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Abstract

In the society under study, the most central purpose of language was to communicate. The purpose of this study was to investigate into the causative factors of codeswitching in Wang'uru which is in Mwea Division in Kirinyaga District. The objectives of the research were to investigate the causative factors of codeswitching in Mwea, whether there were embedded languages and whether there was a dominant ML in Mwea. The place neighboured Mbeere, Embu, Murang’a and Machakos districts in Kenya where different languages were spoken. As a result of the place having many economic activities, it attracted people from Meru and Chuka. The fact that the place was in proximity to districts where different ethnic languages were spoken was a factor in introducing multilingualism and hence codeswitching as people interacted. The presence of Kiswahili (Kenya’s Lingua Franca), ‘Githungu kia Nguku’ (a local pidgin) and English further contributed to the multilingual complexity of the place. Purposive sampling was used to get the required sample size. The study also included an investigation into the relationship between socio – variables and codeswitching. The influence of the notion of domains on codeswitching was also investigated into. Data was collected from the samples using questionnaires, oral interviews and tape recording. Data was analysed using both qualitative and quantitative approach and was presented using tables, graphs and figures. After the analysis, findings were established and conclusion and recommendations made. A major finding was that avoidance of taboo lexical items was a motivation of CS in so many of CS instances.
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OPERATIONAL DEFINATIONS OF TERMS

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are used as defined below:

**Biadialectalism** – Process of switching from one dialect to another in the same language or from one dialect in a given language to another dialect in another language

**Bilingualism** – Process of speaking two languages

**Bodaboda** – Bicycle taxis (Gikuyu) in Mwea

**Code** – Linguistically accepted to mean language

**Codeswitching** – (CS) – process of changing from one language to another in a conversation.

**Embedded – Language** (EL) – the language that has a lesser morpheme contribution in CS

**ET AL** – Latin word meaning ‘and others’

**Group Theme** – An idea that runs through a collection of data

**Interlocutor** – Speaker in a conversation

**Intersentential** – Involving more than one sentence

**Intrasentential** – Within the same sentence

**Intraword** – Within the same word

**Island** – A well formed structure in CS

**L1** – First language

**Islandhood** – Wellformedness in linguistic structures for example EL

Islandhood means Wellformedness in embedded language structure.

**Lexical item** – Word
Lingua Franca – A language that is spoken in a given geographical region and is acquired from the linguistic environment

Matrix language – (ML) the language that contributes more morphemes in CS and also determines the syntax of CS

Matrix language plus Embedded language - (ML + EL) - matrix language combined with an embedded language

Ngumbato – Development projects (Gikuyu) in Mwea

Ooki – Gikuyu term for people who have come to settle from elsewhere

Respondent – Somebody who answers questions to a researcher either verbally or in writing

Theory – A principle or a set of principles on which someone can draw a generalization or conclusion
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Problem

Different language domains called for the use of different codes in the multilingual society studied. Therefore a speaker had to be careful in choosing what code to switch to in interacting with people of different language backgrounds. Examples of such domains were school, market and church. For example English which is the medium of instruction in school in Kenya was unsuitable for market domain. In Wang’uru a teacher used English in school but when he or she went to the market he used a different code. It was observed that in Wang’uru, people had an inclination to speaking different codes. Scotton (1993) observes that CS is caused by various factors, such as to win customer for one’s business or to win favour by the use of the hearer’s LI. The notion of domain was also investigated into and new factors hitherto unexplored by earlier researchers established. Although different people in the society had different reasons for CS there were certain general factors which were investigated into. The factors hitherto known as causing CS are that CS is either intended to serve a social purpose, economic purpose or a communicative purpose (Whitley, 1974). However the research discovered new motivation or factors for CS as were found out in Wang’uru. Since there were various economic activities in Wang’uru, CS was the norm rather than the exception. These activities included buying or growing rice, tomatoes and other types of foodstuff most of which were sold in Nairobi.
1.2 Statement of the Problem.

There were eight languages that were spoken in Wang’uru. These were; Gikuyu, Kimeru, Kikamba, Githungu kia Nguku, Kiembu, English, Kiswahili and Kimbeere. Therefore CS was a complex matter at Wang’uru because there was a temptation for multilinguals to use in an utterance all codes known to them. So far CS has been studied as involving a maximum of three languages in rural areas, but in Wang’uru CS involved more than seven languages in an utterance and hence a unique CS problem.

1.3 Research Objectives

1.3.1 To find out what factors cause CS in Mwea

1.3.2 To find out whether there are embedded languages in CS in Mwea

1.3.3 To find out whether there is a dominant ML in CS in Mwea

1.4 Research Questions

1.4.1 What are the factors that cause CS in Mwea?

1.4.2 Are there embedded languages in CS in Mwea?

1.4.3 Is there a dominant ML in CS in Mwea?

1.5 Research Assumptions

1.5.1 There are certain factors that cause CS behavior in Mwea.

1.5.2 There are embedded languages in Mwea.

1.5.3 There is a dominant ML in CS in Mwea.

1.6 Rationale of the Study

The research on CS added to the knowledge of language in a multilingual society. The knowledge contributed to effective communication in the society
where there was interethnic tension. It was found important to link CS with a given domain. The linking helped to promote interethnic understanding. Through the knowledge of CS people got to know the importance of being careful in choosing codes. A speaker who was not interested in knowing what common words in two different languages meant could use a taboo word. An example of this scenario was found in the words atumia and iveti both of which were found in both Gikuyu and Kikamba but they meant differently. Atumia in Kikamba means men and iveti means women. In Gikuyu atumia means women and iveti (spelt as ibeti in Gikuyu but phonologically realized as /iveti/ in both languages) meant bags. According to an oral interview, a Kikamba speaker who was addressing an audience of Akamba and Agikuyu in his LI switched to English or Kiswahili in the opening address and then reverted to his LI. Lack of knowledge on CS made him lose most of the audience as it was rude to call Agikuyu men ‘women’ and to call Agikuyu women ‘bags’. Knowledge on CS provided that a speaker, in such a scenario switched to some convenient code so as to avoid words which although acceptable in his or her LI, were meaningwise controversial in other codes. It was observed that the other codes also had certain similar words, which although acceptable in some of them were taboo words in other codes. Although language researches had been done, they involved utterances involving mainly a maximum of three codes in a rural area. The CS research done in Mwea was on utterances that involved seven or so codes and so uniquely complex. In addition to this fact no research on CS had ever been done in Mwea.
1.7 Scope and Limitations

The main focus of this study was the causative factors of CS in Mwea most of which had not been stated by other scholars. There were eight codes in Mwea that were spoken in different domains. It was found imperative that the relationship between the notion of domains and CS be investigated into. The investigations was because CS took place within the domains (Scotton, 1993). Scotton (1993) had relationship with CS situation in Wang’uru. Variables such as education, gender and LI that were found influencing CS directly were also investigated into. The study was confined within a rural area and had time and finance as some of its other limitations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

In the literature review an investigation was done on what other researchers and linguists have contributed in the field of CS. It was realized that researchers on CS contributed some knowledge on both bilingual and multilingual societies, although in the latter, there is still much to be done especially in highly multilingual rural environments with interethnic tension. The knowledge of existing theories in CS was found important because it was out of these theories that some few theories were selected that were applicable in the research and therefore relevant to the chosen geographical area in CS.

2.2 Characteristics of CS

Silva (1994) observes that CS in a society as a linguistic area has various characteristics. Examples of these are; overgeneralization, transfer and convergence. One may be out to say something in a certain language but he or she uses a term that may be used to mean the same thing in different languages for the purpose of communicating. He generalizes on the linguistic environment of the usage of the term. In transfer a speaker may use structures from a language that she knows well as she speaks another language. The transfer may involve a few structures from a word or even the whole word. Simplification, a major characteristic, is where a speaker simplifies his utterances to fit in different situations. Emphasis on the communication value of an utterance (more so than other aspects of an utterance) is also an important
characteristic. The speaker’s concern is to be understood as he should by the hearer. Silva (1994) observes that a speaker simplifies language as an important technique in his attempt to communicate a point with minimum efforts. In convergence the speaker may try to link himself up with the hearer for certain favours. He notes that CS has both internal and external causative factors and that the switching from one language to another takes the form of replacement. Internal CS factors are factors from within the speaker such as linguistic incompetence and the desire to be assessed favourably. External factors include factors such as language domain (such as school, home, market) and other factors that make somebody be obliged to speak certain codes. Erick and Michael (1986) observe that a speaker of a foreign language transfers words from his or her LI to the L2 which he or she may not know well. The transfer enables someone to switch to another code. Given the fact that CS involves more than one language, there has to be a linguistic harmony of the two (or more) codes so that a hearer understands the meaning as intended by the interlocutor but not as if it is from two different linguistic environments. CS therefore has an attempt to merge two or so codes in a manner that will allow effective communication. Another important characteristic of CS is the presence of a matrix language and an embedded language (Scotton 1993). She notes that in CS interplay, the morpheme contribution of the codes involved is not equal. The matrix language is the language that determines the syntactic pattern of CS and has a higher morpheme contribution than the other code (or codes).
2.3 Communicative Strategy

Moody (1970) observes that language in the society is basically meant for communication between language originator and language recipient. The originator of the language (initial communicator) should use language or languages convenient to the recipient. He may switch to another language for easier understanding by the hearer. CS therefore is a communicative strategy. Romaine (1982) notes that there are various factors that determine that someone changes from the use of one language to another. She further observes that in the use of languages there is a communicative act which involves certain costs for the speaker in terms of identity change. She supports the idea that to earn social approval from people is a reason for the use of a language that accommodates the speaker to others in social situations. As one speaks to an audience composed of people with different L1s in a multilingual society, one uses structures from different codes. The codeswitched instance is simplified to a level that allows understanding of the hearer. This is Simplification as reflected in so many CS instances. Widdowson, (1979) observes that simplification is an important feature in communication. Herbert and Eve, (1977) observe that the fundamental function of language is communication. Therefore by the use of any code or codes the speaker communicates. Whiteley (1974) notes that cultural pride and knowledge of a language at least to a level that allows mutual intelligibility are important causative factors of CS. The applicability of this view in the research site was investigated into.
Whiteley (1974) further observes that in a place where a certain code is associated with prestige people switch to it (code) so as to enjoy the prestigious status. Mougeon and Beniak (1991) observe that someone wants to speak a language that is associated with a high social class because communicating in this language may add him some favour. Crystal (1997 2nd ed.) notes that the reason why people may choose to use two different languages is to communicate to people with different backgrounds. He further notes (:369):

Switching between languages is extremely common and takes many forms. A long narrative may switch from one language to the other...Speakers cannot express themselves adequately in one language so switch to another language to make good the deficiency. This may trigger the speaker to continue in the other language for a while...

