conscripts, school pupils or those involved with horse racing. It was also used to refer to the language associated with the criminal classes of France up until the beginning of the 20th century. It was a secret lexicon of the under-classes who lived in specific closed ghettos. The areas where the people who used the argot spent much of their lives were inaccessible to outsiders, especially the forces of law and order.

Speakers intentionally kept knowledge of their language from those who were not part of their community. Originally, argot (derived from les argotiers), was a secret language invented in 1628 by robbers in the city of Paris, in order not to be understood by police spies. Today, it is said, all French people know some argot. For the speakers, argot is an “in-group marker”, (Ager, 1990).
1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

According to Hammers & Blanc (1982), there are many factors that predispose human beings to speak more than one language. In many parts of the world the ability to speak more than one language is an accepted norm, giving rise to multilingualism. This phenomenon results from individuals’ access to two or more linguistic codes as a means of communication.

In Kenya the language situation is complex considering that we have about forty ethnic languages. Batibo (2005) states that the fact that Africans speak several languages is not necessarily because they are gifted, but rather because they are exposed to many languages. Multilingual communication, where two or more languages are used, generally involves members of different ethno linguistic groups.

In Kenya for instance, there are over forty indigenous languages classified into three linguistic family groups; the Bantu, the Nilotes and Cushites, (Abdulaziz, 1982:125) Alongside these we have English as the official language and a medium of instruction from class four. Kiswahili is another language spoken by the majority of Kenyans. It was declared the national language in 1974, (Abdulaziz, 1982:125) and currently it is an official language alongside English in the new Kenyan constitution.

The status of Kiswahili was further enhanced when it was made a compulsory, examinable subject in primary, secondary and in teacher training colleges. Therefore,
anyone who has gone through the Kenyan Education system can speak at least two languages, namely: English and Kiswahili which are compulsory subjects in our education system.

Mbaabu (1985:83) observes that in the Kenyan situation, Kiswahili has a clear unique position as a supra-ethnic language. It is used extensively as a public means of communication in domains such as political rallies, social service, local trade and commerce, local administration, primary courts and mass media.

According to Mbaabu (1985), Kiswahili assumes a second place to English among the Kenyan elite. However, it is regarded as the high ‘H’ in relation to languages below it such as indigenous ones. The language at the lowest level of the structure is usually a language of limited communication, often not, or not sufficiently, codified and serves within the confines of speakers for intra-ethnic communication, family interaction and cultural expressions, village activities such as co-operative enterprises and pre-school education. In Kenya these languages correlate with African languages which the Gachathi Report (1976) recommended to be used at the lower primary level of education. Gikuyu and Dholuo are examples of such languages.

The above factors resulted in majority of Kenyans using two or more languages giving rise to a phenomenon known as code switching, hence forth CS. CS can be defined as the alternative use of two or more languages in the same conversation. Milroy and Muysken, (1985) State that CS does not indicate lack of competence on the part of the speaker in any of the languages concerned, but results from complex bilingual skills.
In Meru, apart from using Kimeru, Kiswahili and English, there is an argot commonly used among matatu crew. This is a code that has possibly developed from Kimeru, Kiswahili or English over a period of time. Wilhelm Von Humboldt’s (in Lehmann, 1967:3) observed that “… there can never be a moment of true standstill in a language just as little as in the ceaselessly flaming thought of men by nature, it is a continuous process of development…” It is in the process of this development that the languages above have given birth to the argot. People use an argot as a way of excluding others. Sociologically, the use of such a language/code, instead of using Kimeru or Kiswahili is deviance, which Mueller and Kendall (2005:98) define as, “any behaviour, belief or condition that violates significant social norms in the society or group in which it occurs”. This study therefore sought to establish the motivation of its use, functions, the morpho syntactic structure and whether it is perceived positively or negatively by the passengers.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study sought to investigate out-group and in-group language use by Matatu crew in Meru town. Researchers and scholars have done a lot of research of code switching among various groups. However, despite the existence of in-group language among Matatu crew, little has been done to analyse its morpho-syntactic structure as well as establish the motivations and impacts of its use among the non-initiated: passengers in particular. This study, thus sought to analyze and describe out-group language(s) and
the argot and establish the motivations behind their use. It will also describe the morpho-syntactic structure of the argot and its impacts.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To identify language use strategies that Matatu workers in Meru town employ in in-group and out-group communication.

2. To find out the impact of in-group language usage among Matatu workers on passengers and the general public.

3. To establish the relationship between the morpho-syntactic structure of the in-group language and Kimeru, Kiswahili and English.

4. To investigate functions of in-group language.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research sought to answer the following questions:

1. What language use strategies do Matatu workers in Meru town employ in in-group and out-group communication?

2. What is the impact of in-group language usage among Matatu workers on passengers and the general public?

3. How is the morpho-syntactic structure of in-group language related to Kimeru, Kiswahili and English?

4. For what purpose(s) do Matatu workers use in-group language?
1.5 RESEARCH ASSUMPTIONS

The research was guided by these assumptions:

1. *Matatu* workers employ different strategies in in-group and out-group communication.

2. In-group language use by *Matatu* workers has effects on passengers and the general population.

3. The structure of the in-group language is related to Kimeru, Kiswahili and English.


1.6 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Studies on code switching and the various aspects on CS have been carried out by many scholars. Among these are Romaine (1994) who studied CS and its role in bilingual communicative competence. On the other hand, Gumperz (1982), carried out a study on conversational CS, Muthuri (2000), studied functions of code switching among multilingual students at Kenyatta University. Muthwii (1986) studied language use in plurilingual societies and the significance of code switching. Kwach (2008) studied patterns and motivations of code switching in staffroom conversation and Gitonga (2008) did a study on English, Kimeru/ Kiswahili code switching, a structural perspective.

From the studies, as Trudgil (1994) observes, people have good reasons for CS. It is not accidental and deserves respect, not contempt. Kanana (2003) states that, in a cosmopolitan setting, people of different ethnic backgrounds have to interact with one
another on a day-to-day basis at work or in business transaction; CS is a major feature of such transactions. This study seeks to broaden the knowledge base from researches carried out on CS. It aims at studying a group that has not been studied, Matatu workers, from the perspectives of both in-group and out-group languages. More specifically, this is in pursuit of trying to demystify the phenomenon of in-group language, ‘argot’, among Matatu workers. The argot is rather bewildering to the non-initiated.

The study also sought to establish the language(s) the argot has been grafted from and its functions. It was hoped that a careful description of this argot would lead to significant insights into problems related to its use among the general public and passengers in Meru and other regions where argots are used.

1.7 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This study falls under the realm of sociolinguistics and focuses on language use in a multilingual community. The main concern of this study was to identify the codes used between Matatu workers and passengers and the motivation behind the use of argot by Matatu workers. Matatu workers, in their day-to-day activities, communicate with many groups of people such as municipal council law enforcers, policemen, passengers and many others. This study was however, limited to communication between Matatu workers and passengers and communication among themselves.
Another limitation was that there are many public vehicle termini in Meru town. For example: Nkubu, Maua, Nairobi, Kagaene, Ruiri, Tharaka, Nanyuki and Mikinduri. This study was carried out at Mikinduri bus termini. The study sought to explain how and why touts use an argot alongside code switching; that is the motivation behind the choice of one code over the other and the functions each code serves in Matatu business. It also aimed at establishing whether ‘argot’ is used for any other purpose outside business. A brief description of the structure of the argot was also given.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this section, the researcher wished to review literature at three main levels. The review begins with an account of general studies on CS relevant to this study. This is followed by studies on CS done in Kenya that were relevant to this study were looked at in order to establish the place of the current study. Lastly, a review of literature on the theoretical framework, involving both empirical studies and issues raised on the theories are discussed.

2.2 GENERAL STUDIES ON CODE SWITCHING

Most studies done have focused on patterns that emerge during CS or the syntactic structures of CS. For example, Gumperz (1982) studied conversational CS. He defines it as the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or sub-systems. He goes on to say that, in conversational CS, speakers communicate fluently without hesitation or pauses to mark the shift on codes. The participants in interaction are often unaware which code is being used at any one time.

