

Uses and functions of English in Namibia's multiethnic settings

GERALD STELL*

ABSTRACT: In a context where new English varieties from the Outer Circle have been receiving increasing attention, I propose to outline a descriptive approach to their uses and functions on the basis of their patterns of co-occurrence with local languages across intra and inter-ethnic boundaries. The case study I offer is Namibia, a multiethnic and multilingual African country where English has been the sole official language since 1990 without having had much local history prior to that date. The general question that I pose is to what extent and how English is used in informal interactions in Namibia. Considering Namibia's ethnolinguistic diversity as well as the locally widespread practice of code-switching, the questions I more specifically ask are: What are the patterns of code-switching with which English finds itself associated both within and across Namibia's inter-ethnic boundaries, and how can they be characterized in terms of social function? On the basis of a corpus of intra- and inter-ethnic interactions involving a range of Namibian ethnicities, I show evidence of a continuum of linguistic usage ranging from different patterns of code-switching involving English and local languages to more or less monolingual English varieties. I finally place that evidence within the perspective of new Englishes theory, emphasizing the possible relevance of code-switching patterns to the emergence of indigenized English varieties in general, and of an indigenized Namibian variety in particular.

INTRODUCTION

According to Kachru (1992), the emergence of New English Varieties (NEVs), that is, these English varieties associated with the Outer Circle, is best described in terms of a process simultaneously involving 'indigenization' (i.e. the development of a local variety of English) and 'Englishization' (i.e. the impact of English on local languages). Research on these two phenomena has generally focused on borrowings, but since the distinction between borrowings and code-switching may be seen as gradual rather than categorical, the task of describing NEVs arguably requires a specific sociolinguistic approach that makes provision for the description of linguistic continua potentially ranging from largely monolingual varieties of English to patterns of code-switching¹ involving English and local languages. While generally arguing in favour of one such approach, the study presented in this article explicitly implements a distinction between intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic communication settings for the purpose of data collection and data analysis. This choice rests on two grounds: a distinction between these two types of settings is relevant to describing language variation in Outer Circle societies in general, and variation in code-switching patterns involving English is likely to be a function of speakers' movement across these types of settings. The testing ground I propose for that descriptive approach to the use and functions of English is Namibia, a multiethnic/multilingual African country where English, to the expense of Afrikaans, became the only official language in 1990.

*F.W.O./V.U.B./University of Pretoria, Centrum voor Linguïstiek; Pleinlaan 2, 1050 Brussel, Belgium. E-mail: gstell@vub.ac.be

This article is organized as follows. First, I give a brief overview of descriptive approaches to English in Outer Circle contexts before presenting the historical background of English in Namibia. After presenting the data and the methodology used to process them, I set out to describe the characteristics of code-switching involving English in Namibian intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic communication settings. I finally resituate these characteristics within the perspective of inter-ethnic contact in Namibia, and more generally within the perspective of Outer Circle societies.

VARIETIES OF ENGLISH IN THE OUTER CIRCLE

Kachru (1997) uses the term Outer Circle to refer to those generally multilingual countries where English is the overarching official language in reflection of (post)colonial links with English-speaking countries that form part of the Inner Circle. The question of how to describe new English varieties (NEVs) – usually associated with Outer Circle societies – has been a moot point within the field of world Englishes studies. The matter of including English-based post-creole continua in the concept of NEV may have been settled favourably (Bolton 2006: 251–252), but there are still signs of hesitation concerning the description of NEVs in Outer Circle societies where linguistic continua involve radically distinct local languages that typically function as L1s or lingua francas. Where does a NEV stop and a local language begin? Kachru (1992) describes NEVs as typically emerging as a result of ‘indigenization’ through among other things ‘borrowings’ from local languages while local languages concurrently tend to show signs of ‘Englishization’ through among other things ‘borrowings’ from English.² Since the distinction between borrowing and code-switching (CS) may be gradual rather than categorical, the boundary between NEVs and the various local languages they interact with may not be that clear-cut.³ As a result, research on indigenization in English varieties might have to steer away from its current focus on largely monolingual English codes to take a holistic perspective on English varieties encompassing the languages they are in contact with. The purpose of this paper is not to describe a NEV in terms of its lexical and morphosyntactic idiosyncrasies. Rather, it is to frame a NEV in terms of its patterns of co-occurrence with local languages, on the basis of which lexical and morphosyntactic idiosyncrasies may or may not crystallize.

A specific reason why it may be impossible in the Outer Circle context to draw a line between Englishization and indigenization is that the type of code-switching that these concepts involve is likely to come in the form of what Muysken (2000) calls ‘congruent lexicalization’. Particularly recurrent in postcolonial settings, that grammatical form of code-switching (CS) is one whereby it is often impossible to tell which of the participating language forms the matrix language.⁴ The occurrence of congruent lexicalization rather than insertional or alternational CS⁵ depends not only on the factor of typological proximity between the participating languages, but also on the absence of a societal tradition of language separation, and possibly on a process of language shift taking place. This can be illustrated by Afrikaans-English CS in the in-group usage of South Africa’s Coloured and White Afrikaans-speaking communities. Coloured Afrikaans-speakers – among whom there are signs of language shift to English – tend more towards congruent lexicalization than White Afrikaans-speakers, historically exposed to stronger Afrikaans-oriented puristic pressure (McCormick 2002; Stell 2009). Congruent lexicalization is loosely related to the conversational type of CS to which Auer (1999) refers as ‘language-mixing’,

that is, a type of likewise highly frequent CS whereby switching points tend not to possess any individual pragmatic salience, and as such to form part of a general bilingual speaking style.⁶ The possibility that English and local languages in the Outer Circle cannot be told apart either grammatically or conversationally underscores the desirability of describing NEVs in conjunction with the multilingual stylistic repertoires they may be part of.

Adding the description of multilingual stylistic repertoires to the tasks of world Englishes studies is not a new proposition. Foregrounding the importance to the field of building a ‘truly comparative database’ of world Englishes, Mesthrie (2006: 275) recommends that spoken data be collected across the English-speaking world using uniform variationist methodologies. Since these include the elicitation of informal data, Mesthrie (2006: 275) takes the stance – highly relevant to Outer Circle societies – that ‘[b]ilingual behavior including mixing and switching should be encouraged where natural and expected’. In my view, this recommendation should have needed to go hand in hand with the sketch of a systematic approach to multilingual data collection which variationist methodologies – historically elaborated in monolingual settings – do not usually take. Code-switching involving English and local languages may be recurrent in Outer Circle societies, but its frequency and forms may vary considerably across types of informal communication settings, especially in ethnically diverse Outer Circle societies where a salient distinction may obtain between intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic communication settings.