Adrian (1991) observe that CS is used in the speaker’s attempt to communicate to the listener.

2.4. Syntactic Patterns in CS

Scotton (1993) observe that there is distinction between single lexical items in matrix language plus embedded language (ML + EL) formula and long stretches of lexical items in the same. The former she notes is borrowing (B) and the borrowed form (BF) while the later she calls CS. According to her there are times when a speaker may be speaking a given language and in the event of lack of an appropriate word to convey meaning, he or she picks a word from another language. This is borrowing. Where the speaker may pick many words or whole sentences from another language she calls this CS. She
notes that the ML is dominant language which governs the syntax of the sentence showing CS. The observation of Scotton (1993) was found applicable in Mwea. The applicability comes in that it was found that as people spoke different languages at times they would use a few structures from a given language and sometimes they used whole words or sentences. According to Scotton (1993) the matrix language expects the structures of the embedded language to conform to the syntactic structures of it (ML). She also observes that there are three types of islands and that each one of them must rhyme with the speaker’s attempt to communicate. These are ML Island, ML + EL Island and EL Island. She defines island as well formed structures or constituents. Therefore ML Island is a well formed structure of matrix language, EL Island is a well formed structure of embedded language while ML + EL Island is a well formed structure of a matrix language plus embedded language. According to Bitutu (1991) CS has various syntactic patterns. This is because speakers of different languages have different levels of knowledge of the languages. She observes that regardless of the syntactic patterns there has to be mutual intelligibility between the speakers. Crystal (1987) observes that even in a multilingual society a certain language may be more frequently used than the other languages. He supports the view of a dominant language in CS.

2.5 Dialectological View in CS

Trudgill (1986) explores to an extent CS within dialects and sees it as based on social accommodation factors. A reflection of this tendency was investigated into in the research site where people had a tendency of switching from one
dialect to another dialect of the same language. It was observed that almost all languages had many dialects and people kept on switching from dialect to dialect. He calls this linguistic behavior biadialectalism. He therefore supports dialectological view in CS. He defined biadialectalism as the process whereby people may speak a non-standard dialect of a language at home or in an informal situation. At school or formal situation they speak the standard dialect. The person switches from one dialect to the other and this may sound like two different languages. Trugdill (1986) further observes that social situations are a major factor in CS.

2.6 Codemixing

Kirsten (1991) observes that CS incorporates Codemixing. He states that Codemixing phenomenon is however different from CS in that the former is the change from the use of one language in a conversation or utterance to another while the latter is the use of nouns elements predominantly in another language. According to him, a sentence may have words from different languages. He further notes that CS can take place at various points in an utterance whether at word level, phrase or clause level. Wardhauh (1986) notes that CS and codemixing are comparable linguistic phenomena. He says that CS is the change from one language to another so the individual uses the new language throughout the conversation. According to him codemixing is the process of mixing up words from two different languages in the sentence. Codemixing linguistic phenomenon was investigated into in the research site because it was observed that people have different levels of
changing from the use of one language to another.

2.7 Views of Other Authors

According to Mougeon and Beniak. (1991) borrowing of a core lexical item maybe as a result of status of a given language. One therefore codeswitches so as to gain prestige that goes with the embedded language (EL). He exemplifies his argument by noting that American - Norwegians who saw English as offering status used structures from it which they used as they spoke Norwegian language. In the research site, the factor of prestige was investigated into for it was found that people in the research site, held English as prestigious and many people tried to speak it up even though it meant borrowing words from it and mixing them up with other languages. Someone who spoke even just a few words of English as he or she spoke another language looked advanced. According to Diane and Michael (1991) speakers of a second language who may be at different language continuum levels speak their LI even in a formal situation. They support the view that shared LI may be basis for CS. The two involved in the communication process reverted to their LI. It was observed in the research site that strangers who had been using English or Kiswahili switched to their LI the moment they realized that they had shared L1. Other works investigating into CS include Baetus (1982), Grossean (1982) as quoted in Scotton, (1993). Pier (1972) notes that CS is an important linguistic phenomenon and has formality and informality as important causative factors. According to him a speaker may be speaking a certain language in a friendly or informal domain, but if he or she finds himself
in a formal domain, he switches to the formal language. Gibbons (1987) observes that identification with a privileged group in the society and perception of its (privileged group) language as bringing prestige as pivotal factors in the causation of CS. His view has a relationship with the research site because it was observed that the people in the site did not value the eight languages spoken at the same level. Some were seen as more prestigious than others. Whiteley (1971) observes that security and survival in changing sociopolitical circumstances are key factors in CS. This view was investigated into in Mwea and new dimensions of CS hitherto undiscovered by earlier researchers found out. Jim and Merill (1986) observe that in a bilingual society, speakers change from the use of one language to another frequently in a conversation. Neil (2002) notes that when someone switches from one language to the language of the interlocutor, he forms a positive rapport which is based on mutual respect. This view (positive rapport view has advanced by Neil 2002) had relationship with CS in Wang’uru in that an interlocutor tried to speak the LI of a hearer with who he hoped to established some rapport. To Neil (2002) the hearer will judge favourably the speaker if he or she (speaker) speaks his (hearer) LI. Gorman (1970) observes that CS can be as a result of government policy which provides that at a certain level in school vernacular be used while English be used at a higher level. The teacher therefore codeswitches from one language to another. Gorman’s (1970) view was applicable in the research site because it was realized that in Wang’uru, teachers used vernacular and Kiswahili in teaching primary I and English in
teaching higher levels. Gorman (1970) however doesn’t explore the specific factors that determine the switching and how the switching should be done. Andy (1995) observe that the liking or interest in the culture of speakers of a certain language can be a strong motivating factor in CS. Strevens (1965) shares the same view for according to him if somebody feels that a certain race is superior, one will try to fit in its (race) culture and try to speak the language of the race deemed superior. This usually happens in colonial environments where the colonized view the language of the colonizer as superior. Geoffrey (1974) attributes the desire to exchange meaning properly as the major factor in CS. Bambi (1986) observes that expression of emotions and mood is a factor in the change from the use of one language to another. This idea was reflected in the research site. It was found that as people suddenly expressed an emotion of either pain or happiness or annoyance, they (people) codeswitched to the language that they were used to (their LI mainly). Taaitta (1979) observes that there is intraword level in CS where a language user uses a sound in a given language with another sound in a different language but in the same word. Language has a reflection of the social situations and reality and so a speaker switches to a language determined by the situation (Maya, 1987).

2.8 Theoretical Framework

2.8.1 Social Motivation Theory

This is the theory that states that people use a language with the intent of getting social identification and so use a language that makes them stick together or which shows that they belong together. Language is a social
phenomenon that binds the speakers together and therefore the use of it expresses togetherness or unity thus identifying with the society. To portray this fact, a speaker chooses to codeswitch. Crystal (1987) notes that there is nowhere where the issue of personal linguistic identity emerge more strongly than in relation to question of ethnicity and nationhood. According to Crystal (1987), ethnic identity is allegiance to a group with which one has ancestral links. He further notes that the notion of ethnic identity is carried by language and so when someone switches over to another language he expresses it (ethnic identity). This notion was noted to have some relationship with the research site and so was investigated into. Speakers of a given ethnic language in the site had a tendency of staying together and used to switch from other languages to their L1 the moment they realized they shared an L1. The concept of ethnic identity motivates people to codeswitch. Kinship at ethnic or family level was well expressed by CS. This is a theory on which a number of CS instances are based. It was noted in the research site that people communicated in different languages. However on realizing that they shared L1 they switched to it (L1). In analysing data, the researcher used this theory to identify factors with a social inclination such as survival, social closeness and others. Social Motivation Theory as used in the research site enabled the researcher to find out what made speakers of a given language to switch from other languages to it. Social Motivation Theory has societal bonds and culture as some of its integral parts. Bonds or issues found within the language that bring together the speakers within a certain domain are therefore an important part. The society
according to this theory has the primary group as well as the secondary group and the two of them require language for the expression of the extent of closeness. The primary group consists of domains such as the family and the peer group whereby the members relate intimately and they share many things. People relate closely as they communicate using the language that expresses maximum intimacy. Linguistic situation may dictate that they speak another language but they reswitch to the language of their norm in the absence of unfavourable factors such as the arrival of an outsider. The other group is the secondary group. This consists of people in the society that a speaker knows remotely but interacts with them from time to time using language. People here do not have intimate societal relationship but they are members of the same society. The emphasis here on the use of the language is to communicate. The speakers may borrow structures from the languages in the environment although they may have the main code of the language of the society. According to Crystal (1987) the need to express closeness for certain gains in the society motivates a speaker to use a language that shows that they (speaker and hearer) belong together with the hearer. Social motivation theory has a number of tenets. The main tenet of this theory is that language is a carrier of culture and so one may want to use it so as to identify oneself with the listeners. The applicability of this theory was investigated into and it was found that a speaker’s language reflected the area of Mwea that he came from and his culture. Scotton (1993) notes that speakers use language largely to negotiate interpersonal relationship. Another tenet is that shared LI brings intimacy
among the speakers who may use it for special gains or favours. The use of language to establish social rapport among its speakers and to create closeness is also an important tenet. These two tenets reflected the theory as applicable in the research site. It was observed that language expressed closeness of its speakers and so it is not just a communicative tool. In the site, speakers switched from the language that they were using to a common code, the moment they realized that they shared an LI.