Participants’ main concern is with the communicative effect of what they are saying. Gumperz points out that bilingual exchanges studied show that CS does not
necessarily indicate imperfect knowledge of grammatical systems in question. Only relatively few passages in code alteration are motivated by speakers’ inability to find words to express what they want to say in one or the other code. The study gives insights on CS and reiterates CS as functional and not imperfect knowledge of grammatical systems.

On the other hand, Romaine (1994) examined CS and its role in bilingual communicative competence. The study was based on researches done among a Punjabi speaking community in Britain and bilingual children in Papua New Guinea. Two codes were distinguished: the ‘we’ and the ‘they’ code. The ‘we’ code typically signified in-group informed personalized activities. The ‘they’ variety marked out-group which are more formal relations. She also distinguished between metaphorical and transactional switching as one that is controlled by the components of the speech event like topic and participants while metaphorical CS is the various communicative effects the speaker intends to convey. The central concern of Romaine’s study was the constraints for code choices. She recognized that CS serves some specific functions and behind the CS are motivations for doing so. For instance, the choice of one language over another could display ‘acts of identity’ choosing the groups with whom one wants to identify.

Another observation made was that participants’ attitudes towards a language that is being used might affect switching behavior. In Romaine’s study CS was seen as serving an explosive function and had meaning. Her study also recognized CS as functional. Her study however differs from this study in the choice of the sample and
the languages in question. Our sample is drawn from Meru community (Matatu workers) and the languages in question are Kimeru, Kiswahili, argot (a register) and occasionally English.

2.3 SPECIFIC STUDIES ON CODE SWITCHING IN KENYA

In Kenya, owing to the society’s multilingual nature, the use of more than one language is a common phenomenon. According to Batibo (2005) most countries in Africa are multilingual with an average of about forty (40) languages per country. This has given rise to a complex state of multilingualism with various patterns of language use. Whitely (1974) observes that an attempt to make any useful comment about the state of multilingualism poses a big challenge. One has to find out the incentives which in Kenya today compel men and women to learn and speak other languages other than their first language. For instance, is it that people acquire a second language so as to use it to one’s advantage in the game that is everyday living?

Myers Scotton (1993) responds by observing that researchers have not provided enough evidence from multilingual settings in Africa to explain why people code switch. She observes that speaking is interactional behavior where speakers use code choices to negotiate their wants and relationships with different codes symbolizing different wants. The social purpose of conversation is between speakers and addressees. In connection to the present study, it is therefore in order to say that both in-group and out-group have no single motivation.
Parkin (1974) studied language switching in the speech community of Kaloleni in Nairobi using the variable of ethnicity and social economic status of the sources. In his study, he observed that in this speech community, people switch between English, Kiswahili and mother tongue. He also noted that when people interact they try to judge consciously what mode of behavior best suits their interactions and that ethnic languages connote solidarity.

Those who choose English tend to have high status connotation while Kiswahili is used to connote, brotherhood or neutrality. Kiswahili may be said to bridge both ethnic and status differences. Parkin’s study just like this one focuses on CS during social interaction. Our study just like Parkin’s seeks to discuss why speakers switch languages in the presence of their listeners in the way that they do.

Bunyi (1985) studied CS among standard 4 pupils in a Kiswahili medium. Her study was exploratory based on sociolinguistic functions of code switching. She outlined the functions of CS as follows; clarity, emphasis, appearance of technical vocabulary and private initiation. Bunyi’s study was based in the classroom while this study observes Matatu workers’ use of language amongst themselves and with other people.

Muthwii (1986) studied language use in pluri-lingual societies and the significance of code switching. She points out that most people in Kenya use CS as a speech code
that was emblematic of community identity. She studied CS among three languages. English, Kiswahili and Kalenjin. The linguistic and social significance for CS is based on natural data from natural conversation involving these three languages. Muthwii identified the stylistic functions of CS using Gumperz (1982) function framework theory. According to her, CS served the following functions.

i. Mimicry and quotation
ii. Interjection
iii. Reiteration
iv. Personalization and objectivity
v. Addressees specification and change of topic

Muthwii’s study will furnish the present one with various functions of communication strategies. On the other hand, Gachinu, (1996) studied the linguistic aspect of CS in Kikuyu, Kiswahili and English. Her study was an effort to establish the dominant language between rural and urban Kikuyu when they switch codes. She investigated functions of CS and what determines the matrix language and the embedded language using Myers Scotton’s (1992) frame based model. Gachinu found that the matrix language is Kikuyu in most switches. The focus on the dominant language in CS is useful in this study though ours is based on a different sample.

Another study carried out by Muthuri (2000) sought to investigate the functions of CS among multilingual students at Kenyatta University. The study described the
choice of code involving the use of English, Kiswahili and local languages. In addition to stylistic functions, the social functions of CS, the social symbolism and the codes involved in switching were investigated. The strategies that the speakers adopted in meeting their goals were also examined. The study looked at CS based on 3 theoretical approaches; Giles’ SAT, Scotton’s negotiation principle maxims and Gumperz’s conversation functional model. Muthuri’s study is related to the current one in terms of the theoretical approach- Giles’ SAT (1987).

Kanana (2003) used theoretical approaches of markedness model, scottons and Giles SAT to study CS in a cosmopolitan market setting in Nairobi. The study focused on functions of CS and also the motivations behind the choice of a particular code at any given time. Codes studied include: English, Kiswahili and local languages. At every particular incidence the choice of codes was found to fulfill the functions of ‘solidarity’ and make it easier for a trader at the market to convince prospective customers to buy their products. In this study the sources were cosmopolitan local Kenyans from different ethnic communities and races. This is because the study was conducted at Masai market in Nairobi where curios are sold to Kenyans from all ethnic groups, races and tourists. This study is related to our study in terms of theoretical framework - Giles’ SAT.

Nyakundi (2010) studied an Ekegusii argot called egesenbesa. He analysed the linguistic structure as well as established the motivation of its use. In the analysis of the morpho-phonological structure, he noted that secrecy is achieved through
morphological and phonological processes which are manipulated for the argot. His study is important to the current study in that apart from investigating the functions of the argot, this study will also give the morpho- syntactic analysis of the argot.

It is important to acknowledge that quite a lot has been done on Matatu industry. Mungai (2003:22) points out that Chege, Rimbui and Olembo (1994) studied problems faced by girl – students travelling on Nairobi Matatus where they observed that girls were lured to board by gaudy colours, music, pictures and graffiti. However, Mungai (2003) argues that the three did not show what such texts mean in order to ‘lure’ the school girls thus presenting them in their interaction with the Matatu culture as devoid or incapable of agency. In his study, ‘Identity politics in Nairobi, Matatu folklore’, Mungai demonstrates that Matatu decorations are rooted in different social cultures and need to be understood as legitimate acts of cultural expression within each one’s specific context.

These studies are related to our study in that language, which is our main concern, is an aspect of culture. However, our study is different in that it sought to study and describe language use amongst the Matatu workers and between these workers and passengers. This will add to the already existing body of knowledge on Matatu culture.
2.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The CS theory of speech accommodation has been adopted for the purpose of this study. Giles (1987) offers social psychological approach to language study during contact between speakers from different linguistic groups.

The theory explains how speech undergoes adjustments in the process of interaction. The main argument is that during social interaction, participants are motivated to adjust their speech styles as a way of gaining social approval, attaining communicative efficiency between interactants and maintaining positive social identities.

The process of adjustment is known as accommodation. This process works in two ways: convergence and divergence. In convergence, the speaker uses language that the hearer knows or likes best thus social integration and approval. In speech convergence the interlocutors become more alike in the languages they use. This speech convergence may be an efficient strategy for facilitating inter-ethnic encounters where linguistic dissimilarity may have been a stumbling block for effective cross cultural communication and ethnic harmony, Giles and St. Claire (1979: 125).

The SAT also views convergence as a social exchange during which interlocutors incur certain costs in order to obtain potential rewards which may be in form of
material received or social approval and the costs may include linguistic efforts or group identity loss, Giles and Robinson, (1990).

The second form of accommodation is divergence. Here the speaker wishes to distance himself from hearers by maximizing the differences in the language use. It may occur simultaneously and speakers may not be aware that they are modifying their codes. To account for convergence and divergence in an interpersonal encounter, the study will adopt three social psychological theories of SAT.