Methodological illustrations of systematic distinctions implemented between intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic English usage come from Inner Circle countries, namely New Zealand and the US. In an experiment involving Maori and Pakeha (i.e. White New Zealanders), Bell (2001) established contrasts between in-group and out-group Maori English usage, manifested among other things in the occurrence or non-occurrence of the Maori discourse marker *eh*. While that discourse marker occurs frequently in in-group Maori English usage, it all but disappears in interaction with Pakeha. Comparable observations were made in relation to Black-White interactions in the US: Ash & Myhill (1986) noted a marked decrease in the use made by African Americans of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) features from in-group settings to out-group settings involving European Americans. In the light of these examples, the expectation could seem warranted that out-group and in-group usage in the Outer Circle may differ, with implications for patterns of English usage. A striking difference between in-group and out-group usage in the Outer Circle could be that CS from English into L1s is less frequent in out-group usage. But, as research on intergroup accommodation suggests, out-group usage may – other than L1s and the dominant lingua franca – also involve languages otherwise not or little used in in-group settings, giving rise to a specific out-group pattern of language combination.

The aforementioned interactional patterns from New Zealand and the US can from a communication accommodation theory (CAT) perspective (Gallois et al. 2005) be read as involving socially contrasting groups in which the low status groups converge unilaterally towards the high status groups. Unilateral convergence in both cases takes place by means of English varieties tending towards the standard norm, with relatively little interference from intra-ethnic speech patterns. In multilingual settings, such interactional settings – involving a socially dominant ethnic group perceptually associated with English – patterns of use of English can be expected to be more monolingual. This may not go for other interactional settings where the groups in contact perceive each other as socially equal, in which case contact may bring about mutual convergence via, among other things, mutual code-switching into the interacting groups’ respective L1s. An example is that of

the English-based multiethnolects described by Rampton (1995) in urban England which emerged as a vehicle of solidarity among ethnically diverse immigrant communities, and which as a result exhibit a range of elements from the heritage languages of these respective communities. To what extent does mutual convergence – if it happens in the inter-ethnic communication settings obtaining in Outer Circle societies – result in patterns of CS between English and local languages distinguishable from patterns of CS between English and local languages in intra-ethnic settings?

A comprehensive description of NEVs in ethnolinguistically diverse Outer Circle contexts requires the simultaneous investigation of the use of English across intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic settings. Such a comprehensive description may reveal a continuum of code-switching patterns involving English, each associated with a specific context of intra- and inter-ethnic use. I illustrate this descriptive approach and its possible relevance to the Englishization/indigenization process below through the case of Namibia where nationhood is intimately tied to the promotion of English across historical ethnolinguistic boundaries.

ENGLISH IN NAMIBIA

English may have been Namibia's sole official language ever since 1990, but it does not have much local history before that date. Except for the British enclave of Walvis Bay (populated mainly with Cape Dutch speaking Cape Coloureds and transient British administrators, cf. Wilken & Fox 1978), all of Namibia's current territory was *terra nullius* until the German empire proclaimed it a protectorate in the late 1870s. Cape Dutch had been the dominant lingua franca in the southern and central parts ever since the so-called Oorlams (clans of westernized Khoi-Khois) arrived there from the Cape Colony from the late 18th century onwards (Stals & Ponelis 2001). By the end of the German colonial period German had been made a compulsory medium of instruction – or at least a compulsory subject – at local schools (Goldblatt 1971: 196). The proclamation of the South African mandate in 1919 over what was then known as South West Africa (SWA) brought with itself a new language policy modelled after that of the South African Union, in which Dutch (from 1924 replaced by Afrikaans, a local Dutch-based standard) and English were the two official languages.⁷ As a result of a settlement policy that favoured the immigration of White Afrikaans-speakers (Coetzee 1982: 105, 112, 172), English remained largely a foreign language throughout most of the South African period, confined to administration and schools where it was taught as a subject (Prinsloo 1982). Afrikaans was *de facto* SWA's official language, as well as the established second language of the non-White population except in the northernmost fringes (Ovamboland and the Caprivi), which had historically been insulated from the southern and central parts of SWA (Prinsloo 1984; Fourie 1991).⁸

The turning point in the history of English in SWA coincides with the instatement of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA)-led transitional government in 1980, a local corollary of the international pressure South Africa had been facing over its illegal retention of administrative control over the territory. The DTA's political agenda generally revolved around the gradual dismantlement of apartheid policies that had been transplanted into SWA, which included the devolution of some administrative competences to 'homelands', that is, areas of SWA earmarked for indigenous populations ever since the beginning of the South African mandate (Wallace & Kinnahan 2011). One immediate consequence was the abolition in the northernmost regions of the mother tongue instruction policy

implemented under South Africa's apartheid regime: where the mother tongue had been used for primary education, followed by Afrikaans at the secondary level, English was phased in as the only medium of instruction (Steyn 1980: 303). Meanwhile, SWA's main liberation movement, the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), announced its agenda of enforcing English as the only official language of Namibia, the new nation to be, at the expense of Afrikaans – dismissed as the 'oppressor's language' (UNIN 1981: 7). SWAPO's language policy came into effect shortly after Namibia's independence in 1990. Its most spectacular consequences were felt at the educational level: following in the footsteps taken earlier by northern schools, most Namibian schools – especially urban schools – implemented English as the sole medium of instruction from Grade 1, bypassing the possibility of retaining mother tongues as mediums of instruction in the first three grades (Bekett Mount 1999).

Despite hardly 2 percent of Namibia's population declaring English as their main home language (Central Bureau of Statistics 2001), English has become the most visible language in the country. The main relay of its expansion is not contact with an L1 English-speaking community, but education. Paradoxically, surveys have been highlighting the lack of proficiency in English among teaching staff and the low level of English literacy skills among students (Töttemeyer 2010: 32–40). However justifiable in such a context, mother tongue instruction may seem as an unrealistic solution in the face of increasing ethnic mixing at schools and strained resources (Töttemeyer 2010: 13), as well as – importantly – a strong bias in favour of English among parents as the most desirable medium of instruction for their children (Bekett Mount 1999). In this respect, Namibia differs little from her South African neighbour, in which the 'straight-for-English' approach is supported by non-White parents, while – on the other hand – the White Afrikaans-speaking population still tends to support the principle of mother tongue education (Webb 2002: 12; Töttemeyer 2010: 53–55).⁹ Given the comparability of Namibian and South African settings, English may have been developing a strong connotation of social ascension among Namibia's non-White populations – historically disadvantaged as a result of discrimination policies implemented at their expense by the White community under the apartheid dispensation – in probably the same terms as it has in South Africa, while White Afrikaans and German-speakers may be expected to show strong attachment to their respective languages (Schmidt-Lauber 1993; Webb 2002: 18). Whether and how English on the basis of these connotations has been able to take hold at the expense of L1s and/or Afrikaans in general Namibian linguistic usage has to this day received only scant attention.

There are hardly any descriptions of Namibian English. Perhaps the most visible attempt to describe it can be summarized by Trudgill & Hannah's (2008: 33) passing comment on it as 'similar' to South African English as far as 'relatively small groups of whites' are concerned. Whatever descriptions there are of language variation involving English in Namibia emphasize code-switching and language mixing. Beuke (1997), for example, laments the emergence of a mixed Afrikaans-English variety in Namibia as a result of exposure to Afrikaans drastically diminishing. The Namibian press abounds with references to 'Namlish', a label seemingly applied to non-White Namibian English varieties carrying a strong connotation of language mixing. To what extent and in which contexts can there be a question of English being used in intra and inter-ethnic communication settings, and to what extent and in which contexts does it cohabit with local languages, is what I propose to elucidate in the next sections after presenting the language data I collected and the methodology I employ to process them.