2.8.2 Convergence and Divergence Theory

This is the theory that claims that speakers of a given language can switch to another (language), for the purpose of identifying with a certain class of people in the society (convergence) or for the purpose of delinking (divergence) themselves from a class of individuals. The convergence facet of the theory has the following as its major component parts:
Creating grounds for social interpersonal relationship by the use of a language

Identification with a social group by the use of a language

Using language to be assessed favourably

Achieving social intimacy or closeness by the use of an acceptable code

**Figure 2.1: Tenets of convergence facet of the Convergence and Divergence Theory**

The divergence facet of the theory has the following:

- Distancing oneself from a situation by the use of a language
- Breaking close interpersonal relationship by the use of a language
- Delinking from a social class by the use of a language

**Figure 2.2: Tenets of Divergence facet of Convergence and Divergence Theory**
Crystal (1987), a major proponent of this theory notes that language can be used to identify with a social class or group or to separate oneself from it as one wants. According to Crystal (1987) language is an identification mark or label for a certain social class or ethnic group and therefore it (group) switches to it often to express social closeness. Convergence and Divergence theory has some tenets. One of its major tenets is that use of a language provides social acceptance by the hearer or delinking with the hearers. This means that a speaker depending on the language he or she is using can either be socially accepted to a group or look distant and unaccepted. Another tenet is that language has an identification value socially. The use of a language especially in a multilingual environment can portray somebody’s ethnicity. The use of a socially accepted code as providing its speakers with grounds for close interpersonal interaction is also an important tenet. According to this tenet a language user can link it (languages) with the intent of preparing grounds for interpersonal interaction. When someone switches to a certain code which is the LI of the hearer, the latter gets interested in him or her and this brings about social closeness. Romaine (1982) observes that an individual can induce another to evaluate him more favourably by reducing dissimilarities between them. She supports the view that CS has convergence as an important dimension. This theory was applicable in the research site as was found out following investigations. It was observed that when somebody went to an office for some service he or she spoke English or Kiswahili. However on learning that they shared an LI with the occupant of the office, he (speaker)
switched to the code of the hearer. Switching to the shared LI enabled the speaker to get favour from the learner. This is convergence. As data was analysed, factors for CS as a result of convergence or divergence were identified. It was observed that in the research site, people use language not just for communication but also for social identification. In this multilingual society which has interethnic tensions in some places, the concept of distancing oneself from a group or identifying oneself with a group was an important issue that guaranteed somebody's survival. With this theory in mind, it was possible to find out the extent to which security and survival in some places were factors for CS in Mwea.

2.9 Conclusion

The review of the existing literature was considered important in enabling someone to know what other authorities in the field of CS have had to say. From the existing literature it was possible to know what had already been covered. Most of the existing literature presents a picture of CS in an urban environment such as Nairobi, Newyork, Hongkong, Mombasa. CS causative factors in a village setting where CS is determined by settled people's culture has not been fairly done. Researchers such as Whiteley (1974) and Scotton (1993) have mainly done it on major urban settings. Research on CS causative factors in a place where eight languages are spoken in a rural environment has never been done exhaustively and no researcher has ever researched on CS causative factors in Mwea. Besides these (gaps) research has never been done (going by the existing literature) on how CS can solve interethnic tension.
gender and avoidance of taboo words have not been investigated into as CS motivation. These are the gaps left out by the existing literature and which this research has filled. The theories used in the research were found very useful and relevant because they were applied to show the actual relationship between CS and the actual real life setting in Mwea. They (theories) were found of much use because they reflected language as having other uses other than the communicative use. This was because in the research site people did not use different languages in the same conversation just for the purpose of communicating. There were other purposes served by CS which were deliberate and well fore planned.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the design that was used in this study. It also describes where the study was done, the subjects, the tools for data collection and the procedures.

3.2 Research Design

The research design adopted both qualitative and quantitative approaches. There was no manipulation of the variables because the variables were there in the society and also the reasons for CS to a codeswitcher. This research design used questionnaires and oral interviews to collect data from the samples about their characteristics and experience, in the use of languages in the society, with the aim of generalizing on the population (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). She observes that the type of the research being carried out determines the approach to be used.

3.3 The area of Study and Study Population

The area of study was Wang’uru, an area which was centrally placed in Mwea. The area was chosen because due to its centrality and economic activities, it had attracted people from various ethnic societies and so all the languages spoken in Mwea were found in it. The target population were the people in Mwea while the accessible population were the people of Wang’uru. Wang’uru had a population of 3000 (Kirinyaga District Statistics Office).
3.4 Sampling Procedure and Sample size

The main sampling procedure that was employed was the purposive sampling. This procedure was found convenient because it made it possible to select the samples who met the required criteria. The criteria for sample selection included bilingualism or multilingualism, education, age (at least 20 years) and some others. A sample had to meet at least two of these criteria. The sample size was 40. It was found suitable because in this society all people had almost the same reasons for CS.

3.5 Data Elicitation

Self-administered questionnaires and oral interviews were the main methods that were used. Where applicable, tape recording was used. The respondents before being issued with the questionnaires were informed on what the research was about so as to prepare them for participation. The questionnaire was prepared in five different languages in the research site so that a respondent took a questionnaire written in the language that he or she knew best. The questionnaire had items covering the questions in the introduction as well as other issues concerning language in the society. The questionnaires were collected from the respondents after one week or after a specific period. Before visiting a given respondent for the purpose of an oral interview, prior arrangements were made so as to ensure his or her availability. The interview was carried out in a friendly situation as the data was written down. In the market place and village street domain where spontaneous codeswitched data was collected, tape recording was used. Spontaneous codeswitched data was
important in that it showed how people used language naturally without the realization that someone was observing or monitoring how they were using languages

3.6 Data Analysis and Presentation

The data was analysed using inferential techniques. The data collected was put in categories and the group theme for each category was identified. From the respondents, the most frequent themes running through the data collected were identified as the factors for CS. Presentation of the data was done using tables and graphs. Studying the data presented made it possible to draw a conclusion on the causative factors for CS in Mwea.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

The analysis was carried out with the aim of achieving the objectives of the research as stipulated in chapter one. Besides other areas the analysis investigated into the language domains because it was within the domains that CS took place. Social variables such as education, gender, occupation and avoidance of taboo words were investigated into as they introduced motivation for CS as people interacted. Linguistic variable (speaker’s L1) as presenting a possibility for CS was also investigated into. Data was presented using tables and graphs. Finally the findings were presented and conclusion drawn.

4.2 Domains as Social Motivation for CS

In the attempt to answer the first question, the notion of domains in CS was investigated into. The reason of investigating into the domains or language settings was that it was within the domains that CS took place.

For the purpose of distinguishing data collected from different codes, the following writing styles were used. The translation into English was put within gloss brackets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>STYLE OF WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gikuyu</td>
<td>Italicized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbeere</td>
<td>Bold Italicized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimeru</td>
<td>Upper Case underlined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>lower case underlined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikamba</td>
<td>Upper case italicized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiembu</td>
<td>Bold Italicized Underlined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Githungu kia Nguku</em></td>
<td>Upper Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:1. Styles used in writing data to distinguish between different codes

The domains studied were as follows:

(i) Church

The setting of this data collection was the church service as the church congregation worshiped God. The following is an extract from a conversation collected in this domain:

B: *Asante* for attending service this morning
   [Thank you...]

P: *Naithui nitwauga niwega nigutukaribithia*
   [Thank you for inviting us]

B: *Umuthi kwasababu ya wageni tutatumia lugha igiri kana tuchanganye.*
   [Today because of the guests we are to use two languages or we mix up languages].

This extract showed that inclusion of outsiders in a group and communication were important CS factors. Three languages were used in this domain.

(ii) School

The setting for the data collection here was when the students were doing their general cleaning. In school there were two languages that were used. These were English and Kiswahili. No L1 was found as it was a serious crime in
school to use any other language. Here the main CS factor was Government policy that only the two languages should be used in school.

**B:** Ni lazima the classrooms be cleaned. Do you hear?
[It is a must...]

**P:** Yes mwalimu
[... teacher]

**B:** Kesho we shall have wageni na kwa hivyvo tunataka usafi.
[tomorrow... guests and so we want cleanliness]

It was observed from the extract that in schools in Kenya only Kiswahili and English are allowed. This is as a result of Government policy (Ominde commission 1964) and also for prestige as the students like it. Two languages have been used.

(iii) Market

The setting was a village market where people came to buy or to sell items.

Here spontaneous data was tape recorded.

**Seller:** Customer kunja uwapelekee watoto maembe.
[...come and buy mangoes for children]

**Buyer:** Ni wega no matunda maku unauza mbei kali sana.
[They are good but your fruits are so expensive]

**Seller:** Shiringi ithano tu won MUTHOKOI wa kivwai.
[Only five shillings and you get dressed maize for evening]

From the extract it was observed that for business transactions CS took place.

In the market place there were five languages used. The explanation of there being many codes was that there were people from various ethnic societies selling things and they all tried to win customers by the use of language.

In the market four languages were used.
(iv) Court of Law

The setting for this data was a court session where the judge tried a suspect. In this domain only listening and writing down was allowed. Some extracts from the talks in court were later transcribed on paper.

J – Judge  A – Accused person

J: You have been accused of driving a car without a license.
A: Leseni ndinayo right now.
   [I have the licence ...]
J: What language do you want to speak?
   You should use either English or Kiswahili or we use an interpreter. You can only switch from Kiswahili to English or Gikuyu.

In the Court of Law three languages were used. These were English, Kiswahili and LI. The main CS factor was formality.

Three languages were used. From the extract it was realized that in this domain CS happened as a result of formality or type of topic being discussed

(v) Village Street and Shopping Centres

A village street that had many people going to buy things from shops or to other places was the setting. The research site was a place with interethnic tension and therefore somebody codeswitched to avoid being known as a member of a certain ethnic society. To an extent, CS guaranteed survival. From the data one could not tell the ethnic society of the speakers.

Spontaneous codeswitched data was tape recorded.

B: Mundu wa nyumba UMUSEO?
   [My kinsman how are you?]
P: NI MUSEO, KICULULU KIAKWA KIIKU navota kwinuka
   [Am alright. Where is my bicycle? I might go home]

Three languages were used.
It was observed that in the villages no one liked his ethnicity being known. In an attempt to hide ethnicity speakers code switched. The attempt to hide ethnicity was a major factor in CS. Village Streets and Shopping Centres had many codes, some of which were Gikuyu, Kikamba, Kimbeere and Kiswahili. The reason was that speakers avoided being known as members of a certain ethnic society as some places had interethnic tension. The main CS factor was an attempt to hide ethnicity.

**(vi) Bodaboda Passenger Collection Point**

The setting of this data was a bicycle taxi passenger collection point as an operator talked to a passenger.

**B: Anake habari zenu?**  
[Young men how are you?]

**P: Turi ega, ni kazi tu.**  
[we are alright, it's just work]

**B: Nimukungua?**  
[Can you lift me?]

**P: Ini muno. We go to all places. Even Kagio**  
[So much ...]

Three languages were used. *Bodaboda* passenger collection points used three languages which were Kiswahili, Gikuyu and English. The use of these codes especially Kiswahili was intended to win passengers. Gaining favour was the main CS factor in this setting.

From this extract gaining favour from a passenger as the *bodaboda* operators continued with their business was a major factor in CS.

**(vii) Ngumbate**

The setting was a village women developmental project meeting that was intended to address certain issues. In this domain CS was a usual language
behavior as the members came from different ethnic backgrounds.

They however could understand Gikuyu which was their main code.

The following is an extract of an address of a chairperson of a *Ngumbato* to the members:

Chairperson: *Muri ega akina mama?*  
[How are you ladies?]