Similarity attraction, social exchange and social identity theory accounts for divergence. According to similarity attraction, a person tries to induce another to evaluate them favorably by reducing dissimilarities between the two of them. Here speakers automatically adjust themselves to each other. The theory helps in interpreting the choice of a particular language in terms of other speakers’ language and identity.

The social exchange theory holds that before a speaker engages in an action, they weigh the rewards and costs of entering into such activity. Thus people will engage in behaviors that will earn them reward and avoid that which will yield unpleasant outcomes. Speech convergence thus will occur when rewards outweigh costs. The theory is used to investigate motivations for convergence. Social identity theory analyses divergence. Speakers modify speech away from interlocutors in order to sound least like them. The theory states that linguistic divergence basically reflects motivations to assert positive ethno-linguistic identities when with out-group
members or show disapproval of them. Since convergence and divergence relate to out-group and in-group language respectively, this study used the three theories of SAT to explain the motivating factors that influence the choice of different codes by *Matatu* workers in Meru town when addressing, an out-group and use of an argot among themselves.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the design and methodology that was used for the study. It also shows the area where the study took place, the population and sampling procedures that were employed, the data collection methods that were used, data analysis and presentation.

3.2 STUDY AREA

The study was carried out in Meru town specifically at Mikinduri bus termini. The reason for the choice was that it was convenient to the researcher owing to the fact that the researcher is known to a few Matatu workers and thus less likely to rouse suspicion. This increased the chances of observing and participating in prolonged interactions.

3.3 SAMPLING PROCEDURE

In this study judgment sampling technique and social network approach were used. The judgment sampling method, whose underlying principle involves identifying in advance the ‘types’ of speakers to be studied and then seeking a quota of speakers who fit the specified categories (Milroy, 1987:26), was used to choose the town and bus termini at which data was collected.
The other sampling procedure that was employed is the social network approach. This approach requires the researcher to familiarize him/herself with the sources so that he/she shares the rights and obligations applicable to participants in a specific interaction. Thus, since the researcher was not known to many Matatu workers, a pilot study was necessary. This was done by visiting the stage severally hence creating rapport with them. The researcher also revealed the purposes of the research to the initial ‘link’ that were now friends. The initial link then introduced the researcher to others and this acted as a guarantee of good faith. Milroy (1980) points out that if a stranger is identified as “a friend of a friend”, he may easily be drawn into the networks’ mesh of exchange and obligation relationships and thus increasing the chance of observing and participating in prolonged interaction. This way, the researcher gets quality and quantity data and minimizes the observers paradox. The sample population of sources was Matatu workers and passengers.

3.4 SAMPLE SIZE

The researcher selected 50 sources comprising, 30 Matatu workers and 20 passengers. The sampling was randomly done. For the passengers the researcher sampled the youths and adults of both gender. Children were not to be included in the sample because the argot used by the Matatu crew might not have any impact on them but fun and therefore might not be of any help in the research. The sample appears relatively small for the whole town which has over 200 Matatu workers, but since the linguistic behavior is relatively homogeneous and the sampling
was randomly done by ensuring this small group was sufficient to account for language variation in the out-group and in-group. Milroy, (1987) states that large samples tend to increase data handling problems without significant gain in analytic insight.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION

Going by the objectives of the study it was necessary to collect spontaneous speech so as to find out why and when switching of codes occur. Therefore, three methods of data collection were used in this study viz, tape recording, observation and unstructured interviews. For the passengers the researcher administered unstructured interview and for the Matatu crew all instruments were used viz, tape recording, observation and unstructured interview.

To avoid bias of data collected through tape recording and observation, the researcher employed the social network approach so as to create confidence between him and the sources. This “friend of a friend” approach minimized the observer’s paradox because it built trust with the sources. It also increased the chances of observing and participating in a prolonged informal interaction without suspicion, Milroy, (1987).

The other method included both participant and non-participant observation. In the case of participant observation, the researcher actively participated in the situation. This helped build confidence between the researcher and the sources because they no longer viewed him as an outsider, Milroy, (1987). In non-participant observation the researchers assumed an outsider position in the language use and passively observed
and took notes. To ensure that conversations documented were as natural as possible and carried out in a relaxed manner, the researcher only did the recording after forging a close tie between himself and the sources in the network groups, for example as friends, ethnic brothers’, sisters’ and business partners.

The sources sampled were also made aware that their speech was being recorded but the researcher chose when to start recording. Muthwii, (1994) observes that people don’t remain self-conscious for long even when they are aware that their speech is being recorded.

Lastly, the researcher used unstructured interviews to find out when and why matatu workers code switch and why they do not always use the same language for their in-group and for out-group in the Matatu business.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

The researcher employed qualitative research design to analyze data in this study. First, data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The tape recorded conversations were transcribed on paper and the extracts from transcribed data were studied to identify how different codes are used by matatu workers during their interactions with out-group (passengers) and instances when the in-group codes are used.

A detailed theoretical discussion was done to analyze factors which influence the choice of different codes and social implications of the codes used. Lastly, generalizations and conclusions were made based on the findings or outcome of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 INTRODUCTION
This chapter entails the presentation and analysis of data on language use among Matatu workers in Meru town. The data on in-group and out-group language use among the members of the crew is presented and analyzed on the basis of research objectives stipulated in chapter one of this study. In providing this presentation and analysis, the data from the interview is analyzed and presented in figures while the speech analysis from the audio recording and observation is interpreted by the researcher in line with the objectives. Analyzed below is the data based on appropriate variables of the study and appropriate sub-headings.

4.1 STRATEGIES USED BY MATATU CREW IN COMMUNICATION
From the research carried out, it was evident that Matatu crew employed various strategies in communication in the process of carrying out their business viz out-group and in-group languages.

4.1.1 OUT-GROUP USE OF LANGUAGE
The Matatu crew uses a mixture of languages typical of code-switching in their communication in Meru town. The use of plain encoded language in their speech depicted a certain motivation. Mikinduri termini in Meru town, Matatu workers use plain Kimeru, Kiswahili and some bits of English in their speech blended in certain proportions. When
talking to passengers, they avoid coded language so as to foster business prosperity and signal group identity. The following is an example of a conversation excerpt between two touts and a passenger drawn from conversation 6 in the appendices.

T8: Ester! Esi, twaita iruarii? (Ester, Esi, are we going today?)

P6: Ari itu kandeeta Nanyuki. (No please, I am going to Nanyuki.)

T8: Rete muuntu umwe aki aa wewe! (Bring one person here you!)

T9: Etera ungi umwe Juliano. (Wait for one more Juliano.)

T9: Dadi twite? Itaita dadi aitie, niu endi ngari ikuyura. (Dadi can we go? Give dadi way to board the vehicle, that's all now. The vehicle is full)

It is clear that in the above excerpt that touts use Kimeru to woo passengers to board their vehicle. The choice of words is also calculated with the intention of establishing rapport between touts and the passengers such as in the use of 'Esi' by T8 and 'dadi' by T9 to mean 'Esther' and 'Daddy' respectively as a way of beseeching or persuading the passengers. It is also evident in the same conversation that touts use Kimeru when addressing the passengers in order to identify with the passengers in question.
The following is another conversation excerpt taken from the conversation in the appendix between touts and passengers.

**T10:** Sonku iyyu, sonku iyu twite town na ngari ee mbere. (Sonku - a rich person come, sonku come we go to town with the first vehicle.)

**P7:** Babwi nobuo buwaa, na butiita rua. Kambetere ira yakulia rua. (You, that is what you always say and I know you will take your time. Let me wait for the vehicle that will leave first.)

**T10:** Aki sonku itia twarema utinuke, ailia ngari iu kethira itiuyuri antu. (Sincerely sonku just board the vehicle and if we delay just alight. Just check and see, the vehicle is full.)

**P7:** Sawa lakini Kaulu umenye ndina rua. (It is okay but Kaulu- the name of a tout, note that I am in a hurry.)

**T10:** Kimathi rita ngari au nii, ngari iu ikuyura. (Kimathi- (driver)- get the vehicle out of here, it is full.)

Just like in the previous conversation, the language used is Kimeru though the tout intentionally uses 'sheng' word 'sonku' meant to persuade the passenger to board the vehicle by raising their dignity linguistically.
Below is another conversation excerpt taken from the conversation in the appendix 8 to depict the out-group's use of language among the *Matatu* workers while talking to the passengers.