METHODOLOGY

The data I am using form part of a corpus assembled in 2011 which consists of semi-experimentally set up in-group and out-group interactions involving students of different ethnic backgrounds from the Windhoek campus of the University of Namibia. The recruitment of these individuals proceeded along the 'friend of a friend' approach (Milroy 1987) and was accompanied by semi-directed interviewing aimed at validating self-declared ethnolinguistic identities and eliciting perceptions of language. In reflection of Bell's (2001) study of Maori-Pakeha interactions, members of a given ethnic group were requested to separately interact with one another and successively with members of all other represented ethnic groups for durations of roughly one hour (cf. Table 4 for an overview of the recorded interactions). The interactions took place in a university room, and the resulting data were filmed and transcribed by the participants themselves.

Intra-ethnic interactions involve four participants each, except in the case of Whites, for which only two participants could be found. Only two out of these four participants were selected for the purpose of inter-ethnic interactions. In order to ensure maximal levels of informality, no guidelines for interaction were issued while the researcher was absent during the interactions. This ensured that a wide range of topics were discussed freely by means of the language varieties that the participants deemed appropriate for the occasion. The resulting data are used to answer the general question: To what extent do CS patterns involving English differ across intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic interactions?

The ethnic groups involved in this research represent most of the main ethnic groups in Namibia:¹⁰ Ovambos (49.8% of Namibia's population), Hereros (7.5%), Damaras (7.5%), White Afrikaans-speakers (4.4%), Coloureds (4.1%) and Namas (4.8%). Some of these groups share the same L1: The Coloured participants were L1 Afrikaans-speakers just as the White participants while the Nama and Damara participants were primarily Khoekhoegowab-speakers. Ovambos and Hereros speak closely related Bantu languages, namely, Oshiwambo (the Oshindonga dialect in the case of the recruited participants) and Otjiherero. All participants indicated being fluent in both English and Afrikaans, except for the Ovambo participants who declared not to possess oral competence in Afrikaans as a result of growing up in the northern districts. The participants were between 19 and 24 years old, with roughly equal numbers of male and female participants, and generally grew up in Windhoek, except in the case of the Ovambo participants, who grew up in the northern districts, and the Nama participants, who grew up in the southern districts.

While the participants were generally acquainted with their ethnic peers, they rarely knew their peers from other ethnic groups. The resulting corpus comprises 36 filmed intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic interactions which were all transcribed by in-group members with relevant linguistic knowledge. The number of words transcribed for each interaction averages between 6,000 and 7,000. Although the range of inter-ethnic combinations tested is large, the resulting data cannot be claimed to be representative of more than the upcoming educated generations living in the urban settings of Windhoek, leaving for further research, linguistic patterns observable among lower classes and in rural areas.

The linguistic analysis pursues two interrelated aims. The first aim is the description of two dimensions of English usage among the participants: first, the patterns of lexical usage within English matrix clauses which are attributable to CS into other languages, and

second, the grammatical and conversational patterns of combination of English with other languages, be they L1s or secondary lingua francas. The other aim is to relate these CS patterns to the interactional context of their occurrence.

The point of departure I take for identifying non-English lexemes is mostly Standard British English and Standard South African English norms.¹¹ The frameworks I use for describing CS phenomena between English and Namibian local languages are Muysken's (2000) grammatical typology of CS and Auer's (1999) conversational typology of CS. This results in a categorization of CS phenomena in grammatical terms of mostly insertion/congruent lexicalization and alternation, as well as in conversational terms of language alternation and language mixing.

At the core of the categorization of grammatical forms of CS implemented here lies the methodology employed by Deuchar et al. (2007) for identifying matrix languages: A given clause is identified as having language A as a matrix language if the verbal morphology in that clause stems from language A. As a result, elements from language B embedded in a language A matrix clause are categorized as insertions if they form constituents. Also following Deuchar et al. (2007), tendencies towards congruent lexicalization are measured in comparative terms. Tendencies towards congruent lexicalization will be established on the basis of higher frequencies, higher grammatical diversity of switching and presence of triggering while insertional CS will be established on the basis of the opposite tendencies (see further Muysken 2000: 230). Alternational CS will be identified on the basis of whether switches tend to occur at clausal junctures in the form of either clauses or discourse markers (cf. Muysken 2000: 230; Deuchar et al. 2007).

The categorization of conversational CS into language mixing and language alternation partly relies on frequencies of code-switching. Those samples with higher frequencies of switches will be described as tending more towards language mixing while those samples with lower frequencies of switches will conversely be described as tending more towards language alternation, following the principle that the more frequent code-switching is, the less pragmatically salient individual switches are (Auer 1998; 1999). This categorization will be qualitatively verified on the basis of evidence of pragmatic salience: switches coinciding with conversational structures (e.g. adjacency pairs or frames, cf. Auer 1998; 1999), will be regarded as indicative of language alternation, while switches lacking any clear-cut conversational functions will conversely be regarded as indicative of language mixing.

The nature of the data also invites a categorization of linguistic usage in CAT terms of convergence and maintenance/divergence on the basis of a comparison between usage in in-group settings and usage in out-group settings (Gallois et al. 2005). Specific attention will be paid to trends of convergence and their linguistic outcome. The linguistic continuum reconstructed on that basis is expected to show not only how frequent the use of English is across intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic contexts, but also the extent to which speakers' movement across these contexts involves mutual alignment with either monolingual English or with a specific pattern of code-switching involving English earmarked for inter-ethnic communication.

The analysis comprises three stages. In the first stage, intra-ethnic patterns of linguistic usage involving English are paid attention to. In the second stage, inter-ethnic patterns of linguistic usage involving English are described with an emphasis on dynamics of convergence. On the basis of a comparison between intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic English usage, the third stage resituates the obtaining continuum of Namibian English

Table 1. Overall frequencies of CS on the basis of lexeme counts

	Ovambos	Hereros	Damaras	Namas	Coloureds	Whites
Percentage of lexemes not pertaining to the in-group language	47.9%	31.9%	20%	10.9%	22.0%	3.2%
Percentage of English lexemes	47.8%	11.2%	8.9%	4.9%	22.0%	3.2%
Percentage of Afrikaans lexemes	0.1%	20.7%	11.1%	6.1%	70.5%	96.8%

varieties within the general perspective of Kachru's indigenization/Englishization process while simultaneously placing it against the background of Namibia's inter-ethnic relations.

ENGLISH IN INTRA-ETHNIC USAGE

Intra-ethnic conversations turned out to contain considerable amounts of CS involving English, Afrikaans and other languages, except among the L1 Afrikaans-speaking groups – whose CS patterns involved only Afrikaans and English. The place occupied by English in intra-ethnic interactions turns out to be highly variable. If measured in terms of lexeme numbers (cf. Table 1), the share of English in interactions is highest among the Ovambos – making up almost half of the total interaction – and weakest among the Whites. Its share is lower than that of Afrikaans among all groups except for the Ovambos.

Another point of contrast concerns the respective proportions of insertions and alternations in the totals of switches out of or into English. Example (1) shows an English insertion in a Herero matrix clause, (2) an English insertion into a Khoekhoegowab matrix clause, and (3) an English clausal alternation following a Herero clause.