Members: *Turi ega muno.*  
[We are very alright]

Chairperson: *MwACEO umuthi? We are many.*  
[Are you alright today?...]

*Tukwaria* Kikamba, Gikuyu zote  
[We will speak in Kikamba, Gikuyu all of them]

*Tondu ningwenda tunyitanire.*  
[Because I would like us to socialize.]

Member A: *Aria Gikuyu tondu ngumbato ino itu*  
[ speak in Gikuyu because in our project ]

*Gikuyu nikio tunyitanagira muno.*  
[Gikuyu is the language we use often]

Chairperson: *Wangapi wanataka twarie Gikuyu?*  
[How many would like us to use Gikuyu?]

Members: *Ithuothe*  
[All of us]

Member A: *Na atiriri shaimani tondu twauga tukwaria Gikuyu ona gwakinya*  
[And since chairman we said that we are to use Gikuyu even when it comes]

*Ithabu ria mbeca ni Gikuyu*  
[financial report]

*Hindi thiru twathomeirwo kumwe na githungu. Umuthi gutiri na mushetho*  
[last time some parts of the report were read in English, today we are not to joke around]

Chairperson: *Ninguria nyina wa Kareko athome ithabu ria mbeca.*  
[I request Kareko’s mother to read the financial report]

Three languages were used. After studying the above data which was tape recorded and then transcribed on paper, it was concluded that socialization, peer group influence and friendship were some of the factors for CS in this domain. The conclusion was supported by an oral interview with the
chairperson who gave in to the demand by the members that she uses Gikuyu.

(viii) Home

The setting was in a family at dusk after the members of the family came back from their days commitments. The family visited was made up of the father, wife, children and the mother in-law (mother to the man).

Wife (to the husband): Karibu, watinda atia?
[Welcome, how was the day]

Husband: Ndatinda o wega katika damu ya Yesu
[I have had a good day in the blood of Jesus]

Wife: (To a child) Remove the uniform haraka sana na uvae ngo za nyumbani.
[...very fast and put on home clothings]

Wife (To a visiting neighbor): unakumbuka MUTWAANO WA KIMEU? It is on this coming Saturday.
[Are you remembering Kimeu’s wedding?...]

Home domain used four languages. These were English, Kiswahili and the LIs of the parents. The use of many codes especially where the spouses had different LIs was mainly for unity and closeness. Four languages were used in this domain. From the data, intermarriage and family intimacy were established as the CS factors.

(xi) Youth Camp

The setting for this data was a youth camp where youths from the villages came to be taught certain issues. In this domain data was collected using questionnaires. This was because the youths in the camp did not like their voices being tape recorded and they had no time for oral interviews. They however were willing to fill up the questionnaires. After studying the data collected by the use of questionnaires, it was found that in the youth camp, only two languages were spoken. These were Kiswahili and English. It was
noted that the youths in it codeswitched for socialization, linguistic tastes and sometimes as a formality. The administration of the camp encouraged the youths to use only English and Kiswahili. The participants in the youth camp were from different ethnic societies and therefore had different L1s. They therefore were unable to socialize using their L1s. Since they (participants) had beyond primary education they were able to communicate in English and Kiswahili. The administrators of the camp made it a rule to communicate only in English and Kiswahili. The rule was introduced for the purpose of enabling the youths to further learn the two languages (outside high school and colleges) According to an oral interview with one of the camp administrators, English standard among youths in Mwea was very low. A language rule therefore was introduced which included only Kiswahili and English. This created a motivation for CS involving the two Languages. Youth camp had only two languages which were English and Kiswahili. This was because the facilitators of the camp wanted the students to further learn the languages they study at school as they participated in the seminar. Just as was the case in school domain languages involved in CS behaviour in youth camp setting were few. The main CS factor was socialization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Domains</th>
<th>No.of Codeswitched Languages</th>
<th>Main CS Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accommodation and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government Policy and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Business and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Formality and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village streets and shopping Centers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hiding ethnicity and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodaboda passenger collection points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wining favor and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family intimacy and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngumbato</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peer group influence and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administration reasons and Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Relationship between CS factors and Domains

The above table shows that:

i. In the church three languages, were used. These were English, Kiswahili and the speakers’ LI. The main CS factors were accommodation and communication.

ii. In school only two languages were used. These languages were English and Kiswahili. No other languages were used as it was a serious crime for the members of the school community to use their LI or other languages. In this domain, the main CS factors were communication and Government Policy.

iii. In the market place there were five languages that were used. The languages were Kiswahili Gikuyu, Kikamba, Kimbeere and Githungu kia Nguku.
The explanation of there being many codes was that there were people from different ethnic societies. The sellers viewed CS as assisting them to win customers. In this domain therefore, the attempt to win customers and communication were a motivation for CS.

iv. In the court of law three languages were used. The languages were English, the speaker’s LI and Kiswahili. The main CS factors were formality and communication.

v. Village streets and shopping centres had four codes. The four codes were Kiswahili, Kikamba, Kimbeere and Gikuyu. One of the main factors for CS was that the speakers tried to hide their ethnicity so as to avoid being subjected to interethnic tension. It was discovered that people belonging to a certain ethnic society claimed nativity to the place and derogatorily called the others ‘foreigners’. Communication was another main factor for CS in this domain.

vi. *Bodaboda* passenger collection points used three languages which were English, Gikuyu and Kiswahili. Besides communication purpose, CS in this domain served the purpose of gaining favour from the passengers.

vii. Home domain used four languages. These were Gikuyu, English, Kiswahili and Kikamba. The use of different codes especially where the spouses had different LIs, had family intimacy and communication as the motivation for CS.

viii. *Ngumbato* had three different codes which were Gikuyu, Kikamba, and Kiswahili. The main CS factors were peer-group influence and communication.
Youth camp domain had two languages that were used. The two languages used were English and Kiswahili. After studying the data that was collected by the use of questionnaires, administrative reasons and communication were established as the main factors for CS. The use of questionnaires was found being the most effective method since the youths did not like their voices being tape recorded and they had no time for oral interviews. The administration of the camp encouraged their students to use only English and Kiswahili. The encouragement was with the intent of having the youths further learn the languages they studied at school. And also to promote the use of the two codes.

Number of codes used in CS instances varied with domains.
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The graph shows that the number of codeswitched languages varied with domain. This is evidenced by the fact that the height of the bars changed with domain.

The above graph shows that:

(i) Domain that had a lot of interaction had more codeswitching than the domain with less interaction. Examples of this scenario was school, youth camp and Ngumbato domains. The less the interaction in the multilingual society, the less the codeswitching. The market, village streets and home domains had a lot of interaction and so the codeswitched languages in them were more than in court of law, bodaboda passenger collection points and the church domains.

(ii) Formal situations had less codeswitching than informal situations. Church, school, court of law, bodaboda, Ngumbato and Youth camp as examples of formal domains showed less CS than in market, village street and home domains. As was observed while in the formal situations there were regulations restricting the language to be used, in the informal situations there were no restrictions and so one used any language one wished.

In conclusion, it was noted that:

i. Different domains had different factors for CS.

ii. Although each domain had various factors for CS within it, each (domain) one of them had a major factor.

iii. The notion of domains provided grounds for CS as different domains were found suitable for certain languages by speakers. For example in the market one switched from any one language to another but in school one
could switch only from Kiswahili to English and vise versa.

Other specific factors for CS are shown in appendix C for each domain.

In the attempt to answer the second question the following data was collected by the use of tape recording in a village shopping centre:

1st Speaker – N 2nd Speaker – P

N: Hello. Uthiire ku na niguo ngulookite?
    [...Where did you go and the way I have looked for you?]

Two languages were used - English and Gikuyu

P: Hello men: Kuapologaisanira and then mucii tondu kuma na uvoro_urgent ukwaragirwa ivetire
    [To apologise... home because there was an issue ... that was discussed down the valley]
    niandu mavau.
    [by people who are satisfied ]

Three languages were used - English, Kimbeere and Gikuyu

N: Uboro ucu niuceruvithirio? Keritu...
    [Did the issue get renewed? Girl...]

Four languages were used - Kimbeere, Gikuyu, Kikamba and Kiembu

P: Ndeto jikikarirwo thi ni old men inakuanga mzuri INO INGIKIRO IMO NDITO sana kwa sababu
    [When an issue is discussed by ... even if it has been very difficult]
    wanahekima kubwa
    [for they have great wisdom]

Four languages were used - Gikuyu, English, Kiswahili and Githungu kia

Nguku

N: UKUNTHITHIA NGUGI IRIKU tondu wira wa mucere si MUSEO MUNO? Onanie ndirona mucere. [What work are you doing since rice business is not very good? And even me I don’t see rice business doing well]
    WYIWA GUKUA MIIGO NA KISULULU NI MUCEO
    [Business of bicycle taxis is better]
    INO INGIKIRO MICIRO NDIRIRIHO MBICO NJIGO RIO am still pushing on ngihopaga maundu ni mekwagira
    [Even if rice is not bringing good money now ... still hoping that things will
be alright]
*Kana TWITE Miru tukaricage MIRAA*
[Or we go to Meru to be eating a type of vegetation with an intoxicating effect]

Five languages were used - Kimeru, Gikuyu, Kiswahili, Kikamba and *Githungu kia Nguku*

The following CS instances were also written down according to the styles written in the table 4.1

**CS instances whose syntax is determined by a certain code:**

i ... *niguo ngulookite* (ML Gikuyu)  
[...and the way I have been looking for you]

ii ... *kuapologaisanira..* (ML Gikuyu)  
[...to apologise]

iii ... *niuceruvithirio?* (ML Kimbeere)  
[...was it renewed?]  

iv ... *ikikarirwo...* (ML Kiswahili)  
[...to be discussed...]

v ... *inakuanga...* (ML Kiswahili)  
[...it becomes...]

vi ... *KUNTHITHAGIAnga wira...* (ML Kimeru)  
[...to do some work...]

vii ... *si MUSEO MUNO* (ML Kikamba)  
[...not very good]

viii ... *ngihopaga...* (ML Gikuyu)  
[...am hopeful ]

The above CS instances show ML in each instance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>% frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gikuyu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbeere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimeru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikamba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiembu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Githungu kia Nguku</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>=100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Percentage in which codes determine syntax of CS.