**T11**: Ruarii ii yaka kieni kikuuma muno ii! (It seems today that there won’t be much business!)

**T12**: Ai! ii bwana, imagine ni abiria batano aki twonete kuuma twiyire aa rukiiri! (Oh! yes bwana, can you imagine since we arrived today there are only five passengers aboard our vehicle!)

**T11**: Wee! Wee mzee! Ingia hapa twende. Hii gari ndio inaenda kwanza. Unaenda Mikinduri au Kaene? (Hey! Hey old man! Get in here we go. This is the next vehicle to leave. Are you going to Mikinduri or Kaene?)

**P8**: Ndio, naelekea Mikinduri. Mnalipisha pesa ngapi? (Yes, I am heading to Mikinduri, how much do you charge?)

**T11**: Eighty bob only, Ingia mzee. (Eighty shillings only, get in old man)

**T12**: Hapana wachana na hii, ile iko karibu kujaa. Hiyo haina mtu hata mmoja. (No leave this alone, that one has more passengers. This one doesn't have any.)
T11: Very good, ingia mzee, kaa hapa mbele. Tunangoja mtu mmoja tu twende.
   (Very good, get in here and take the front seat. We are waiting for one
   passenger to leave.)

T12: Baite utibui, ita nara, noka ukwenda nkoma imbona answer ii? (Mister, you
   are not good, keep off. You don't wish me well eh?)

In the conversation excerpt above, the two touts were initially communicating in Kimeru
but on seeing a well dressed man who appeared a stranger to them, they code-switched to
Kiswahili. This was due to the fact that Kiswahili is a national cum official language and
would accommodate him. The man in question was a middle aged man and the choice of
the word 'mzee' in the conversation was more of a show of respect rather than denoting
age. The inclusion of English phrase 'very good' was used in a jocular manner in an
endeavour to establish cordial relationship and consequently have him board their vehicle.

Considering another excerpt in conversation 3.

T1: Kurumu uu inataai nthereo? (Where does this old man go every day?)

T3: Utisii uu ii taridai nitau ii! (Don’t you know this one is a doctor in this town?)

T1: Waambu kaa ndakiiae ndomage nitau. (I have always thought that he deals in
   illegal goods in this town.)
T2: Kithure aria na mukuru ura ii kastoma wetu. Kariemba na likia raki naki ndakali kuika nembo thiraki sindirangai. (Kithure (T2), call that old man, he is our customer, and let me talk to that lady in miniskirt and try my luck.)

T1: Tonya aa mzee, ngari ii imuuntu umwe ikwenda. (‘Mzee’ get in here. We need only one passenger.)

On seeing a man approaching, the two touts (T1 and T2) started to backbite him using the coded language as evident in the conversation. Afterwards, they code-switch to Kimeru with tout (T2) requesting tout (T1) Kithure to persuade the man to board their vehicle. On the other hand, T2 informs Kithure using the coded language (Kimeru argot) that he wants to woo a lady whom he has spotted in the vicinity. It is evident here that wherever they want to talk to the passenger, they use Kimeru or Kiswahili as above to accommodate them.

From the speech analysis in 4.1.1 above it is clear that the out-group uses speech convergence as a language accommodation strategy.

Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) by Giles et al. (1979) accounts for the motivations underlying the language switching in the peoples' speech during an interaction by making their speech style more or less similar to that of their interlocutors. Speech convergence is whereby individual speakers use the language that the hearer knows or likes best. Speakers converge when they desire social integration and approval with
other people. This may be done consciously or unconsciously.

The similarity Theory which is a subset of speech accommodation theory proposed that the more similar our attitudes and beliefs are to certain others; the more likely it is we will be attracted to them. The Social Exchange Theory (SET) on the other hand states that prior to acting, people weigh the potential costs and rewards and thus choose the alternative that best maximizes the positive outcomes. The data in this study observed that Matatu crew try as much as possible to use the language most appropriate to the passengers for the suitability of their business as evident in the out-group's language use in the conversation excerpts in the 4.1.1.

According to the conversation excerpts in the analysis of the out-group's use of language, it is clear that the choice of words and phrases used to passengers is entirely dependent on a number of factors. These include but not limited to age, sex, socio-economic status, cultural identity, personality, level of education and occupation among others.

4.1.2 IN-GROUP USE OF LANGUAGE

This refers to the language use among a particular group of people that is only known by the member of that group. This research is focused on one group, the Matatu crew and established the motivations behind the use of the argot.

Below is an excerpt from conversation 3 among the three touts namely; T1, T2 and T3.

**T1:** Kurumu uu inataai nthereo? (Where does this old man go every day?)
T3: Utisii uu ii taridai nitau ii! (Don’t you know this one is a doctor in this town?)

T1: Waambu kaa ndakiaae ndomage nitau. (I have always thought that he deals in illegal goods in this town.)

T2: Kithure aria na mukuru ura ii kastoma wetu. Kariemba na likia raki naki ndakali kuika nembo thiraki sindirangai. (Kithure (T1), call that old man, he is our customer, and let me talk to that lady in miniskirt and try my luck.)

T1: Tonya aa mzee, ngari ii imuuntu umwe ikwenda. (Mzee get in here. We need only one passenger.)

The above conversation was captured in a scenario where the touts in question had just spotted a man who happened to be their regular customer. One of the touts, (T1) uses Kimeru argot to inquire from others on where the man always goes. They manage to discuss him in his presence. T1 says that he has been thinking that the man could be engaging in illegal deals or businesses in the town but T2 informs him that he is a doctor in Meru town. Tout 2 has noticed a young lady wearing a miniskirt coming towards them, he requests T1 in Kimeru, to talk to the man claiming that he is their customer. This was a way of establishing rapport with him (doctor). Shortly after, the two code-switch to Kimeru argot to talk about a young lady they had spotted in the vicinity. One of them said that he wanted to try his luck. It is thus evident from the conversation above that the Matatu crew use both in-group and out-group language conveniently to suit their situation.
The following example constitutes an excerpt taken from conversation 1 in the appendix.

**D1:** Rai bagaamu bakei tise. Ndake ringa uyurai. (Tell Mugaa and others to board the vehicle so as to lure the passengers to board.) - In-group

**T1:** Tetwi tebai ndake ntua raba tiabai ringa. (Lets go aboard so that those passengers can board.) - In-group

**T2:** Wee! maama itieii ngaari kekuyura twitite. (Hey! Mama get into the vehicle. It is getting full. We want to leave.) – Out-group

**D1:** Aniatia Kaulu urwamire au utiwikira antu ngaarine? (Kaulu- tout- why are you standing there without telling people to board the vehicle?) - Out-group

**T3:** Utikwona buu kiumire wee. Inaa nkurita antu? (Where do I get passengers? Can't you see today that there are few passengers?) - Out-group

**D1:** Riirua kurumwe akanaa ntuno uriti sambe ciakurau rioi. (Today the wife will go back to her parents because there is no money to buy food.) - In-group

**T3:** Ndini tiania tuotai ndake ntuma tayai yabwe? (So what will we do so that things will be okay?)
D1: Ruarii no Murungu atuchaara. (It is only God who will save us today.)

This was a conversation between a driver and touts at Mikinduri bus termini in Meru town. There were not many passengers travelling and touts had to use all means possible to attract the passengers into their vehicles. This forced the driver to use the in-group language to request the tout to pose as passengers to attract people into their vehicle. They however, used Kimeru when it had nothing to do with the passengers. It is also apparent that in-group language is used when talking about personal issues that are not meant to be heard by the outsiders as is evident between the driver and tout (T3).

Below is another conversation held by a tout (conductor), a passenger and the driver of the Matatu en route to Mikinduri.

D3: Ringa ui ikurauyu. Kiraua ntumu ngiu ntuno nakwi sibori aeneka bantinge nomu. (This Matatu is damn filled up so let no other person board because there are tough traffic police officers at Kaene).

T5: Twitire au bwana. (Then let us leave bwana.)

T5: Kuri wa Thimangiri? (Anybody alighting at Thimangiri?)