- (1) Moskole ka *perform-a*.
The schools not perform
'The schools don't perform' (Herero-English CS, Herero in-group)
- (2) Want Naman ge Iinā *colonial* Ilaebba xu Iinā taob Ikha ge tsoatsoa.
'Because Namas started feeling ashamed from colonial times' (Khoekhoegowab-English CS, Nama in-group)
- (3) Otjina otjisnaaksa momurungu woye, *it is something that is meant to take you by surprise*.
'It is something weird in front of you, it is something meant to take you by surprise.'
(Herero-English CS, Herero in-group)

The share of insertions in all switches in general, and of English insertions in all switches in particular, is relatively low in the intra-ethnic interactions involving the Bantu-speaking groups, relatively high in the others (cf. Table 2). This discrepancy may have to do with the fact that insertions are less likely to occur in typologically distant pairs, such as between English/Afrikaans and Bantu languages (Muysken 2000: 247). By contrast, Afrikaans and Khoekhoegowab tend to lack the agglutinative characteristics of Bantu languages, which favours insertions, most of them English except in the case of the Nama sample.¹² English alternations, on the other hand, are generally dominant among alternational switches – except in the Herero and Nama samples, where Afrikaans alternations are dominant.

Table 2. Proportions of (English) insertions and alternations in totals of switches

	Ovambos	Hereros	Damaras	Namas	Coloureds	Whites
Percentage of insertions out of all switches	33.9%	53.3%	65.2%	70.4%	80.3%	93.5%
Percentage of English insertions out of all switches	33.9%	32.3%	37.2%	24.1%	80.3%	93.5%
Percentage of alternations out of all switches	66.1%	46.7%	34.8%	29.6%	19.7%	6.5%
% English alternations out of all switches	66.1%	16.3%	21.4%	1.9%	19.7%	6.5%

A contrast concerning the nature of English insertional and alternational types is visible across intra-ethnic interactions. English insertions that only involve a noun or an adjective form the only insertional type in the White sample (4), while in the other samples, English insertions are grammatically more diverse – and thus tending more towards congruent lexicalization (Muysken 2000: 130), as illustrated by (5) where a whole English Determiner Phrase is inserted. Also, English alternations that involve only discourse markers are dominant in the White interaction (6) whereas English clausal alternations are the most recurrent types elsewhere, as shows in (7) where the English alternation is bracketed. Reminiscent of congruent lexicalization, English clausal alternations are positionally diverse in the non-White samples, as a result of which English alternations are syntactically [–peripheral] wherever they occur in the Nonwhite samples whereas they are syntactically [+peripheral] in the White sample, in line with ‘classic’ patterns of alternational CS (Muysken 2000: 100).

- (4) Die ou sê dis’n *promise ring*
‘The guy says it is a promise ring’ (Afrikaans-English CS, White in-group)
- (5) *The other one* gwoku yoomusica oye naanaa eli *boring*
‘The other one from your music is the boring one’ (Oshiwambo-English CS, Ovambo in-group)
- (6) Ja ek kan nie weer, *ok, anyway*.
‘Yes I can’t do it again, ok, anyway’ (Afrikaans-English CS, White in-group)
- (7) Bonang okuna no *clothing line* [*and she’s even a model, she’s a TV presenter, she’s a radio presenter*]
‘Bonang has a clothing line [*and she’s even a model, she’s a TV presenter, she’s a radio presenter*]’ (Oshiwambo-English CS, Ovambo in-group)

A characteristic feature of clausal English alternations wherever they occur in the non-White samples is their frequent contiguity to inserted English elements, thus producing English stretches which altogether do not form constituents, as in (7) above where the whole English stretch is italicized while the English alternation stands in between brackets. Such occurrences can be regarded as the outcome of triggering, a phenomenon characteristic of congruent lexicalization and language mixing alike (Auer 1998; Muysken 2000: 134, 230). By contrast, clausal English alternations in the White sample do not occur in contiguity to other English elements. Besides, they possess a quotational function (8), which suggests that CS into English in the White sample tends towards language alternation.

- (8) Hulle het my gevra *what is the worst case scenario if you don’t get a place*.
‘They asked me what is the worst case scenario if you don’t get a place’ (Afrikaans-English CS, White in-group)

Table 3. Distribution of languages across speaker turns^a

	Ovambos	Hereros	Damaras	Namas	Coloureds	Whites
English	24.0%	17%	7%	0.5%	20.8%	1.0%
Afrikaans	0%	0.7%	6%	1.8%	74.8%	92.7%
In-group Language	42.0%	65.3%	75%	94.5%	74.8%	92.7%
Mixed	34%	17%	12%	3.3%	4.4%	0.4%

^aFor the purpose of the speaker turn count I only take account of those speaker turns that contain more than one lexeme, thus leaving out of consideration speaker turns consisting only of adverbials or single nouns. In categorizing speaker turns as ‘mixed’ or monolingual English/Afrikaans, I did not take account of discourse markers. Therefore, I counted English utterances with non-English discourse markers as monolingual English.

English is not only present in the forms of insertions and alternations. It is also present in the form of speaker turns (cf. Table 3). Their share in the total number of turns is highest among the Ovambos, Hereros and Coloureds, sensibly lower among the Damaras, and negligible among the Namas and Whites. The fact that monolingual English turns are more frequent than Afrikaans turns among three out of the four groups that do not have Afrikaans as an L1 could be taken as an indication that monolingual English code is more deeply entrenched in intra-ethnic stylistic repertoires than is monolingual Afrikaans code.

The conversational function of monolingual English turns is often not clear-cut in the non-White intra-ethnic interactions as their occurrence may seem random, in a pattern reminiscent of language mixing. In some cases, however, they may be taken to signal new frames, although the use of monolingual English code by participants rarely proves co-extensive with those new frames, unlike what could be expected in patterns of language alternation with highly salient CS. Example (9) below shows a monolingual English turn taken by B in which B questions A as to her ethnic origins. This switch could be interpreted as introducing a new frame coinciding with a sidetrack aiming to elucidate A’s ethnicity. A’s response to B assumes the form of a mixed code turn in which the sentential element is monolingual English, but introduced by the Oshiwambo response marker *iya* ‘yes’. This example is one of many examples of monolingual English first pair parts not being reciprocated by monolingual English second pair parts, unlike what could be expected in patterns of language alternation with highly salient CS.¹³

(9) A: *She’s Kwambi ndee* (.) *oshili that woman!*

‘She’s Kwambi but . . . truly, that woman!’