The table above shows:

i. All codes in Mwea

ii. Gikuyu was the dominant ML in CS in Mwea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>% frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gikuyu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbeere</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimeru</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikamba</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiembu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Githungu kia Nguku</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Analysis of Morphemes

The table above shows:

i. The dominant language which was the language with higher morpheme contribution. The language was Gikuyu.

ii. Other codes in CS instances in Mwea
As shown below the data from 40 questionnaires supports the observation on page 38:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>% Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gikuyu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimbeere</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimeru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikamba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiembu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Githungu kia Nguku</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=40 100

Table 4.5 Dominant ML Analysis according to 40 respondents interviewed using questionnaires

The above table shows that:

I. Gikuyu, the dominant ML in Mwea, had the highest percentage frequency

II. All other codes in Mwea and the percentage of people out of 40 who indicated them as dominant or main language.

4.3 Sociolinguistic Variables in CS

In the course of visiting different domains, it was found that there were certain variables that motivated CS behavior. For the purpose of this research, these variables were referred to as sociolinguistic variables.

These Sociolinguistic Variables were:

4.3.1 Education
According to Kenya Government Policy (Ominde commission Report, 1964) English is the medium of instruction in schools as an examinable subject. Government policy therefore created a possibility of CS amongst all the educated people.

The following is an extract of tape recorded data on a conversation in the research site:

B: Niatia riu? uri mwega?
   [How are you? Are you alright]

P: Ni kwega. Gutiri na uuru
   [Am alright. There is nothing wrong]

B: Tanjira atiriri, wathomagira Karira?
   [Tell me, did you study at Karira?]

P: Niki?
   [Why?]

B: Kwina mucemanio waria oote marikuo.
   [There is a meeting for all the people who studied there]

P: Nii haguthoma ndiathomire.
   [I have never been to school]

This data showed one language throughout.

Data collected from other two respondents from a conversation:

B: Hello my friend. Uthiite ku?
   [...where are you going?]

P: Nathii kuria vacancy ya kugatithagia tigiti
   [I have gone to apply for a vacancy as a ticket officer]

From this extract it was observed that the two involved in the dialogue had English and Gikuyu in their CS behavior because they were educated. Education was seen as a strong factor influencing CS. This variable relates with the first question in that the variable serves as motivation for CS.

The following table shows data reflecting CS behaviour of people with different levels of education:
Table 4.6: Education and CS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>No Education at all</th>
<th>Lower Primary</th>
<th>Upper Primary</th>
<th>Lower Secondary</th>
<th>Upper Secondary</th>
<th>Beyond Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Languages used</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4.2: Relationship between Education and CS

NE - No Education
LP - Lower Primary
UP - Upper Primary
LS - Lower Secondary
US - Upper Secondary
BS - Beyond Secondary

Level of Education
The above graph shows:

i. People with no education spoke one language. People with lower primary and upper primary education spoke two languages and so their CS behavior was the same in terms of the languages they used. They had their LI and a bit of Lingua Franca (Kiswahili).

ii. People with lower secondary education spoke three languages which were Kiswahili, English and their LI. This was because they could speak English and Lingua Franca.

iii. People with upper secondary education spoke four languages which were English, Kiswahili, their LI and one other language in the society. The same was observed from people with beyond secondary education. The CS patterns at these two levels included more languages than in earlier cases mainly because of exposure to the society and education.

Generally the bars become longer as one moves from 'no education level' to 'beyond secondary education'. Education therefore influenced CS. This conclusion is consistent with Gibbons, (1987) and Whiteley, (1971). The data in the table shows that the less the education of the respondent, the fewer the codeswitched languages. Education as a variable was relevant to the research questions in that it added a new code in somebody's repertoire and so one could codeswitch from his LI to English. English, the language of the educated, was seen as a language that had prestige and so for prestige speakers codeswitched from LI to English. This shows relationship between this variable and question one.
The possibility of a speaker borrowing a word from English and making it fit in the syntax of a code he or she was using introduced a new embedded language in the CS of the educated. It was observed that English was made to embed to a certain language among so many speakers especially the ones who had primary education.

4.3.2 Age

The following codeswitched data was tape recorded from a Church domain. 
Tape recording was the best for the purpose of collecting CS data without letting people to know that they were being observed.

The letters below are the initials of the four respondents:

C- Conductor of the service
W – Another Church member
T – Also a Church member
P – Preacher

C: Nawauliza nyote tusimame ili tuabudu mungu na wimbo moja. Am for the [Am requesting all of you to stand up so that we worship God with one song...]
opinion that the song be known to all.

Ni mahinda ma uira. Ninguhe dada wetu chance  
[It is time for testimonies. I will give our sister a ...]

Four languages were used.

[... Am saved. I feel to stay in the blood of Jesus]

Three languages were used

T: Mwathani agocwo. Agocwo ringi Mwathani
[Praise God. May he be praised again]
Ngoro yakwa ni honokete. NAKUA NI MUSEO.
[am saved. Am alright]
Two languages were used

P: Mwathani agocwo. May the Lord be praised
   [Praise God …]
   Maadishi ya Bwana hunichangaza sana ...
   [The word of God amazes me]

Three languages were used. From a brief interview with the four church members, their ages were established as shown in the following table. Their codeswitched languages were also shown and also their age categories and specific ages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age classes</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific age</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Codeswitched languages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Relationship between CS and Age

The table above shows that:

i. People of age grouping 21 – 30 years had four languages which they used in their CS behavior. This was because they liked using many languages and they found it prestigious to switch from one code to another and even to other codes in the same conversation.

ii. The people of age grouping 31 – 40 spoke three languages and also the people of grouping 41 – 50. This was because in these age groups people were usually settled in certain places where they did their things. They
were also not aggressive as was the case with the younger grouping.

iii. In the age grouping of 51 – 60 people codeswitched less. Their CS behavior included two languages. It was observed that people in this grouping stigmatised switching which they called mixing up languages. They did not like it. They liked sticking to one language or two throughout their conversations despite their knowledge of other codes.

iv. The number of codeswitched languages decreased as one moved from the low age grouping to high age grouping. This was because, as was observed, as people grew old in this society, despite their knowledge of other codes, they liked speaking their LI and sometimes the Lingua Franca. The conclusion was that age was a strong motivation for CS. This variable related with the research questions in that it presented grounds for speakers to change from one code to another. Preference to sticking to one code or even codeswitching had much to do with the speaker’s age. This variable was relevant in answering the first question in that the lower the age the more the motivation to codeswitch. This was so to the age of 21. As was observed, the CS behaviour of the people of age bracket 21 – 30 years had more embedded languages than the CS behavior of older age bracket. From this young age bracket, one established the fact that there were embedded languages and identified them.

4.3.3 Occupation

Using oral interviews and spontaneous recording, data was collected from twelve respondents who were distributed as follows; three professionals, (one
teacher, one agricultural officer and one nurse) three farmers and six business people. The business people were spontaneously tape recorded as they transacted business. The reason for using tape recording in the market was that the business people had time only for people buying items. The professionals had time to discuss issues on an oral interview especially concerning their profession.

The following are extracts of codeswitched data from the business people in the market:

**Seller 1:** *Ni ikumi na ithano. Watoto wale matunda.*
[Fifteen shillings is the cost. Children can eat fruit]

Two languages were used - Gikuyu and Kiswahili

**Buyer 1:** That is too much. *Ni maaro no mbei ndio mbaya.*
[...They are good but the price is bad.]

Four languages were used - English, Kimbeere, Kiswahili, *Githungu kia Nguku*

**Seller 2:** *Nunulia familia yako nyama cia thamaki*
[Buy for your family fish meat]

Two languages were used - Kiswahili and Gikuyu

**Buyer 2:** *NGUGI ya kwendia NTHAMAKI NIO UTHITHAGIA GUKU?*
[Is the work of selling fish what you do here?]

Two languages were used - Kimeru and Gikuyu

**Seller 3:** Customa *UMUSEO? Gura MUTHOKOI.*
[... how are you? Buy dressed up maize]

**Buyer 3:** *Ni MUSEO*
[Am alright]

Three languages were used - English, Kikamba and Gikuyu

The CS of the business people reflected seven languages.
Extracts from some farmer’s speech in Wang’uru:

**Farmer 1:**  *Niatia riu? Ndikwiriga.*  
[How are you? I have not met you for some time.]

**Farmer 2:**  *Gutiri uru. Ni MUCEO MUNO no kuhanda mbembe na mboco.*  
[There is nothing wrong. Am very alright it is just a matter of planting maize and beans]

Data from the farmer’s speech reflected two languages - Kikamba and Gikuyu

The following is an extract from data got from the professionals:

**A:** Madam *ukuuga atia riu?*  
[... how are you?]

**B:**  *Ndímwega. Hakuna ncno mbaya,* only that work is so much.  
[Am alright. There is nothing wrong …]

Three languages were used – Gikuyu, Kiswahili, English

This was from a medical officer (nurse). The data reflected three languages.

Data from the teacher and agricultural officer also reflected the same languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Business people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of Code-switched languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.8: CS and Occupation**

The farmers used very few languages (two languages) This was mainly because their exposure and interaction with other people was low. They didn’t move so frequently. Professionals spoke three languages while the business people spoke seven of the eight codes. The business people interacted with so many people and so they had to speak many codes in their conversations. Professionals spoke just a few languages and were formal in their use of
language Exposure was a major factor in determining CS and so business people had seven languages in CS behavior.

The above table shows that:

i. The farmers spoke two languages which were their LI and the Lingua Franca. This was because they interacted with almost the same people everyday and if anyone could not understand the farmer’s language there was the alternative of Lingua Franca.

ii. The Professionals’ CS behavior involved three languages which were English, there.

iii. LI and the Lingua Franca. They did not have to switch to so many other languages because their exposure with people covered the area of formality. If the client was educated, he or she spoke English. If not he or she spoke the LI and if they could not communicate in LI then there was the Lingua Franca.

iv. The business people spoke seven codes which they used in their CS behavior. This was because they had an exposure to people from various linguistic environments and so as to win the customers, they tried to speak the languages of the customers. Generally the number of codeswitched languages increased as one moved from the farmers to the business people. The exposure to people speaking different codes of the professionals was more than the one of the farmers while the one of business people was more than the one of the professionals.
The above graph shows Occupation and CS as related.

In conclusion it was observed that occupation influenced CS. Occupation as a social variable was considered useful motivation in CS because it created a situation on which CS factors developed. The CS factor here was to win customers in the case of business people, to socialize in the case of the farmers and to communicate in the case of the professionals. In each one of the three types of occupations there was the main reason for CS. The variable related with the first question therefore because it created grounds for CS. Occupation
also related with the second question because in the CS behavior of somebody in a given occupation there were some languages that were made to embed to a certain language. In each utterance in CS behavior there was the main language that determined the syntax of the utterance, while other languages were tuned to its syntax. The CS behavior of people involved in various occupations reflected both matrix language and embedded languages.