P2: Mbika Ndurumo mwanokoa. (Drop me at Ndurumo my son.)
T5: Mpa bebute mucia. (Give me fifty shillings mother.)

D3: Itangia mishara non tu bwa sibori rembe. (Charge the fare because of the police ahead.)

T5: Nu ari rwari? (Which police officer is manning this route today?)

D3: Ii mama ura sumu, ntiumba kuthaikwa. (It is that tough police woman, I can't risk being jailed.)

T5: Malwa ua neneko nuketuti mweba ntuno bwa sibori ui thirabatwi rembe. (Stop at that corner so that a few can alight they will meet us past the road block.)

P3: Ibuo ontu nthwire ‘matatu’ cia Mikinduri, wita na ma ru na muntu ariite mbesa. (That’s why I hate Matatus plying Mikinduri route. One has to walk despite having paid fare.)

This conversation is taking place inside a Matatu en route Mikinduri market. At the very onset, the driver uses in-group language to alert the tout that they should not carry more passengers because there were traffic officers manning the route. They had already carried excess and the use of Kimeru to communicate the same would risk some passengers alighting due to fear of being charged or arrested. Thus the choice of in-group in the situation is very appropriate because out of overloading they would make more money.
The driver also signals to the tout using coded language. He tells him to charge fare before getting to where the police were, for fear that if they told the passengers to walk and meet them past the road block without paying, some would disappear to avoid paying or refuse to pay the whole amount. This is confirmed by one passenger who complains about Mikinduri Matatus, on being told to alight and walk past the police officers.

Below is an excerpt taken from conversation 5 between two touts and a school boy passenger.

T6: Ii nyankume roiwo nirari nkuthiu kuye ibuo ntonu wina wonje bwa ngui uu
   (I know that yesterday you must have really celebrated. No wonder you look damn tired today for the job.)

T7: Ai, bwana nambonjetie piu (ugh! Mister, she really wasted me.)

T6: Baite ndimu iu niukuramenye ibuo ntonu taukuthe na kurumwe kuwo.
   (Mister, that lady really keeps you well, no wonder you quarrel your wife.)

T7: Ita nara manko kairuthi ura ngompa kwawo wa doka. Aria na muritwa ura bwana.
   (Go away you devil, that is my concubine. Jokes aside, can you talk to that student.)

T6: Muritwa unkuma au ngarine katuthunguthile
   (You student board the vehicle we are going right away. We are not waiting for more passengers.)
P4: Mikinduri ii mbesa iyana?

(How much is the fare to Mikinduri?)

T7: Ni eite unkuma au, uti bungi yina ngoma iimetha aki uteri.

(It is eighty shillings get in there, no other price. The car has nice music.)

P4: Ii sixty aki ndinio.

(I have only sixty shillings)

T7: Wee, takama uu na tesi. Ukuma au kijana.

(Hey, let him pay sixty shillings. Get in the vehicle young man.)

The above conversation took place on a Monday when usually at Mikinduri bus termini there is not much Matatu business. They have time to discuss their weekend memories. T7 recounts his love escapade with his concubine (Kairuthi).

This is captured through use of in-group language derived from both Kimeru and Kiswahili to exclude passengers and the general public. (The non-initiated)

As Trudgil (1994) observed, people have good reasons for code-switching. It is not accidental and deserves respect not contempt. In conversation 5 the boy says he has sixty shillings only prompting the tout to shift to Kimeru argot to exclude the boy and the rest of the passengers so as to tell the driver what the boy is ready to pay.
(This conversation is held among touts, drivers and passengers at Mikinduri bus termini in Meru town.)

**T13:** Baariu niatia, ndetwe?

( Baariu what do you say, can we go?)

**D8:** Ka tucarry no libai ndetwe tebai.

(Lets carry at least two then we go.)

**T13:** Mama tonya aa iwenka aki tukwenda. Kara side ira.

(Mother get in here, we need only one and off we go. Sit on that side.)

**D8:** Wantinukiria Kionde mwanokoa?

(Will you drop me at Kionde my child?)

**T13:**Yii ina uti haraka. Wee jango babe. Ndetwe.

(Yes mum, no hurry. Hey you wait carry her. Let’s go.)

In the conversation 9 above, the tout and the driver code-switch to Kiswahili and Kimeru argot in an endeavor to exclude the customers. The word 'tebai' by D8 when addressing T13. Similarly the Kiswahili (argot (“wee jango, babe………" is derived from Kiswahili "wee ngoja beba" meaning "hey, you wait carry."
Speech divergence

As much as the Matatu crew would want to use out-group language for convergence with the passengers, situations arise that force them to diverge from their customers. Speech divergence is where the speaker tries to create distance between himself or herself and the hearer by maximizing differences in language use (Giles and Robinson 1990). Speakers will therefore diverge to differentiate themselves from each other socially. Speech divergence is accounted for by social identity theory of communication which states that linguistic divergence primarily reflects motivations to assert positive identity when with out-group members or show disapproval of them. From the conversation above 4.12, it is clear that Matatu crew shift from out-group to in-group language use due to various motivations Viz, secrecy, talk about obscenities, discuss people, boost business, hide intentions among many others.

4.1.3 Summary of the Out-group and In-group Speech Analysis

It is worth noting that all the conversations provided in the appendices were tape-recorded sporadically. This means that they were recorded spontaneously as they appeared. Each unique or specific episode triggered a certain conversation. For example, the presence of the doctor at the bus termini triggered the conversation 3. analysed in 4.1.1 and 4.1.2. The Traffic Police Officers manning the Meru- Mikinduri road at the road block triggered conversation 4 which is used in the analysis of in-group and out-group use of language. Similarly, because of the activity level of the day, T6 and T7 in conversation 5 use Kimeru argot to pass time discussing personal issues that transpired over the weekend. On citing a
student in the vicinity they code-switched to Kimeru in order to accommodate and persuade him to board the vehicle.

From the above examples, though convergence in the out-group language use and divergence in in-group language use have been elucidated independently, no conversation can be said to wholly be devoid of each other. The in-group and the out-group use of language are blended in the conversation.

4.2 DATA ANALYSIS FROM THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE.

4.2.1 Data analysis of Matatu crew use of language when talking to passengers.

The data analysed from the interview shows the 50 interviewees categorized as Matatu workers 30 and passengers 20.

The table below shows the number of passengers and Matatu workers regarding the use of language by Matatu workers when talking to passengers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Matatu Workers</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimeru</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.2.1 above shows languages by matatu workers and passengers in Meru town. It gives responses for both Matatu workers and the passengers. It is clear in
the data analysis that 86.66% of the Matatu workers and 90% of the passengers said that the Matatu crew use Kimeru as a predominant language as it is known to most of the passengers. The reason for use of Kimeru by Matatu crew to passengers is to ease the negotiation of prices and persuade as well as to linguistically accommodate the passengers. The relatively low percentage in the use of Kiswahili 30% among the Matatu workers and 30% among passengers was due to the fact that touts tend to use Kiswahili to only the passengers that they suspect are of high social–economic class, personality, foreign cultural perception among others. The use of Kiswahili to certain passengers by the Matatu crew was a way of linguistically accommodating such passenger(s) for the Matatu business interests. The dismal percentage in the use of English is a cursor to several things such as the literacy level of the Matatu workers and the passengers and that it is contrary to the language of accommodation characteristics. It is not used for accommodating Matatu business and it is only occasionally used with a touch of humour.