B (addressing A): *So you are half Ndonga and half Kwambi?*

A: *Iya it’s like my relative are Kwambi but I grew up in Ondonga* (Oshiwambo-English CS, Ovambo in-group)

The use of English in combination with discourse marking devices of various origins is located at the boundary between alternational CS and lexical variation within English.¹⁴ Among these discourse marking devices, the most widespread are adverbial discourse markers that are considered part of Standard Afrikaans, namely the indicator of shared knowledge *mos*, the ironic dubitative marker *kamma*, the interrogative or exclamative markers *nè*, *hoeka* and *etse/aitsa*. Of indeterminate origin are the response marker *a-ha* ‘no’, the indicator of shared knowledge *kao*, the polysemic word *nla* ‘good, fine, to like’. Combined with English or other languages (10, 11), these discourse markers

occur mostly or solely in the non-White interactions. They are found in their narrowest range in the Ovambo interaction, in their broadest range in the other non-White interactions.¹⁵

- (10) Cause I follow Omshasho babe on Twitter *mos* and they are saying it wasn't all that
(Ovambo in-group)
- (11) As if you study Portuguese *kamma*
'Like you study Portuguese' (Coloured in-group)

Another marking device located at the boundary between alternational CS and lexical variation within English is the phonotactic adaptation of English lexemes, constituents, or clauses ending on a final consonant in the Ovambo and Herero interactions.¹⁶ This is visible in isolated English insertions such as *commission-a*, *perform-a*, *court-a*, *ladies-a*, *commitments-a* which occur in seemingly free variation with their phonotactically unadapted counterparts. (12) and (13) illustrate the use made of phonotactic adaptation in English clauses, where it seems to possess the same salience as that associated with switched discourse markers: they may as such possess an emblematic function, and qualify as language alternation.

- (12) That's how she got famous-*a* (Ovambo in-group)
- (13) Speaker 1: Which lady is this?
Speaker 2: This other relative of mine-*a* (Ovambo in-group)

All in all, there is evidence of two patterns of CS involving English and L1s, one tending towards congruent lexicalization and language mixing, the other tending less towards congruent lexicalization and more towards language alternation. If one leaves out of consideration the Nama interaction,¹⁷ there is – on the basis of frequency and grammatical diversity of CS – a case for calling the former type 'non-White' and the other type 'White'. A qualitative look at non-English discourse markers appearing in combination with English does, however, suggest that language alternation between English into L1s or into L2 Afrikaans can occur in every in-group's usage.

ENGLISH IN INTER-ETHNIC USAGE

English is used to various degrees as a medium of communication across all inter-ethnic interactions, forming the main language in all interactions involving Ovambos, as well as in the Damara-Herero interaction. By contrast, Afrikaans is the main medium of communication in all other inter-ethnic interactions, except the Damara-Nama interaction where Khoekhoegowab is the main medium of communication. Table 4 summarizes the use of languages across interactions in terms of proportions of lexemes from English, Afrikaans, and other languages.

The figures contained in this table show that inter-ethnic interactions involving Ovambos are marked by convergence towards a mostly monolingual English code, which did not obtain in intra-ethnic interactions. The figures also suggest convergence at the level of the use of English in inter-ethnic interactions involving L1 Afrikaans speakers. It is quite striking that the Coloured participants engage in less Afrikaans-English CS in favour of a more monolingual Afrikaans code when interacting with the White participants as well as with the other L2 Afrikaans-speaking participants. On the other hand, the White

Table 4. Use of languages across interactions

Language Group	Ovambos	Hereros	Damaras	Namas	Coloureds	Whites
Ovambos interacting with	E: 64.2 A: 0.4 I: 35.2	E: 99.6 A: 0.4	E: 99.5 A: 0.5	E: 99.6 A: 0.4	E: 99.7 A: 0.3	E: 100
Hereros interacting with	E: 99.5 A: 0.5	E: 13 A: 6.7 I: 80.2	E: 94.1 A: 5.8	E: 9.4 A: 85.5 I: 5.1	E: 7.2 A: 92.8	E: 33.4 A: 66.4 I: 0.2
Damaras interacting with	E: 99.4 A: 0.6	E: 93 A: 6.9	E: 13 A: 4 I: 83	E: 3.7 A: 5.3 I: 91	E: 15.3 A: 84.7	E: 13.2 A: 86.7
Namas interacting with	E: 99.6 A: 0.4	E: 7.6 A: 86.4 I: 6	E: 1.8 A: 3.1 I: 95.1	E: 0.5 A: 1.2 I: 98.2	E: 2.4 A: 97.1 I: 0.5	E: 1.9 A: 98
Coloureds interacting with	E: 99.4 A: 0.4	E: 15.7 A: 83.3	E: 16.6 A: 83.1	E: 1.92 A: 97.54	E: 36 A: 64	E: 20.1 A: 79.8
Whites interacting with	E: 100	E: 23.9 A: 76	E: 5.9 A: 95	E: 3.1 A: 96.8	E: 5.8 A: 94.1	E: 2.9 A: 97

E: English, A: Afrikaans, I: In-group Language. Lexeme count involving two participants per ethnic group (%)

participants tend to ‘English up’ their Afrikaans when interacting with Coloureds and L2 Afrikaans-speakers.

There is a range of interactions in which the language of interaction is reset. This is the case in the Herero-White interaction, in which White Participant 1 is initially interacting with the two Herero participants in English as a result of engaging with them in English. However, White Participant 2 – who evidenced a strong attachment to Afrikaans during the interviewing stage – ends up imposing Afrikaans as the medium of interaction by not accommodating in English his Herero interlocutors. The language of interaction is also temporarily reset in the Herero-Damara interaction, where the medium of interaction is generally English allegedly as a result of the participants knowing each other from a Windhoek secondary school where they experienced English as a default lingua franca. The participants can be observed to use a monolingual Afrikaans code at a few junctures of the exchange while they otherwise keep using Afrikaans insertions in English matrix clauses and Afrikaans alternations with a seemingly salient conversational function. (14) exemplifies the frequent use of Afrikaans insertions in English matrix clauses with an instance of an Afrikaans collective plural *-goede* ‘and stuff’ which seems to derive an emblematic value from its occurrence against an overwhelmingly monolingual English code, while (15) illustrates Afrikaans alternations filling a quotational function. Finally, (16) illustrates convergence around an Afrikaans-English mixed code as a result of Damara Participant 1 switching to Afrikaans against a largely monolingual English background.

- (14) Okay if you’re going to do accounting-*goede* then fine, but you have to take it or otherwise you don’t have math and accounting or do you? (Damara-Herero interaction)
- (15) He followed me everywhere, he only came to university this year I was here before him and he says *ek en jy Yvonne ons was saam vir amper tien jaar*

‘He followed me everywhere, he only came to university this year I was here before him and he says me and you Yvonne we were together for almost ten years’ (Damara-Herero interaction)

(16) Damara 1 (addressing Herero 1): *Hy sal eendag gevang word hy en Quera*
‘He will be caught one day, he and Quera’

Herero 1 (answering Damara 1): Getting a licence is *moeilik*
‘Getting a licence is difficult’

Damara 2 (addressing Herero 1): *Is waar daardie boek* (.) that book is net (. . .) =
‘It’s true, that book, that book is just . . . ’

Damara 1 (addressing Damara 2): = *Swaar*
‘ . . . difficult’ (Damara-Herero interaction)

English in other interactions involving participants with L1 or L2 knowledge of Afrikaans may or may not fill conversational functions. A salient use is occasionally made of English in the White-Coloured interaction, such as when a Coloured participant – who momentarily finds himself left out within an exchange mostly taking place between the two present White participants – tries to reclaim the floor by putting English questions to one of the White participants (17). Seen from the perspective of CAT, the Coloured participant’s choice for English could be read as a strategy of divergence aiming at claiming authority amid a monolingual Afrikaans interactional context dominated by the White participants. Endowed with this conversational function, the participant’s switch into English qualifies as indicative of language alternation.