4.3.4 Gender

Data over gender was collected from eight respondents who were customers of a cobbler. Four of the respondents were females and the others males. Spontaneous codeswitched data reflecting how people of different gender naturally use language was required. Therefore tape recording was used and the data transcribed on paper.

The following are extracts from the conversations between the cobbler and his female customers:

Only extracts from the females part of the conversation was transcribed. Since the cobbler was a male, his was not required here:

1st Female: NIMUSEO MUNO NAKWA.
[Am fine]

One language was used.

2nd Female: Ikumi! Nguruta ithano
[Ten! I will pay five]

One language was used

3rd Female: Ndirakwiririe marawont arusi and so you do a good job
[I told you they require wedding ...]

Three languages were used.
4th Female: Njeru niurashaga Customer
[Njeru you ask for too much from the …]

Two languages were used.

The following were extracts from the male respondents or customers. The extracts also included turns from the cobbler’s speech since he was a male:

1st Male: wewe hunidanganya sana. Every time I come you tell me, ‘come
[you cheat me so often…] tomorrow.’
Wendaga atia?
[What is it that you want?]

Three languages were used.

Cobbler: Tutazungumza tuhoreire.
[We are to discuss as we relax.]

Two languages have been used.

2nd Male: Niki unanikosea hivi?
[Why have you offended me like this?]

Two languages were used.

Cobbler: Nipeange Kama dakika ithano uguo
[Give me about five minutes]

Two languages were used.

3rd Male: Kazi yako nzuri lakini mbei mbaya
[Your work is good but the price is bad]

One language was used.

Cobbler: Zote ni nzuri. Rangi wina goro muno
[All are good. The paint is very expensive].

Two languages have been used.

4th Male: Wewe umefinish. Ninapenda ukweli. Have you finished?
[Have you…I want the truth.]

Navota gukuthama. Tondu umbenagia so much.
[I can go elsewhere. This is because you cheat me …]
Four languages have been used.

Cobbler: *Maundu maku nitavatengeneza sitakangi mabaya.*

[Am to work on all issues about you …]

Two languages have been used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code-switched instances</td>
<td>No of codes used</td>
<td>Code-switched instances</td>
<td>No of codes used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.9: Relationship between CS and Gender**

The above table shows that:

i. 1<sup>st</sup> female had no CS instances for she used one language.

ii. 2<sup>nd</sup> female had no CS instance and too used one language.

iii. 3<sup>rd</sup> female had one CS instance which included three languages.

iv. 3<sup>rd</sup> female had a CS instance including two languages.

v. 1<sup>st</sup> male had a CS instance which involved three languages.

vi. 2<sup>nd</sup> male had a CS instance involving two languages.

vii. 3<sup>rd</sup> male had no CS instance.

viii. 4<sup>th</sup> male had a CS instance involving four languages.
The above graph shows:

i. In the 1\textsuperscript{st} pair, the CS behaviour for the male involved three codes while the female showed no CS. In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} pair, CS behaviour for the male involved two codes but in the female speech there was no CS.

ii. Female CS behavior in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} pair involved three languages but the male speech showed no CS.

iii. In the 4\textsuperscript{th} pair, the CS behaviour for males involved four languages but the
one of females had two languages.

The conclusion after the analysis was that gender influenced CS. Males did not only codeswitch more often than females but they also had more languages in their codeswitched instances than females. Gender was considered a relevant variable to the second question because it showed that there were embedded languages in Mwea and that speakers depending on their gender had an inclination to using many languages in speaking. Males had more embedded languages than females.

4.3.5 Avoidance of Taboo words and words common in different languages but with different meanings

It was observed that there were various words that were common in most of the languages in Wang’uru. However in most cases, social perception of the speakers changed with the languages. The following data shows that: The speakers are labeled 'A' and 'B'.

* A **TWITE** for the function
  [let us go... ]
* B: Ya nini?
  [Of what?] 
* A: Ya to pray for the function
  [Of...]
* B: *Kai iri guku sokoni?*
  [You mean it is here in the market?]
  **Si useme KUROMBERA inchi**
  [You should say 'to pray for the country.']['
* A: Nyinyi wakikuyu you say
  [You Agikuyu...]
  **KUROMBERA** is “to guess…”
  [To pray ...]

‘A’ had Gikuyu as his LI and ‘B’ Kimeru. The two as much as possible avoided the term KUROMBERA.
A: **NIT NTHITHAGIA NGUGI YA BIAHAR**

[...I am a businessman]

*No my wife* *ni mwalimu*

[But...is a teacher.]

B: *Na miaka iyo yothe wewe ni biashara tu?*

[And for all those years you just run business?]  
*Hebu niambie kwanini watu hawapendi kazi hii?*  
[Tell me why people don't like this work?]

A: **ANTU ENGI** wanaogomba blowing dust  
[Many people fear ...]

*Lakini nyinyi wakikuyo mmesoea*  
[But you Agikuyu are used to it]

'A' had Kimeru as his LI and knew how 'B' would perceive the word *muka* since the later had Gikuyu as his LI. They tried to avoid it. They also knew each others meaning of *kuguruka* which they avoided by CS.

**i.**

A: *Habari yako mama?*  
[How are you lady?]

B: *Mzuri gutiri na uuru*  
[There is nothing wrong]

A: *Wina kanyenje?*  
[Do you have green peppers?]

B: *Zile zinaitangwo green peppers kwa kingereza?*  
[The ones called ... in English?]

'B' was not sure of what 'A' wanted so he was to confirm.

**ii.**

A: *Ukunjira atia sasa?*  
[what are you to tell me now?]

**iii.**

A: *Tuthii haria penye* tree because it is so hot  
[let us go there ...]

B: *Nakwa am comfortable*  
[I am ...]

A: *Ni kama unanjikasa na blanket.*  
[It is like you are...with...]

B: *Si useme MURINGITI?*  
[You should say prostitution]

A: *Aha...Hiyo mbaya nvinyi. Wakamba majina venu ni funny.*  
[That is bad. You Akamba have ... words.]

Speaker 'A' who had Gikuyu as his LI and knew how the term **MURINGITI**
would be understood by his hearer avoided it. Speaker' B 'had Kikamba as his LI.

vi A: *Mwendia wimwaro?*  
   [Business person how are you?]
B: *Ndimwega* customer  
   [Am alright ...]
A: *Wina tunyamu tutu*  
   [Do you have the things]
   *twa kuruta mwiba kugururi?*  
   [for removing a thorn from the foot?]  
B: *Uramina pins? Icio guku ni nyingi*  
   [Do you mean ...? They are very many here]

After listening to the tape and having an oral interview with the two people who had Kimbeere and Gikuyu as their L1, it was established that 'A' who had Kimbeere as his L1 avoided the word *mbini* because it was a taboo word in his language.' B' also tried to avoid it by codeswitching so as not to sound rude to the customer. Avoidance of taboo words was motivation for CS.

The following extract from a dialogue showed avoidance of derogatory terms as grounds for CS:

A: Am just resting *ngiendia matunda.*  
   [...as I sell fruits ]
   *Niuiigate uria muka wa Kimundiu aramwikire?*  
   [have you heard what Kimundiu’s wife did to him? ]
B: *Nindiraiguire no mundu niakwenda kuracia kwaa* his wife.
   [I heard but someone should pay dowry ...]
   Imagine *muture na mutumia,*  
   [... you stay with a wife ]
   *mugie ciana igimare*  
   [you beget children and they grow up]

Speaker 'A' mentioned wife of Kimundiu with a lot of despise but ' B' who mentioned ‘wife of' 'with a lot of respect avoided *muka* and so he switched to English .
Table 4.10: Some of the Common words in codes but with different meanings

The table above shows the following words whose avoidance as somebody spoke presented a motivation for CS:

i. *Kuguruka* existed in many of the languages in the research site but its meaning changed from code to code. In Kimeru it meant 'blowing up' but in Gikuyu it meant 'becoming mad'.

ii. *Kurombera* existed in Kimeru and Gikuyu but while in Kimeru it meant to
'pray' in Gikuyu it meant 'to guess'. A speaker with Gikuyu switched to English or Kiswahili when speaking to someone with Kimeru as his L1 so as to avoid the term.

iii. *Kanyenje* was to be found in Kimbeere and Gikuyu but it meant differently in the two codes. In Kimbeere it meant green peppers but in Gikuyu it meant 'a small cockroach'. When someone with Kimbeere as his L1 was out to ask for *kanyenje* from someone with Gikuyu as his L1, he switched to another code. This was because he knew of the differences or he would be asked what it was he was talking about by his hearer.

iv. *Muka*, a term which existed in most of the languages in Mwea was socially perceived differently by different people. It meant 'wife of' but while it was socially accepted by certain people, other people saw it as a derogatory term and tried to avoid it. People who saw it as a derogatory term avoided it when talking positively about a married woman. For example the Gikuyu LI speakers used this term only when talking derogatorily about a woman. Kimeru LI speakers however accepted it even when one was talking positively about a married woman.

v. *Muringiti* existed in most of the codes in the research site. In Kikamba it meant 'prostitution' but in Kiembu it meant 'blanket'. Somebody with Kikamba as his or her LI switched to Kiswahili or English so as to avoid the use of this term. This was either on the request of his hearer or chose to do so on his own accord.

vi. *Mbini* was a taboo word in Kimbeere. It could never be mentioned in the
public but in Gikuyu it simply meant ‘a pin’ or something used in removing jiggers or thorn from the feet. Someone who had Kimbeere as his LI looked for an alternative code so as to avoid the mention of this word. It was observed that a Gikuyu speaker who knew the meaning of the term in Kimbeere also avoided the term in talking to Ambeere so as not to sound rude. This scenario presented grounds for CS.