Table 4.2.2 Language used among the Matatu Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Matatu workers</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of times</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimeru</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 4.2.2 above depicts language use among the *Matatu* workers in Meru town. From the table it is evident that even when communicating among themselves, *Matatu* workers mostly use Kimeru as a medium of communication. This is depicted in the 73.3% from *Matatu* workers and 70% from the passengers’ responses. It is only wise to say that the use of Kimeru among the *Matatu* crew is as a result of it being the language of the catchment area and not every instance that exclusion is needed. From the data in table 4.2.2 on the use of Argot 26.7% of the *Matatu* crew said they use argot amongst themselves whereas 40% of the passengers said *Matatu* workers use Argot when talking amongst themselves. These percentages can be attributed to the fact that in the course of their business, it is apparent there are things they would want to exclude the passengers from the welfare of their business among other reasons. This relatively high percentage is also as a result of the fact that any member of *Matatu* crew must get oriented in the use of the Argot for group identity; it is need driven. Knowledge of the Argot is considered a vital requirement in the *Matatu* industry and those who are competent in it are perceived as excellent *Matatu* workers, because they use it for maximizing benefits in the *Matatu* business. By ranking the four languages, Kiswahili comes third followed by English. Just like in most towns in Kenya, the use of Kiswahili is prevalent in Meru town thus *Matatu* workers naturally code switch to Kiswahili in some instances. On the other hand, English is not popular among the *Matatu* crew, not that they don't know the language Perse but most of the passengers and the environment they operate in does not favour the use of English. It not being a common practice, they find themselves not using it as there is no motivation. However, in instances when they want to create humour they use it though rarely or sparingly.
The basic languages used in the Matatu business are Kimeru, Kiswahili and Argot. This probably accounts for the reason why the Argot is derived to a large extent from Kimeru and occasionally Kiswahili. Rarely will you find in use Argot derived from English as most of the people in question are not very conversant with the language.

**4.3 IMPLICATIONS ON THE USE OF ARGOT TO THE PASSENGERS.**

**4.3.1 Keeping and Maintaining Secrets.**

The use of Kimeru and Kiswahili argots by the Matatu crew is interpreted by the passenger and the general public as a way of maintaining secrets. Communication is a two way traffic. The speaker and the hearers should understand each other. In view of this, when touts and drivers code switch to the argot, the passengers cannot be convinced beyond reasonable doubt that whatever is being discussed is not fishy, or rather the secrecy in the message cannot be dissociated from scandalous or sinister motives such as carjacking prevalent in Meru- Mikinduri route and other evils.

**4.3.2: Concealing / hiding intentions**

Typically, Matatu workers code switch to argot automatically when they want to hide from passengers what they want to do. Generally, the interpretation of such episodes by the passengers is that the Matatu crew wants to hide what they want to do for their own benefits, at the expense of the passengers. For instance, conversation 4 in the appendix, tout (T5) tells D3 using Kimeru argot to stop at the corner so that a few passengers alight and later on meet them ahead after crossing the traffic police road block.
4.3.3 Exclusion

The *Matatu* workers in Meru town code switch to argot in certain circumstances when they want to exclude unintended audience such as the passengers or members of the general public. In some cases they do this to deter the passengers from verbally participating in making decisions on the fare to be charged as in the case of conversation 5 where the driver and the tout shift to argot to decide whether to carry P4, a school boy who says he has sixty shillings instead of the usual eighty shillings. The shift excludes the boy and other passengers from following or participating in the negotiations.

4.3.4: Discussion of people in their presence.

The passengers’ perception regarding the code switching to argot by *Matatu* workers is so as to discuss them. This is confirmed by the fact that the issues and the actions revolving around the code switching are interpreted by the passengers to be the trigger of the switching. For example, in conversation 5 in the appendix, T7 code-switches to argot to request the driver to carry passenger (P4) who pleads that he does not have enough fare. The passenger in question does not understand the coded language and only realizes they were talking about him when finally, the tout tells him to board. This is a common phenomenon in other spheres of life where code switching has similar implications for example, when three people are discussing using the same language and two of them who happen to share a common language not known to the other person code switch, the interpretation is that they are talking about him/her unless proven otherwise.
4.3.5. Hiding Obscenities / Insults.

Passengers at times interpret the codeswitching into argot as a strategy to avoid being openly obscene. At times when Matatu crew argue with passengers on negotiations or quarrel or talk about relationships and cannot agree amongst themselves and then they code switch to argot, passengers interpret this as a way of concealing obscenities. The passengers in such a situation have a ground to suspect that whatever the reason for the code switching, cannot be anything positive.

The following is an example of an excerpt from conversation 5.

**T6:** Baite ndimu iu niukuramenye ibuo ntonu taukuthe na kurumwe kuwo.

(Mister, that lady really keeps you well, no wonder you quarrel your wife.)

**T7:** Ita nara manko ura ngompa kwawo wa doka. Aria na muritwa ura bwana.

(Go away you devil, that is my concubine. Jokes aside, can you talk to that student.)

In the above conversation T7 on being told about his concubine, as a rejoinder says, "ita nara (go away you………..) and immediately code-switches to argot 'manko' (devil). The passenger's interpretation of what follows the phrase 'ita nara' which is construed as negative, is an obscenity.

4.3.6. Amusement.

Some passengers, especially the youth perceive the use of argot by Matatu workers as amusing. They see it as a way of creating jokes meant to entertain the people at the
vicinity. This group of passengers is oblivious of multiplicity of purposes of argot use. This is however, a casual treatment of argot use by the Matatu crew.

The myriads of implications of argot use by the Matatu workers on the passengers emanates from the passengers’ minimal knowledge on the coded language. However, the passengers’ suspicion on the reasons as to why Matatu crew use the argot is confirmed by the interview schedule for the Matatu crew as analysed in table 4.3.7 below.

From the interview schedule administered to the Matatu crew, the following were the reasons as to why they use the argot.

Table 4.3.7 : Purposes for the use of Argot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number of times</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To communicate secrets</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For in-group identity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To exclude unintended audience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To hide intentions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To insult / hide obscenities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To talk about people in their presence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To amuse the non-initiated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in table 4.2.3: shows Matatu crew argot has various sociolinguistic functions, suffice to say, language exists to serve social needs. The data above clearly demonstrates that other than communication among the Matatu crew, the argot serves other social functions like any other language, therefore, the Matatu crew argot satisfies pertinent social needs of its speakers, through deliberate re-arrangement of the formal structure of the parent language (Kimeru / Kiswahili)
4.4. THE MORPHO-PHONOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF KIMERU / KISWAHILI ARGOT

Kimeru argot is not everyone's variety. It is a result of the language undergoing a linguistic process to achieve a unique form to exclude the non-initiated. This section presents data on the morpho-phonological processes involved. The process affects the formal pattern of Kimeru and consequently achieving the intended secrecy. Kimeru syllables undergo various transformations to achieve secrecy and bar unintended audience.

Kimeru Monosyllables

Table 4.4.1 a) shows a list of Kimeru monosyllables, their argot equivalents and gloss.

Table 4.4.1 Kimeru monosyllables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIMERU</th>
<th>ARGOT</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>Here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>This one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>uu</td>
<td>This one (referring to a person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>ua</td>
<td>There (near the addressee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaa</td>
<td>aya</td>
<td>These ones (after words starting with ma……. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rai</td>
<td>Ira</td>
<td>Bring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nda</td>
<td>Inda</td>
<td>Stomach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baa</td>
<td>aba</td>
<td>These ones (referring to people)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table 4.4.1 it is clear that some Kimeru monosyllables remain intact in the formation of the kimeru argot. However, there are some cases where there is introduction of new graphemes as in 'ndaa - inda', which is as a result of prefixation. Other resultant words for example 'ira' which means 'tell', is derived from 'rai' (bring) after undergoing initial vowel transfer and is an existing kimeru word.

**Table 4.4.2. Kimeru disyllables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kimeru</th>
<th>Argot</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antu</td>
<td>Ntua</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenda</td>
<td>Ndake</td>
<td>So that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngari</td>
<td>Ringa</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nontu</td>
<td>Ntuno</td>
<td>Because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwari</td>
<td>Rimwa</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bweya</td>
<td>Yabwe</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reka</td>
<td>Kare</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungi</td>
<td>Ngiu</td>
<td>Another one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbesa</td>
<td>Sambe</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twite</td>
<td>Tetwi</td>
<td>Let's go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbere</td>
<td>Rembe</td>
<td>Ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reonthe</td>
<td>Nthereo</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baite</td>
<td>tebai</td>
<td>Mister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the formation of Kimeru argot, the Kimeru disyllabic words undergo initial vowel transfer whereby the initial vowel is put at the end of the word. Most of the resultant words
do not exist in kimeru. However, few of the resultant words are existing kimeru words but with a new meaning.