(17) White 2 (addressing White 1): *Weet jy wat is dit dit is* (.) die lecturers kyk na hoe die persoon optree en wat hy (.) en wat hy in sy mind (. . .) =
‘You know what is this (.) this is the lecturers look at how the person behaves and what he [has got] on his mind.’

Coloured 2 (addressing White 2): = *hoe hy sou dit uitbeel* =
‘How he would represent it.’

White 1 (addressing White 1): = *hoe interpretate hy*
‘How he interprets.’

Coloured 2 (addressing White 1): *And how do they judge you?*

White 1 (addressing Coloured 2): *Nee maar dit is net die begin van die interviews*
‘No but it’s just the beginning of the interviews’
(Coloured-White interaction)

This instance of English floor taking contrasts with other instances of English floor taking in interactions involving non-White participants with L1 or L2 knowledge of Afrikaans (other than the Damara-Herero interaction discussed earlier). In those interactions, Afrikaans and English turns cohabit seemingly without invoking authority values or indexing new conversational frames, forming instead part of a bilingual style akin to language mixing.

Inter-ethnic interactions involving the Ovambo participants are characterized by the use of English with little CS, or no CS when these interactions also involve the White participants. Some of that CS can be accounted for as participants diverging into their L1 for emblematic purposes, and as such qualifies as language alternation. This is illustrated

by (18) where the male Herero participant attempts to ward off suspicions aired by the female Ovambo participant that he might ever become gay by countering them with a Herero response marker *ayee* ‘no’, of which the pragmatic effect is to throw into relief the adjoined English negative adverbs while possibly calling up the imagery of Herero manhood in the face of a doubtful Ovambo woman.

- (18) Herero participant: If you’re meant to be a man then you should be a man. You know there is a saying that says never say never but I’m saying never gay, seriously.
Ovambo participant: Are you saying never?
Herero participant: Never ever
Ovambo participant: I will see a big picture of you on Facebook or wherever <laughs>
Herero participant: *Ayee* never ever (Herero-Ovambo interaction)

Interestingly, features shared by in-group Oshiwambo-English and Otjiherero-English code-switching are absent in Ovambo-Herero interactions. This goes for the phonotactic adaptation of English lexemes, as well as for homophonous Otjiherero and Oshiwambo insertions occurring in the form of subordinate conjunctions, such as Oshiwambo *kutya* and Otjiherero *kutja* ‘that’ in [...] *but my sister told me kutya it’s one model* (Ovambo in-group) and *it just happens kutja you end up doing something you don’t want* (Herero in-group). Where convergence between Hereros and Ovambos could take place by means of English varieties displaying these common features, it instead takes place by means of an English variety in which CS only involves alternations in the form of the discourse markers of Afrikaans origin or of indeterminate origin presented in the preceding section, which in fact form the bulk of code-switches in the English varieties used in all inter-ethnic interactions involving Ovambos.

Non-English discourse markers used in combination with English in non-White interactions involving Ovambos are met in their narrowest range among Ovambo participants, in their broadest range among other non-White participants. Interestingly, a few of these discourse markers are used by the Ovambo participants in inter-ethnic interactions – such as *kamma* in particular – while they were not used in the Ovambo intra-ethnic interaction. Despite such signs of mutual convergence around what could be termed a ‘non-White Namibian register’, the fact that the Herero, Damara, Nama and Coloured participants remain the exclusive users of a few discourse markers (e.g. *kao*, *aitsa/etse*, *hoeka*) could mean that these discourse markers have acquired the function of signalling membership of a non-White ethnic group other than Ovambo. In other words, non-English discourse markers in inter-ethnic interactions between Ovambos and other non-Whites seem invested with an identity value that makes them salient.

In summary, there is evidence of different patterns of code-switching involving English which are seemingly determined by the ethnic background of the participants. At a structural level, these patterns may involve monolingual English varieties (used in interactions featuring Whites), English varieties marked by a common set of non-English discourse markers (used among non-Whites), or an Afrikaans-English mixed code (used in the Damara-Herero interaction). At a conversational level, English is used in patterns of language mixing involving Afrikaans among non-Whites with L1 or L2 knowledge of Afrikaans. English also seems to occur in conversational patterns of language alternation when marked by non-English discourse markers (i.e. in non-White

interactions involving Ovambos) or when its use is aimed at bringing about divergence (i.e. in the Coloured-White interaction). I attempt to reconstruct in the next section the observed continuum of CS patterns involving English while relating it to societal trends in Namibia.

ENGLISH AND NAMIBIA'S MULTILINGUAL CONTEXT

Generally, the Namibian patterns of CS involving English presented in the preceding sections can be categorized according to language combination and language dominance. English was found in combination with each of the participants' L1s (and sometimes L2 Afrikaans) in the intra-ethnic interactions. English was found to function as a dominant medium of interaction mostly in the inter-ethnic interactions, where it appeared in a continuum of forms ranging from a monolingual form to a bilingual form involving extensive CS into Afrikaans via intermediate forms marked by non-English discourse markers against a largely monolingual English background.

Intra-ethnic patterns of CS involving English can be categorized in terms of their grammatical and conversational features. Even though – in reflection of typological factors – alternational CS is dominant in Ovambo/Herero intra-ethnic interactions while insertional CS is dominant in other intra-ethnic interactions, there are altogether more signs of congruent lexicalization among non-Whites than among Whites in intra-ethnic interactions. If one leaves out CS involving discourse markers, conversational CS involving English among Whites revealed a [+salient] type typical of language alternation while it exhibited among non-Whites a [-salient] type typical of language mixing. In other words, English tends to form an inextricable part of non-White intra-ethnic stylistic repertoires. Inter-ethnic patterns of CS involving English also seem to tend towards congruent lexicalization and language mixing in those settings where the interactants are non-White and Afrikaans is the dominant language. By contrast, they are more alternational and more interpretable as language alternation in those interactional settings involving Ovambos and Whites.

The data revealed patterns of CS marked by the use or non-use of a range of non-English discourse markers in combination with monolingual English code. These discourse markers can be called 'intra-ethnic' in certain cases, such as in the case of the strategies of phonotactic adaptation that were found in the English varieties used by the Herero and Ovambo participants within intra-ethnic interactions. Some of the non-English discourse markers that were encountered can also be called 'pan-ethnic non-White' in that they occur across non-White intra and inter-ethnic settings. It must, however, be stressed that only restricted combinations of these discourse markers occur among the Ovambo participants while the most comprehensive combinations of these discourse markers occur among the other non-White participants.

A systematic comparison between intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic settings shows that patterns of CS involving English must be described as components of stylistic repertoires, which for some individuals turned out to vary considerably not only across the intra-ethnic/inter-ethnic dichotomy, but also across inter-ethnic combinations. The main styles involving English that could be identified are as follows:

- L1-dominated styles involving CS into English, characteristic of non-White participants in intra-ethnic interactions;
- an English-based style with salient or non-salient CS into Afrikaans, specific to the Damara-Herero interaction;

- an English-based style with non-White discourse markers, characteristic of inter-ethnic interactions involving Ovambos in interaction with other non-Whites; and
- an English-based style without non-White discourse markers, characteristic of inter-ethnic interactions involving Whites.