vii. Kamuti was a common term in the society under study. The term however had different meanings depending on someone's LI. In Kikamba, the term meant 'a charm' or something used in witchcraft. In Kiembu and in some of other codes it meant a 'short tree' or 'a stick'. A Kikamba speaker who was aware of this difference in speaking to someone with Kiembu as his LI switched to another code. From an oral interview the languages in the data labled (i) – (vii) were established. The words that the speakers avoided in their conversations or which made them switch to other languages were established. The words were: Kurombera, Kuguruka, Kanyenje, Muka, Muringiti, Mbini and Kamuti. They are shown in table 4.10. Although there were common words in the codes in the research site, they had different meanings. Their differences in meaning despite their existence in the same codes was a motivation for CS. This was because when a speaker came to a point of using certain words that were tabooed in the language of the listener, he switched to another language that accepted them. An example of such a word is mbini which was found both in Gikuyu and Kimbeere. In Gikuyu, the word meant a ‘pin’ or something one can use in
removing jiggers from the feet but in Kimbeere it was a taboo word. It was observed that someone with Gikuyu as his LI as he spoke to Ambeere switched to Kiswahili or another code to avoid the taboo word. It was concluded that people change from one code to another so as to either avoid taboo words whose meaning is different in a different language or to avoid the use of certain words. Although some words may not be taboo, they were not socially acceptable and therefore their use made a speaker be construed as rude. This scenario presented grounds for CS. The idea of avoiding certain words in a multilingual society as influencing CS as people interacted is paralleled by the existing CS knowledge (Bambi 1980). However earlier scholars do not specifically explore taboo words as grounds for CS. Avoidance of taboo words was considered a variable relevant to the objectives and questions of the study. This was because it influenced the codes that a speaker was to use. It was observed that a speaker switched from a language that tabooed a word he intended to use to another language. He could also try to borrow parts of words from other languages in his attempt to either avoid a taboo word or a word that was not socially acceptable although it was not an outright taboo. He could stick to the language he or she considered worth being used in a certain situation and then made other codes fit in its syntactic structure. In the process, such speakers spoke different languages in the same conversation. It was also observed that while a speaker in a certain situation spoke a certain language, in changing circumstances he either spoke another language or avoided the use of certain words. It was observed that while some
speakers knew the meaning of common words in different codes, other speakers did not know. The speakers who knew switched to the language of the hearer or Kiswahili so that they could be understood. Avoidance of taboo words and words that were not socially acceptable was a major motivation in CS. It related with the first question in that a speaker speaking a certain language codeswitched to another in the attempt to avoid the taboo word according to the hearer. It also related to the second question in that as the speaker spoke the language he actually intended to use, the morphemes borrowed from the other languages introduced many embedded structures into the conversation.

4.4 Speaker’s L1 as a Linguistic Variable

The LI of a speaker was considered as an important Linguistic variable in the study. This was because speaker’s LI determined what other codes he or she was to have in his repertoire

The following are extracts from the dialogues:

i A: Hello. *Niatia mundurume?*
   [...Man how are you?]
B: *Nikwega buru*
   [All is alright]
A: *Wewe unaitwa nani?*
   [What is your name?]
B: **MBITAGWO GITONGA NA NTITHAGIA NGUGI YA BIASHARA.**
   [My name is Gitonga and I run business]
A: wewe mumeru?
   [Are you from Meru?]
B: Ndio lakini najua Gikuyu.
   [Yes but I know Gikuyu]

A: Kweli ?
   [Really?]
B: **Tamba unguire mucere.**
   [First buy some rice here for me]
Hata Kiemboo, Kikamba zote mimi najua.

The respondent had Kimeru as her L1. Her CS behaviour reflected five languages.

ii A: Hello man *UMUCEO?*  
   [ ...Are you alright?]  
B: *NIMUCEO MUNO*  
   [Am very alright]  
A: *Tiga giikamba kuri lugha zingine ambazo unaiua?*  
   [Apart from Kikamba are there other languages that you know?]  
B: Najua nyingi. *Ngiciruta niundu* waguikarania wega na andu.  
   [I know so many because of communicating with people.]  
A: *Andu aingi Mwea wanajua lugha nyingi* like you?  
   [Do many people in Mwea ...]  
B: *Watu wamakabila mengi ni mesi lugha nyingi* very much including Gikuyu  
   [ People of other ethnic societies know ...]  
   *Lakini wakikuyu speak one or two languages.*  
   [But Agikuyu ...]

The respondent had Kikamba as his LI. His CS behaviour had three languages.

After studying the data that was collected in investigating on LI variable, the table below was drawn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code spoken as first language (LI)</th>
<th>Gikuyu</th>
<th>Kimeru</th>
<th>Kiemboo</th>
<th>Kimbeere</th>
<th>Kikamba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of code switched languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.11: Relationship between CS and First language (LI)**

The table above shows that:

i. People who had Gikuyu as their LI spoke two languages which they used in their CS behaviour. The two were Gikuyu and Kiswahili. This was because
Gikuyu was known also by speakers of other languages and so they could communicate with them (speakers).

ii. Speakers of Kimeru as LI spoke many other codes which they kept on switching to. They spoke five languages. This was because of their interaction as they came to Mwea and also for trade reasons. They came from further than all other societies in Mwea.

iii. Kiembu LI speakers had three codes in their CS behaviour. These others were Kimeru and Kikamba. This was because they had mutual intelligibility with Gikuyu and Kimbeere speakers.

iv. People with Kimbeere as their LI had four languages in their repertoire. These were Gikuyu, Kikamba and Kimeru (besides Kimbeere). This was because Kimbeere and these other languages were not very close and so Kimbeere speakers had to learn them for communication.
The above graph shows:

i. People with Gikuyu as their LI spoke two languages in their CS behaviour. As was learned this was because Gikuyu was the main language in Mwea and so many people knew it. Gikuyu speakers could communicate with other people through it (Gikuyu).

ii. The speakers of Kimeru as their LI had five codes in their CS. This was because Meru was far away from Mwea and so, as the Ameru shifted to Mwea they interacted with people from other societies. Kimeru LI speakers furthermore were more involved in business in Wang’uru than
other societies and this made them acquire many codes.

iii. Kiembu speakers had three codes. The reason for few codes was their mutual intelligibility with Gikuyu and so they did not have to have many other codes in their CS.

iv. Speakers with Kimbeere as their LI had four codes. This was because they interacted with quite a number of societies such as Akamba on their way to Mwea.

v. People with Kikamba as their LI spoke three codes in their CS behavior. This was because they could communicate with other people through Gikuyu. Gikuyu as a code played a major role in determining CS patterns as spoken by so many speakers in the multilingual society under study.

vi. People in the society had different repertoire depending on their LI. Variation in CS behavior depended on LI to a large extent.

vii. Speakers of LIs that were close to Gikuyu spoke fewer languages in their CS behavior than people whose LI was not very close to Gikuyu.

It was concluded that LI of a speaker to a significant extent determined what other codes he or she was to have in the CS behavior. This conclusion agrees with earlier scholars in the relationship between LI and CS (Michael and Erick, 1986, Diane and Michael, 1999). LI as a linguistic variable was considered relevant to the research questions. The consideration was because the knowledge of many languages, as was observed, was determined by LI and therefore the speaker acquired and spoke different codes depending on his or her LI. LI also determined how many languages a speaker could possibly have
as embedded languages in his or her CS. Besides visiting domains and eliciting data in them two of the sub-areas in the research site were visited. These sub-areas were Kiamanyeki and Kigeca. In Kigeca the dominant language was Gikuyu while in Kiamanyeki the dominant language was Kikamba. For various reasons people in the site kept on visiting various places from time to time. From an oral interview it was realized that people switched to the common or dominant code as they changed places. A respondent in Kigeca spoke Gikuyu but he said that in Kiamanyeki he switched to Kikamba. This was for the purpose of identifying with the Akamba and by so doing avoided being subjected to interethnic tension.

The following is an extract of some data from the same respondent in two different places (Kigeca and Kiamanyeki) The two sub-areas were chosen because they were bigger than other sub-areas.

I. In Kiamanyeki

A: WAKWITU UMUSEO?
   [My kinsman, how are you?]
B: NI KUSEO TATA.
   [Am alright father.]
A: Lete chai na muthokoi.
   [Bring tea and dressed maize dish]
B. KISULULU KIAKU KIiku?
   [Where is your bicycle?]
In both data (i) and (ii) the speaker labeled ‘A’ was the same and was tape recorded in two different places. The tape recording was later transcribed on paper. The data (i) was collected in a public meeting. From an oral interview with speaker ‘A’ it was realized that he knew other codes other than the dominant ones in the places. He chose to switch to the common code so as to identify himself with the ethnic society in the region. To him switching guaranteed acceptance and survival because people were more willing to transact with somebody with who they apparently shared an LI. It was observed that the concept of shared LI made a social bond among speakers and so whoever spoke it was assessed favorably. Although Mwea was a multilingual society, there was a general tendency of different ethnic societies occupying certain sub-areas. People from outside a certain sub-area were not well received and were referred to as ooki [outsiders].

4.5 Conclusions

The following conclusions were made after the study:

4.5.1 CS is caused by the following factors:

i. Government policy was found important in CS. It was observed that teachers who shared an LI discussed things in their LI outside school but in the school they switched to English. In Wang’uru, just as is the case in the rest of Kenya government policy is that English be used in schools (Ominde Commission Report, 1964).

ii. Peer group influence was also an important motivation for CS. The code generally accepted by a group someone belonged to determined that he or
she switched to it (code). It was observed that if the code used by the group was Kiswahili, everybody switched to it from other codes in discussing issues with the group members. However outside the group one was free to switch to another code. The main reason for switching to the peer group code was to be accepted in the group. This observation is consistent with Trudgill (1983).

iii. The topic of discussion in a given setting determined what language one switched to.

iv. Some objects in the research site did not have names in certain languages. This motivated speakers to codeswitch either at intraword, intrasentential or intersentential level. It was observed that an attempt by the speakers to translate words made some of the words to lose some meaning and so the speakers opted to use the same words in another language so long as there was no communication loss.

v. Identification with people in a certain geographical region was an important CS motivational factor. This observation is consistent with the existing literature (Whiteley 1974). It was found out that the need to identify oneself with people in a given place and to be accepted in Mwea made people switch to a code associated with the region. Speakers of the different codes such as Kikamba and Kimbeere were associated with certain places. Since in the research site ethnic tension came up from time to time a speaker decided to hide his actual ethnicity by either speaking the language of the
region or Kiswahili.

vi. Getting favour from individuals or a group motivated a speaker to codeswitch. This observation concurs with Crystal (1997) who notes that language can be used to link oneself with the hearer. Crystal (1997) observes that the need to get some favours determines that the speakers switch to another code.

vii. Business related reasons provided motivation for CS. Wang’uru had many economic activities and these attracted many people. With the hope to win customers business people switched to another code. Usually the code of the customers was the preferred code. This observation concurs with Scotton (1993) who notes that socio-economic factors are strong motivation factors for CS.

viii. Marriage relationship was a CS motivation factor. It was observed that when a lady got married to a man who did not share her LI, she learned the LI of the husband and in her communication to him spoke it. However in her communication with other people or her ethnic society, she switched to her LI. CS therefore helped to bring family members together.

ix. The type of domain that a speaker was in determined that he or she codeswitched. In domains such as church and school that were formal, speakers used either English or Kiswahili as the acceptable codes. However, when they (people) went home or to the market they used their LI or a mixture of other languages. It was observed that church and school
functions were solemn and had to be carried out in languages accepted as formal. This finding is in agreement with the existing literature that formality and informality are important CS causative factors (Romaine, 1989).

x. Establishing rapport with the hearer was a CS motivation factor. On identifying the LI of his hearer a speaker switched to it (hearer's LI) because as was observed the two had a stronger rapport if they shared the same code. The speaker greeted the hearer in Kiswahili or in his LI (speaker LI) but if the response reflected the hearer’s LI, the speaker codeswitched to it. Neil, (2002) agrees with this observation and notes that when a speaker switched to the language of the hearer, he or she forms a positive rapport which is based on mutual respect. It was therefore concluded that CS as a linguistic behavior was caused by various factors. Most are socio-motivational or socio-economic factors (Scotton 1993).