'Ringa' which means 'beat'

'Rimwa' which means 'be weeded'

Table 4.4.5. Kimeru Trisyllables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kimeru</th>
<th>Argot</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mwekuru</td>
<td>Kurumwe</td>
<td>Old woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niatia</td>
<td>Tiania</td>
<td>How are you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twaita</td>
<td>twatai</td>
<td>We are going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariuwa</td>
<td>Awariu</td>
<td>He/she is saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambarie</td>
<td>Kariemba</td>
<td>Let me talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bang'enti</td>
<td>Banting'e</td>
<td>They are tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumenya</td>
<td>Nyakume</td>
<td>To know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamata</td>
<td>Takama</td>
<td>Carry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baitie</td>
<td>tiebai</td>
<td>Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Kimeru trisyllables undergo syllable swops whereby in some words syllables swop positions. In other words syllables 2/3 swop and the first is retained for example "Twaita' becomes "twatai", "kambarie" – 'kariemba'.
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In another category of trisyllabic words, syllable, I takes second position, 2 takes third position and 3 takes the first position as in the word 'kumenya' – 'nyakume' (argot). The resultant words in this category are mainly potentials.

According to the analysis of the words above in regard to syllable swop, it emerges that there is no distinct rule governing the formation of Matatu crew argot. It all depends on the number of syllables in a word. It is important to note that Matatu crew argot (Kimeru argot) interferes with the rules of syllabic and morphemic combinations and therefore, distorts Kimeru meaning completely. This makes the argot incomprehensible even to duly socialized Kimeru speakers. Even when Matatu workers use Kiswahili argot, though it rarely occurs, the same pattern of syllable swop just like that of Kimeru prevails. The Matatu crew argot sentential structure is similar to that of the matrix language (Kimeru)
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter entails the summary of the findings, the conclusion and recommendations and suggests areas for further research on Kimeru argot.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The following is a summary of the findings regarding out-group and in-group use of language among the Matatu crew in Meru Town.

5.2.2 Out-group use of Language

The analysis of the out-group use of language revealed that Matatu workers use language appropriate to the passengers when addressing them. In doing so, they are motivated by the welfare of their business. This speech accommodation strategy realizes convergence between the two groups.

According to the conversations used in the analysis of out-group use of language, it is clear that the choice of words and phrases used to address the passengers is entirely dependent on a number of motivational factors. These include;

i) Age

ii) Social-economic status

iii) Cultural identity

iv) Personality

v) Level of education

vi) Sex and occupation
5.2.2 In-Group Language use.

Trudgil (1994) observes that people have good reasons for code-switching. It is not accidental and deserves respect. From the analysis of data from the respondents, Matatu crew and the passengers on the use of argot the following are the reasons behind Matatu crew use of the in-group language as depicted in the table 4.3.7;

- i) To communicate secrets
- ii) For group identity
- iii) Exclude un intended audience
- iv) Hide intentions
- v) Insult / hide obscenities
- vi) Talk about people in their presence
- vii) Amusement of the non-initiated and pass time.

This use of argot realizes divergence in speech amongst Matatu crew in order to meet the above reasons. All said and done, Matatu business is the major motivation behind the use of the In-group language among Matatu workers.

5.2.3 Perception of passengers on In-group use of language.

The use of in-group language is interpreted by the passengers to mean the following

- i) Keeping and maintaining secrets among Matatu workers
- ii) Concealing /hiding intentions
- iii) Excluding them from following the conversation.
- iv) Discussion of people in their presence
- v) Hiding obscenities /insults.
- vi) Amusement.
5.3 CONCLUSION

The study on In-group and Out-group language use among Matatu workers revealed that there is in-group use of coded language; Kimeru argot, when Matatu workers communicate among themselves where circumstances dictate. This argot is derived from mostly Kimeru and is typically characterized by syllable swop. It is this swopping that makes the argot incomprehensible even to the duly socialized Kimeru speakers. However, the sentence structure of the argot and the matrix language Kimeru is the same.

The Matatu workers also made use of out-group language amongst themselves and also when talking to the passengers. They mostly use Kimeru among themselves and when negotiating with passengers. Occasionally, they use Kiswahili. English is rarely used and whenever used it is with a touch of humour. The use of out-group language is motivated by need to accommodate and thus convergence strategy is employed.

This study has contributed to knowledge about the strategies Matatu workers in Meru town employ when communicating amongst themselves and with passengers. This work opens new vistas on further study of language use among this group.

5.4 RECOMMENDATION SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following are recommendations for further research.

This study focused on Matatu workers use of out-group and in-group language. The study found out that Matatu workers to a great extent use Kimeru as an out-group language. They also use Kimeru when talking amongst themselves and shift to argot whenever need
arises. However, there are times they find themselves using the argot involuntarily not propelled by any particular reason.

It can thus be of value if another study in the same town or elsewhere is carried out to find out whether the same scenario of out-group and in-group is evident and whether the motivating factors are the same.

Similarly, in the study of out-group and in-group use of language among Matatu workers, another study can be carried out on social variables such as age, gender and education level among others to establish whether they have any implication on the use of language by Matatu workers.
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APPENDIX I

Conversation One.

This conversation is held among the touts, drivers and passengers at Mikinduri Matatu terminus.)

D1: Rai bagaamu bakei tise. Ndake ringa uyurai. (Tell Mugaa and others to board the vehicle so as to lure the passengers to board.)

T1: Tetwi tebai ndake ntua raba tiabai ringa. (Lets go aboard so that those passengers can board.)

T2: Wee! maama itieii ngaari kekuyura twitite. (Hey! Mama get into the vehicle. It is getting full. We want to leave.)

D1: Aniatia Kaulu urwamire au utiwikira antu ngaarine? (Kaulu- tout- why are you standing there without telling people to board the vehicle?)

T3: Utikwona buu kiumire wee. Inaa nkurita antu? (Where do I get passengers? Can't you see today that there are few passengers?)

D1: Riirua kurumwe akanaa ntuno uriti sambe ciaraku rioi. (Today the wife will go back to her parents because there is no money to buy food.)

T3: Ndini tiania tutai ndake ntuma tayai yabwe? (So what will we do so that things will be okay?)

D1: Ruarii no Murungu atuchaara. (It is only God who will save us today.)
APPENDIX II

Conversation Two

This conversation is held among a young lady, a passenger and a tout.

T4:  Wee madam tonya aa, waita Mikinduri? (Hey madam, get in here. Are you going to Mikinduri?)

P1:  Wita Mikinduri ii mbesa iyana? (How much is the fare to Mikinduri?)

T4:  Ukuma no ura uriaa madam, kawaida. (Board madam, you will pay what you usually pay.)

P1:  Ndina eite. (I have eighty shillings.)

T4:  Uu awariu anati sambe iniga itei kia yoaina. (She says that she has only eighty shillings.)

D2:  Temukama. (It is okay.)
APPENDIX III

Conversation Three

This conversation is held among touts at Mikinduri bus termini in Meru town.

T1 : kurumu uu inataai nthereo? (Where does this old man go every day?)

T3 : Utisii uu ii taridai nitau ii! (Don't you know this one is a doctor in this town?)

T1 : Waambu kaa ndakiiae ndomage nitau. (I have always thought that he deals in illegal goods in this town.)

T2 : Kithure aria na mukuru ura ii kastoma wetu. Kariemba na likia raki naki ndakali kuika nembo thiraki sindirangai. (Kithure (T2), call that old man, he is our customer, and let me talk to that lady in miniskirt and try my luck.)

T1 : Tonya aa mzee, ngari ii imuuntu umwe ikwenda. (Mzee get in here. We need only one passenger.)
APPENDIX IV

Conversation Four

This conversation is held by a tout (conductor), driver and passenger(s) in a *Matatu* en route to Mikinduri.

**D3:** Ringa ui ikurauyu. Kiraiuwa ntumu ngiu ntuno nakwi sibori aeneka bantinge nomu. (This *Matatu* is damn filled up so let no other person board because there are tough traffic police officers at Kaene).