This summary suggests that the most monolingual Namibian English-based styles might have to be sought in specific inter-ethnic communication settings, as in particular those inter-ethnic communication settings involving Ovambos and Whites.

Those English-based styles are variable. The Ovambo participants and the other non-White participants may have opted for a mostly monolingual English code for interacting with one another, but in the process combined that monolingual English code with different ranges of non-English discourse markers. In other words, the use or non-use of certain discourse markers in combination with English may have acquired the function of emphasizing a socio-political rift between Ovambos and other non-White ethnicities. That rift may have two origins. There is on the one hand resentment among non-Ovambos at the SWAPO dispensation, perceived as mainly promoting Ovambo interests (Düsing 2002: 161–162). On the other hand, inter-ethnic tensions may be arising in the specific context of Windhoek where Ovambos tend to be fresh immigrants while other non-White ethnic groups are long-established (Pendleton 1996). The Ovambo population's claim to legitimacy in an urban environment where Afrikaans is long established as a lingua franca (Ohly 1987) and where they have been historically underrepresented, may involve identification with more standard and more monolingual varieties of English, which form the linguistic attribute of Namibian nationhood as promoted by the SWAPO dispensation (Pendleton 1996, Maho 1998).

The fact that the non-White participants use a monolingual English variety without 'non-White' discourse markers in their interactions with the White participants is the linguistic reflection of a historical White/non-White socioeconomic dichotomy inherited from apartheid in which whiteness is still invested with prestige and is as such perceived as worth converging to in the specific settings of interaction with Whites (see further Stell & Beyer 2012 for a detailed study of unilateral linguistic convergence from Namibian Coloureds to Whites).

The findings detailed in this paper are in a position to cast Kachru's description of the Englishization/indigenization process in a new light. To begin with, they confirm that CS between L1s/L2 Afrikaans and English can be intensive to the extent that the boundary between them may not be that clear-cut. With regard to Englishization, some intra-ethnic interactions – particularly in the case of Ovambos, Hereros and Coloureds – showed English to have become an inextricable component of L1s by virtue of forming part of a pattern of CS that tends towards congruent lexicalization and language-mixing. With regard to indigenization, they showed intra-ethnic varieties of English to bear the marks of L1s/L2 Afrikaans through strategies of alternational CS in the form of non-English discourse markers – of which phonotactic adaptation among Hereros and Ovambos is perhaps the most fitting example. Inter-ethnic varieties of English offer quite a different picture, however, in which the causal link implied between indigenization and CS with local languages must be qualified.

No inter-ethnic interaction showed L1s to combine with English, except in the form of localized instances of divergence into the L1 as exemplified by (18). It seems that inter-ethnic convergence around a more or less monolingual variety of English is a prerequisite

for bringing about a common linguistic ground between (some) ethnic groups. The pursuit of that prerequisite seems to be the explanation for the fact that strategies of phonotactic adaptation of English lexemes are totally absent from the Herero-Ovambo interaction even though phonotactic adaptation is a feature shared by the intra-ethnic English varieties used by Ovambos and Hereros. This need not mean, however, that the English as used in inter-ethnic interactions is not undergoing indigenization.

As it turned out, inter-ethnic convergence through English involved mutual convergence of non-White participants around a range of discourse markers that are to a large extent shared across non-White intra-ethnic repertoires. Many of these discourse markers can be described as Afrikaans without being associated with White Afrikaans. Seen from a CAT perspective, their convergent use in the non-White Namibian context conveys inter-ethnic solidarity values. One of the functions of these inter-ethnic solidarity values may be to 'water down' the White and/or middle/upper-class connotations of monolingual English usage. As such, the use of these discourse markers is an important feature of the use of English as a Namibian non-White lingua franca: They are at the core of the indigenization process that may cause a Namibian non-White English variety to start emerging in conscious opposition to monolingual English varieties which the dynamics of inter-ethnic convergence detailed in this paper showed to be earmarked for interaction with Whites.

CONCLUSION

If indigenization/Englishization and CS are treated on a par, the Namibian case study presented in this paper shows that Englishization of L1s and indigenization of English go to a large extent hand in hand, yet not necessarily across contexts of communication. Intra-ethnic stylistic repertoires in Namibia reveal evidence of strong Englishization in Namibian L1s and indigenization of English as a result of CS between L1s and English. By contrast, inter-ethnic communication settings produce a specific indigenized variety of English on which L1s have a lesser impact than has Afrikaans – today still a major inter-ethnic lingua franca in Namibia. A cursory glance at other Outer Circle societies suggests that the local emergence of NEVs may to a large extent have taken place in comparable contexts of cohabitation between English and other lingua francas. Swahili functions as a primary lingua franca in Anglophone East Africa, Pidgin English fulfils that function among a large part of Nigeria's population, and as such they may provide linguistic elements usable as the symbolic common denominator for East African and Nigerian inter-ethnic English varieties. 'Glocalization' causes English to both spread and to indigenize. Indigenization processes may lead to different outcomes in multiethnic Outer societies according to whether they are meant to carry ethnic or pan-ethnic values.

NOTES

1. I use for the purpose of this paper the term 'code-switching' as a cover term for the various linguistic phenomena involving language juxtaposition.
2. Besides borrowings, Kachru (1992) also mentions grammatical influences of English on L1s as part of the Englishization process, as the use of passive constructions with a 'by' equivalent in Korean.
3. Myers-Scotton (1993) characterizes the distinction between borrowing and code-switching as not categorical since both borrowings and code-switches can exhibit the same degrees of phonological or morphosyntactic integration (Myers-Scotton 1993: 165). On this basis, there is little theoretical ground for distinguishing between a lexical item

from language B in English and a clause from language B adjoined to an English clause, since both can be equally referred to as code-switches.