4.5.2 Dominant Matrix Language and Embedded languages in CS in Mwea

i. In the multilingual society under study, there was a dominant ML. As somebody spoke a CS instance involving his or her LI and another language(s), the LI determined the syntax. There was therefore the possibility of every code with native speakers being ML in a CS instance. It was observed that the most common code (Gikuyu—the code with more native speakers than other codes) was the dominant ML.
There are embedded languages in CS instances in Mwea. The embedded language as was observed depended on the speakers' LI. In a CS instance, the speakers' LI contributed more morphemes than other codes.

4.5.3 Sociolinguistic Variables influencing CS

As was observed in chapter 4, there were certain sociolinguistic variables which to a significant extent influence CS. The variables that were considered useful for this research were:

i. Occupation

It was found that one's occupation determined the number of codes one was to have in his repertoire (as shown in table 4.7). Occupation, for example, business made someone have exposure to situations where one met speaker's of different languages. The business person switched from one code to another as he interacted with people.

ii. Somebody's LI

A speaker of a language that was widely known and spoken in the multilingual society did not put in a lot of effort to know many languages as he or she could comfortably communicate with other people using his or her LI. Speakers of such an LI had a smaller number of languages in their repertoire. People tried to know so many languages for the purpose of communicating with other people outside their LI. It
was observed that native speakers of a certain LI that had few speakers strove to know many languages and kept on switching from code to code. Someone's LI therefore determined whether he or she was to keep on switching from code to code and also the number of codes in his repertoire.

iii. **Age**

Old people in the society were found to codeswitch less than the young.

iv. **Gender**

Females codeswitched less than males.

v. **Education**

Education was a strong sociolinguistic variable influencing CS. Educated people had English as an additional code in Mwea that they used in their CS. Besides this, education exposed someone to situations where he or she interacted with other people. The educated acquired other codes other than English and used them. The Educated people had more codes in their repertoire than the ones who were not educated.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The present study was on causative factors of CS. As shown in the findings, some of the factors found out are as stated in the existing literature but there are also new factors or knowledge in CS that the research has found out. This chapter therefore presents a summary of the major findings, the implications of the findings and recommendations. Areas that require further research are also highlighted.

5.2 Summary of the Major Findings

Although some of the findings agree with existing literature, there are other factors that the research has discovered. Examples of these new findings are common words in different codes but with different meaning, avoidance of taboo words, gender and family intimacy as causative factors for CS. As was observed a codeswitcher had a certain gain that he or she intended to have. It was also found out that there were embedded languages in the CS behavior in the research site. It was however noted that each one of the languages in Mwea namely: Kimeru, Kiembu, Githungu kia Nguku, English, Kimbere, Kiswahili, Gikuyu and Kikamba could serve as an embedded language depending on the L1 of the speaker. As was observed, these languages were usual in CS behavior in the research site. Gikuyu was found out to be the code determining the syntax of CS in so many of CS instances and therefore it (Gikuyu) was the dominant
ML. CS instance by a speaker had its syntax determined by his or her LI. There was the possibility of every language in Mwea that has native speakers to serve as an ML. However, it was found out that Gikuyu which was the dominant language was more frequently serving as ML in so many of CS instances and so it was the dominant ML.

5.3 Implications

First of all there is the fact that CS has a communicative strategy. The codeswitcher should identify the language of the hearer or a language which is convenient for him or her (hearer) and switch to it. This is imperative because language does not just communicate some message but it also helps to reduce (or increase) the social distance between the interlocutor and the hearer. Existence of same or common words in the different codes spoken in the research site although they had different meanings was usual. As demonstrated by the findings, CS can be used to link or delink oneself with the hearer, therefore a speaker should decide what aims they intend to have by the use of certain codes. They (speakers) should relate the codes used with the aims. In some areas of the research site, survival and security were determined by the use of the acceptable code. People speaking a different code from the one generally spoken in a given place were referred to as ooki and subjected to mistreatment. In such a situation a person newly settled in the place had to learn the local code and switch to it in his or her interaction with the local people. CS in such a scenario guaranteed survival and so it was advisable that a speaker switched to the code depicting him rightly or wrongly as a native to a
certain place. CS was generally accepted as an equivalent to the LI of the hearer and therefore it was favorably received.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made.

5.4.1 To the people of Mwea

i. It was observed that knowledge of many local languages was a positive tool in solving economic, political and social misunderstanding. Speakers should therefore identify what code best serves a certain purpose and switch to it. It is evident from the findings that there were various CS causative factors. The speaker should identify the factor and link it with his needs.

ii. In the multilingual society people should try to learn many codes for unity and intimate interaction. This is because despite their (people) different linguistic backgrounds, they (People) have to co-exist in the society and therefore it (Society) has to have cohesion. When people speak or communicate in the same language whether it is their LI or an LI of one of them, they relate intimately. CS enables people to relate intimately and should be encouraged.

iii. Different codes are best suited for different domains. It is therefore recommended that the interlocutor picks from his repertoire the most suitable code and switch to it as determined by the situation.
iv. In the society under study just as is the case in various multilingual societies, there were words common in various codes. In most cases some of the words meant differently in different codes. The speaker should therefore be careful not to be misunderstood or offend the audience. As was observed some words were accepted in some codes and are used in the public. However, in other codes the same words are taboo or derogatory words and could not be used in the public as this was a violation of cultural values. The speaker is advised to switch to another code so as to avoid using the taboo word. When speaking to an audience in multilingual society, a speaker should find out what language is most convenient for them and then switch to it.

5.4.2 To the Language Planners

Local languages should be recognized as important and given Government support as they contribute positively to the economic, political and social welfare of the people as the case of Mwea has demonstrated.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

5.5.1 The Linguistic Determinant of ML in CS

It was observed that there were issues that determined that a certain language in the CS instance be the ML. The possibility of 'code position' concept and others as determining ML should be investigated into.
5.5.2 The Relationship between Linguistic Simplification and CS
As somebody switched from his or her LI to another code, the code switched to lost some of its structures (whole words or bound morphemes). This process is linguistic simplification and as was observed it was related to CS. This relationship should be investigated into.

5.5.3 An Investigation into Psychological Motivation in CS
As discussed in chapter four, the current study has dealt mainly with Socio - economic motivation in CS. There should be a study to investigate into the criteria that the speaker in a CS instance uses in deciding the positions of the codes. In addition, a situation was observed where a speaker involved in a conversation with another person used his LI throughout while the hearer in his or her response used only his LI. Although they could understand each other’s LI (and could speak it), each one of them used his or her LI throughout the conversation. This scenario and others reflects CS as having a psychological motivation and should be investigated into.

5.5.4 A Study of CS to be Done in a Bigger Area
The present study was done in a relatively small area (Mwea Division). Additional study should be conducted in a bigger multilingual area so as to increase the generalization of the results.
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KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

LINGUISTICS RESEARCH

TOPIC : CS CAUSATIVE FACTORS

RESEARCH AREA : MWEA

RESEARCH SITE : WANG’URU

Please answer the questions on this questionnaire.

1. What is your first language?

Write in the space below:

2. How old are you? Write in the space below:

3(a) How many languages do you know?

(Please tick where applicable)

1 2 3 4

5 6 7 8

(b) In the spaces provided here below write the languages you know:

____________________________________  ______________________________________

____________________________________  ______________________________________

____________________________________  ______________________________________

82
4. Write down the reasons as to why you change from the use of one language to another:

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

5. a) What is your occupation?

(Please tick where applicable)

☐ Professional related employment
☐ Farming
☐ Business
☐ Others

(b) Does your occupation make you change from the use of one language to another?

(Please tick where applicable)

☐ Yes ☐ No
5. Is there a language which is more frequently spoken than other languages in Mwea?

(Please tick where applicable)

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If ‘yes’ what is the language?

________________________

6. What is your level of education?

(Please tick where applicable)

☐ None  ☐ Lower Primary  ☐ Upper Primary

☐ Lower Secondary ☐ Upper Secondary  ☐ Beyond Secondary

7. For how long have you stayed in Mwea?

(Please tick where applicable)

☐ 1 – 5 yrs  ☐ 6 – 10 yrs  ☐ 11 – 15 yrs

☐ 16 – 20 yrs  ☐ 21 – 25 yrs

8. Are there certain places in Mwea where certain languages are spoken?

(Please tick where applicable)

☐ Yes  ☐ No
If 'yes' give an example

9. (a) Write down (here below) the districts that border Mwea and the languages spoken in them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How many languages do you speak?

2. Are there specific places where you speak each one of the languages you know?

3. (a) Are there times when you mix up languages as you talk?
   (b) Why do you keep on changing from one language to another or mixing up languages (if the answer is 'yes')?

4. Please tell me how many languages are spoken in Mwea?

5. (a) What are the districts that neighbour Mwea?
   (b) What languages are spoken in those districts?

6. Do you think the neighbours of Mwea have made it (Mwea) to have many languages?

7. (a) As people use different languages in their discussion, can you tell what the main language is in the mix up?
   (b) What are the languages attached to the main language (if there is a main language)?

8. What is the main language that speakers in Mwea usually have in their
behaviour of mixing up languages?

9. Does the main language determine the order of words borrowed from the other languages?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Church</td>
<td>i. Inclusion of people into group communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. To socialize with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. School</td>
<td>i. For prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Government policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Market</td>
<td>i. Influence from friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. For business reasons / to win customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Court of Law</td>
<td>i. To express national unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Depending on the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Village streets and Shopping centres</td>
<td>i. With the intent of preventing outsiders from participating in some group communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Identifying with people in a given geographical area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Hiding ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bodaboda stage</td>
<td>i. For reasons of getting favours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Age of the passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ngumbato</td>
<td>i. For friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home / Family</td>
<td>i. For family unity and closeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Acceptance by relatives of the spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Youth Camp</td>
<td>i. Some languages are easier to understand and camp rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. The region of Mwea where one is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Socialization and rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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