**T5:** Twitire au bwana. (Then let us leave bwana.)

**T5:** Kuri wa Thimangiri? (Anybody alighting at Thiamngiri?)

**P2:** Mbika Ndurumo mwanokoa. (Drop me at Ndurumo my son.)

**T5:** Mpa bebute mucia. (Give me fifty shillings mother.)

**D3:** Itangia mishara nontu bwa sibori rembe. (Charge the fare because of the police ahead.)

**T5:** Nuu ario rwarii? (Which police officer is manning this route today?)

**D3:** Ii mama ura sumu, ntiumba kuthaikwa. (It is that tough police woman, I can't risk being jailed.)
T5: Malwa ua neneko nukietuti mweba ntuno bwa sibori ui thirabatwi rembe. (Stop at that corner so that a few can alight they will meet us past the road block.). Wee, tukinyakinyei nthii bamwe tukuruke borisi. Twitherine mbera aara. (Wee, those without seats, please let us alight, you will meet us past the road block).

P3: Ibuo ontu nthwire Matatu cia Mikinduri, wita na mauru na muntu ariite mbesa. (That’s why I hate Matatus plying Mikinduri route. One has to walk despite having paid fare.)
APPENDIX V

Conversation Five

This conversation is held between two touts at Mikinduri bus termini in Meru town and a student (boy) passenger heading to Mikinduri.

T6: Bwana aa buu mbooti ya kaali kaa ibui ya kumama thaa ii kuti na ngui!

(Mister, this car has a nice boot for sleeping especially a time like now when it is off peak of our business!)

T7: Ya likia kira kia kuntu rai tutirari nakio iworor! Uuuwi Kairuthi ii muthiro kuthongoma! (Do you know that yesterday we were with the lady you saw me with that day! Wow, Kairuthi is lovely!)

T6: Ii nyankume roiwo nirari nkuthiu kuye ibuo ntonu wina wonje bwa ngui uu

(I know that yesterday you must have really celebrated. No wonder you look damn tired for the job.)

T7: Ai bwana nambonjetie piu (ugh! Mister, she really wasted me.)

T6: Baite ndimu iu niukuramenye ibuo ntonu taukuthe na kurumwe kuwo.

(Mister, that lady really keeps you well, no wonder you quarrel your wife.)

T7: Ita nara manko ura ngompa kwawo wa doka. Aria na miritwa ura bwana.

(Go away you devil, that is my concubine. Jokes aside, can you talk to that student.)
T6: Muritwa unkuma au ngarine katuthunguthite

(You student board the vehicle we are going right away. We are not waiting for more passengers.)

P4: Mikinduri ii mbesa iyana?

(How much is the fare to Mikinduri?)

T7: Ni eite unkuma au, uti bungi yina ngoma iimetha aki utiri.

(It is eighty shillings get in there, no other price. The car has nice music.)

P4: Ii sixty aki ndinio.

(I have only sixty shiilngs)

T7: Wee, takama uu na tesis. Ukuma au kijana.

(Hey, let him pay sixty shillings. Get in the vehicle young man.)

T6: Bonthe ibeye wee! Wee! Katuthunguthite. (Come one come all! We are going right away. We are not waiting for more passengers.)
APPENDIX VI

Conversation Six

[This conversation is held between two touts and a passenger in an endeavour to lure them board a *Matatu* to Mikinduri from Meru town.]

**T8:** Ester! Esi, twaita iruarii? (Ester, Esi, are we going today?)

**P6:** Ari itu kandeeta Nanyuki. (No please, I am going to Nanyuki.)

**T8:** Rete muuntu umwe aki aa wewe! (Bring one person here you!)

**T9:** Etera ungi umwe Juliano. (Wait for one more Juliano.)

**T9:** Dadi twite? Itaita dadi aitie, niu endi ngari ikuyura. (Dadi can we go? Give dadi way to board the vehicle, that's all now. The vehicle is full)
APPENDIX VII

Conversation Seven

[This conversation is held between touts and passengers at Meru town, Mikinduri bus termini.]

T10: Sonku iyu, sonku iyu twite town na ngari ee mbere. (Sonku – (a rich person) come, sonku come we go to town with the first vehicle.)

P7: Babwi nobuo buwaa, na butiita rua. Kambetere ira yakulia rua. (You that is what you always say and I know you will take your time. Let me wait for the vehicle that will leave first.)

T10: Aki sonku itia twarema utinuke, ailia ngari iu kethira itiuyuri antu. (Sincerely sonku just board the vehicle and if we delay just alight. Just check and see, the vehicle is full.)

P7: Sawa lakini Kaulu umenye ndina rua. (It is okay but Kaulu- (the name of the tout,) note that I am in a hurry.)

T10: Kimathi rita ngari au nii, ngari iu ikuyura. (Kimathi- (driver)- get the vehicle out of here, it is full.)
APPENDIX VIII

Conversation Eight (8)

[This conversation is held between two touts and a passenger in an endeavour to lure them on board a Matatu to Mikinduri from Meru town.]

T11: Ruarii ii yaka kieni kikuuma muno ii! (It seems today that there won’t be much business!)

T12: Ai! ii bwana, imagine ii abiria batano aki twonete kuuma twiyire aa rukiiri!
(Oh! yes bwana, can you imagine since we arrived today there are only five passengers aboard our vehicle!)

T11: Wee! Wee mzee! Ingia hapa twende. Hii gari ndio inaenda kwanza. Unaenda Mikinduri au Kagaene? (Hey! Hey old man! Get in here we go. This is the next vehicle to leave. Are you going to mikinduri or Kaene?)

P8: Ndio, naelekea Mikinduri. Mnalipisha pesa ngapi? (Yes, I am ending to Mikinduri, how much do you charge?)

T11: Eighty bob only, Ingia mzee. (Eighty shillings only, get in here old man)

T12: Hapana wachana na hii, ile iko karibu kujaa. Hiyo haina mtu hata mmoja. (No leave this alone, that one has more passengers. This one doesn't have any.)
**T11:** Very good, ingia mzee, kaa hapa mbele. Tunangoja mtu mmoja tu twende.

(Very good, get in here and take the front seat. We are waiting for one passenger and off we leave.

**T12:** Baite utibui, ita nara, noka ukwenda nkoma imbona answer ii? (Mister you are not good, keep off. You don't wish me well eh?)
APPENDIX IX

Conversation Nine

[This conversation is held among a tout, a driver and a passenger in Mikinduri bus terminus in Meru town.]

T13:  Baariu (driver) niatia, ndetwe?
       (Baariu what do you say, can we go?)

D8:   Ka tucarry no liwawi ndetwe tebai.
       (Lets carry at least two then we go.)

       (Mother, get in here, we need only one and off we go. Sit on that side.)

D8:   Wantinukiria Kionde mwanokoa?
       (Will you drop me at Kionde my child?)

       (Yes mum, no hurry. Hey, you wait and carry her. Lets go.)
APPENDICES

A1 SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR MATATU WORKERS

Name of respondent (optional) __________________________________________

Date of interview _____________________________________________________

Questions 1  Which language (s) do you use when talking to fellow workers?
Subject: ______________________________________________________________

Question 2  Which language or languages do you use when talking to/negotiating with passengers?
Subject: ______________________________________________________________

Question 3  Why do you use different language (s) when talking to passengers and fellow matatu workers?
Subject: ______________________________________________________________

Questions 4  Why and when do you use a language only known to you?
Subject: ______________________________________________________________

Questions 5  From which language (s) is this language derived?
Subject: ______________________________________________________________

Question 6  How effective is the use of this language in your business?
Subject: ______________________________________________________________
SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PASSENGERS

Name of respondent (optional)________________________________________________

Date of interview ______________________________________________________

Questions 1 Which language (s) do Matatu workers use to address passengers in Meru town?

Subject:_________________________________________________________________

Question 2 Which language (s) do Matatu workers use when talking amongst themselves in the presence of passengers?

Subject:_________________________________________________________________

Question 3 To what extent have you been exposed to the in-group language used among Matatu workers?

Subject:___________________________________________

Question 4 What is your feeling as a passenger when Matatu workers shift to in-group language?

Subject:___________________________________________

Question 5 How do the passengers and the general public perceive the in-group language use by the Matatu workers?

Subject:___________________________________________
## 2 RESEARCH SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September, 2010</td>
<td>Defence of the concept paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – July, 2011</td>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2011</td>
<td>Proposal defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2011</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2011</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2011</td>
<td>Writing of final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2012</td>
<td>Submission of final report to supervisors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A3 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST IN SHILLINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typesetting and printing</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research instrument</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of final report</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>