4. Congruent lexicalization can be regarded as a form of highly frequent ‘insertional CS’, that is, a form of CS whereby constituents from language B are inserted in language A, with the difference that function words in insertional CS all derive from language A, which as a result is regarded as the matrix language (see further Muysken 2000).
5. Alternational CS refers to that grammatical form of CS whereby clauses or syntactically disjunct elements such as discourse markers are switched. As a result, a hallmark of that form of CS is that matrix languages visibly alternate. Alternational CS typically occurs in typologically distant language pairs as well as in societal contexts where each language is used in specific contexts to the exclusion of others (see further Muysken 2000).
6. As such, language mixing is opposed to ‘language alternation’, whereby each participating language is allocated well-delineated slots within the unfolding exchange. Language alternation is comparable to alternational CS in that it tends to occur at clausal junctures (see further Auer 1999).
7. German was allowed to retain symbolic official functions as part of the South African Union’s strategy not to alienate the remaining German settler population (Maho 1998:170).
8. Ovamboland had *de facto* lain beyond the reach of German colonial authority. Even though ample use has been made of migrant Ovambo workforce ever since the German period, the South African policy of influx control kept Ovambo settlement outside of Ovamboland at relatively low levels (Wallace & Kinnahan 2011).
9. There are currently four Afrikaans-medium schools in Namibia, all of them private. The only public school in Namibia with a medium of instruction other than English is a German-medium school.
10. Not represented in the selection are Okavangos (9.3% of Namibia’s population), Caprivians (3.7%), Tswanas (0.6%) and Bushmen (2.9%, cf. Central Bureau of Statistics 2001).
11. The reason behind that choice is that Standard British English and Standard South African norms have been the prestige norms in South Africa. The historical connection between Namibia and South Africa implies that these norms have also been the dominant English norms – at least during the South African period when school curricula where designed from South Africa (Lass 1995:89–90).
12. Poplack (1980) predicts that CS into language B tends to happen at points of linear equivalence and where no morphological marking is required by language A. Example (5) shows an English adjective inserted in a Khoekhoegowab matrix clause. Adjectives may be placed pre-nominally in Khoekhoegowab, where they do not take inflections (Olpp 1977). In Poplack’s perspective, this is one context in which CS into English can happen more easily in Khoekhoegowab than in Bantu languages, where adjectives are postnominal and need inflections.
13. Pair parts (i.e. first and second pair parts) are constitutive of adjacency pairs (Schegloff 2007:13). For the relevance of adjacency pairs to CS, see Auer (1998).
14. Switched discourse markers are considered to form alternations on account of their syntactically disjunct nature (see further Muysken 2000).
15. Among these discourse markers, only *mos* occurs in the White interaction, albeit to a significantly lesser extent than in the non-White interactions.
16. Lexemes do not usually end on a consonant in Bantu languages, while they do in Khoekhoegowab.
17. Frequencies and grammatical diversity of CS is low in the Nama sample, a fact which could be explained by the rural origin of the two Nama participants, who attended southern schools where Afrikaans and Khoekhoegowab were the dominant mediums of interaction.

REFERENCES

- Ash, Sharon & John Myhill. 1986. Linguistic correlates of inter-ethnic contact. In David Sankoff (ed.), *Diversity and diachrony*, 33–44. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter. 1998. Bilingual conversation revisited. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*, 1–24. London: Routledge.
- Auer, Peter. 1999. From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4). 309–332.
- Bekett Mount, Lisa. 1999. Post-Apartheid nation-building: Whose culture shapes educational policy? In Bruce Fuller (ed.), *Government confronts culture: The struggle for local democracy in Southern Africa*, 113–164. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Bell, Allan. 2001. Back in style: Reworking audience design. In: Penelope Eckert and John Rickford (eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation*, 139–169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beuke, Chrisna. 1997. Afrikaans in Namibië: Kontak en konflik. In Wim De Geest (ed.), *Recente studies in de Contactlinguïstiek*, 1–7. Bonn: Dümmler.
- Bolton, Kingsley. 2006. World Englishes Today. In Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru and Cecil L. Nelson (eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes*, 240–270. London: Blackwell.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 2001. *2001 Population and Housing Census*. Windhoek: National Planning Commission.
- Coetzee, E.R. 1982. Die geskiedenis van landelike vestiging van Blankes in Suidwes-Afrika, 1915–1931. MA thesis, Rand Afrikaanse Universiteit.

- De Klerk, Vivian & David Gough. 2002. Black South African English. In Rajend Mesthrie (ed.), *Language in South Africa*, 356–380. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deuchar, Margaret, Pieter Muysken & Sung-Lan Wang. 2007. Structured variation in code-switching: Towards an empirically based typology of bilingual speech corpora. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10(3), 298–340.
- Düsing, Sandra. 2002. *Traditional leadership and democratisation in Southern Africa. A comparative study of Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa*. Hamburg: LIT.
- Fourie, David J. 1991. Sociolinguistic trends in Owamboland. *News from the Languages Society of Namibia* 2(2), 6.
- Gallois, Cindy, Ogay Tania & Giles Howard. 2005. Communication accommodation theory: A Look back and a look ahead. In W. B. Gudykunst (ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication*, 121–148. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Goldblatt, Israel. 1971. *History of South West Africa. From the beginning of the 19th century*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1992. World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching* 25(1), 1–14.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1997. World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17(1), 66–87.
- Lass, Roger. 1995. South African English. In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Language and social history: Studies in South African sociolinguistics*, 89–106. Claremont: David Philip.
- Maho, Jouni F. 1998. *Few people, many tongues. The languages of Namibia*. Cape Town: Gamsberg Macmillan.
- McCormick, Kay. 2002. *Language in Cape Town's District Six*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mesthrie, Rajend. 2006. Contact linguistics and world Englishes. In Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru & Cecil L. Nelson (eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes*, 273–288. London: Blackwell.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1987. *Observing and analysing natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual speech. A typology of language mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling languages. Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ohly, Rajmund. 1987. *The destabilization of the Herero language*. Windhoek: The Academy.
- Olpp, J. 1977. *Nama-Grammatika*. Windhoek: Departement van Bantoe-Onderwys.
- Pendleton, Wade C. 1996. *Katutura, a place where we stay: Life in a post-Apartheid township in Namibia*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Center for International Studies.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish t termino en Español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18(7–8), 581–618.
- Prinsloo, Karel P. 1982. *Aspekte van taal- en kommunikasieaangeleenthede in SWA/Namibië*. Vol. 1–13. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Prinsloo, Karel P. 1984. *Die status van Afrikaans en die ander hooftale in SWA/Namibië*. In Karel P. Prinsloo and Christo van Rensburg (eds.), *Afrikaans: Stand, taak, toekomst*, 124–136. Pretoria: Opvoedkundige Uitgewery.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. New York: Longman.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in conversation analysis*. Volume I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt-Lauber, Brigitta. 1993. *Die abhängigen Herren: deutsche Identität in Namibia*. Münster: LIT.
- Stals Ernst L.P. & Fritz A. Ponelis. 2001. *Só het Afrikaans na Namibië gekom*. Windhoek: Gamsberg McMillan.
- Stell, Gerald. 2009. Code-switching and ethnicity: Grammatical types of code-switching in the Afrikaans speech community. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 199(2), 103–128.
- Stell, Gerald & Herman Beyer. 2012. Interethnic relations and language variation: Namibian Coloureds and Whites in interaction. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 41, 115–139.
- Steyn, Jacob C. 1980. *Tuiste in eie taal. Die behoud en bestaan van Afrikaans*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Töttemeyer, Andree-Jeanne. 2010. Multilingualism and the language policy for Namibian schools. *PRAESA Occasional Papers* 37, Cape Town.
- Trudgill, Peter & Jean Hannah. 2008. *International English. A guide to the varieties of Standard English*. 5th edn. London: Routledge.
- UNIN. 1981. *Toward a language policy for Namibia. English as the official language: Perspectives and strategies*. Lusaka: United Nations Institute for Namibia.
- Wallace, Marion & John Kinahan. *A history of Namibia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Webb, Vic. 2002. *Language in South Africa. The role of language in national transformation, reconstruction and development*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wilken, J. & G. Fox. 1978. *The history of the port and settlement of Walvis Bay*. Johannesburg: Perskor.