CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

To better understand the occurrence of code-switching (CS) in Botswana classrooms, an awareness of the language situation in Botswana is imperative. Equally important is an understanding of the role of English in Botswana. According to Batibo and Smieja (2000), research has not yet established the exact number of languages in Botswana owing to the blurred distinction between a language and a dialect. Webb (2002: 72) made a similar observation on the linguistic profile of South Africa when he commented that it is difficult to be precise about the number and identity of languages of South Africa. Notwithstanding the above, it is generally agreed that Botswana has at least 25 languages, including English and Setswana (Webb & Kembo-Sure, 2000: 47; Molosiwa, 2006: 16; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004). Batibo (2006) puts the figure at 28. The exact status of Setswana is debatable, as scholars do not agree on the precise proportion of the population of Setswana speakers who speak the language as their mother tongue, or use it only as a second language. For instance, Nyati-Ramahobo (2004: 31) states that Setswana is spoken by eight Tswana tribes that comprise 80% of the population. Other scholars put the figure at 78.6% (Batibo, 2006), or 90% (Webb & Kembo-Sure, 2000: 47). Molosiwa (2006: 17) adds another dimension by stating that Setswana is spoken by at least 80% of the population either as their mother tongue or as a second language. Despite these conflicting figures, all these scholars agree that Setswana is the most widely spoken language in the country, hence its status as the national language. Other languages (at least 23 of them) make up the remaining 21.4% of the population (Batibo, 2006).

English is the official language in Botswana and is used in the secondary domain cluster functioning as the language of education, government administration, the judiciary, science and technology, trade and industry, and the media. Setswana is the national language but has limited use in some of the secondary domain clusters such as education, government administration, the judiciary and the media. However, it still predominantly functions in primary domain clusters as a language spoken by family,

1

friends, in religion, in the local markets, domestic service, and in traditional social institutions. Other local languages such as Ikalanga, Shiyeyi, and Sekgalagadi to mention but a few function strictly within primary domain clusters.

Setswana was the first indigenous language to undergo status and corpus planning. To date, few indigenous languages, including Ikalanga and Shiyeyi, have undergone corpus planning, mainly by the efforts of some scholars but not by the efforts of government. The language issue in Botswana is beginning to receive much attention. Language activists are pressurizing the government to give all indigenous languages the same treatment as that of Setswana. The feeling among these scholars is that the government is deliberately stifling the development of these languages (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004). In the views of these language speakers, by not promoting their languages in the same way that Setswana is promoted, the government is denying them the right to use their languages in order to assimilate them into Setswana. They view the attitude of the government as treating language not as a right and a resource but as a problem. The proponents of this view were supported by the Government's rejection of Recommendation 18 (e) made by the second National Commission on Education (NCE 2) of 1993: 115 regarding the teaching of local languages in schools which stated that:

> Where parents request that other local languages be taught to their children, the school should make arrangements to teach them as a co-curricular activity.

The government's argument for the rejection of this recommendation was that there would be undue pressure on schools to offer the various languages spoken in the country as schools have no capacity to undertake this new task and the education system is unable to support such a development. In addition, it was contrary to the national language policy. The latter implies that the national language, Setswana, should be the only local language taught in schools with the objective of building a unified nation in which "… tribal groups will … take secondary place" (Carter & Morgan, quoted in Molosiwa, 2006: 23). In the spirit of the national language policy, nationhood takes precedence over ethnic identity.

Looking at the ethnic conflict in Africa, it is perhaps fair to say that the initial decision to promote nationhood over ethnicity was a wise one. Building a unified nation after independence was the greatest priority given that a number of African countries were ravaged by wars resulting from ethnic tensions after independence. These fears were not without reason. However, having succeeded in building a united nation that proudly calls itself the Batswana, whilst other ethnic groups had to accept being collectively identified as Batswana, it is perhaps time for the government to make some concessions and begin to show a willingness to recognize Botswana as a multilingual country and ethnic diversity as a right and a resource, and not a problem. Paying lip-service to the recognition of ethnic diversity without showing any tangible efforts to promote other languages will only exacerbate the problem. The general feeling among these ethnic groups is that their languages and cultures are being suppressed. Consequently, they are also indirectly being suppressed. Botswana is projected as a monolingual country while, in fact, it is not. In this regard it is way behind other countries such as Benin, Ghana, Guinea, Nigeria and Togo, which have promoted indigenous languages (Webb, 1995: 103). Even a young democracy like South Africa has made visible progress regarding the promotion of its indigenous languages by declaring that there are 11 official languages, including nine indigenous languages (Murray, 2002: 436; Webb, 1995: 77). In addition, the Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB) is charged with the responsibility of promoting and creating conditions for the development and use of all the official languages, including the Khoi and San languages and the South African sign languages (Heugh, 2002: 462). Therefore, in Botswana, the issue should not be that other languages are not being developed because their speakers are numerically fewer than Setswana speakers, or that some Tswana groups taken individually are viewed as minority groups. Both arguments are weak; in fact, the arguments advanced by both sides (government and language activists) are wrong. All indigenous languages should be developed to enable their speakers not only to identify with them, express their cultures through them, but also to be able to eventually use them in high function, formal contexts. As Bamgbose (1991), Batibo (2004), Kamwangamalu (2004: 34 quoting Diop, 1999: 6-7) rightly noted, one cannot develop a people by using a foreign language. The same observation was made by Shope, Mazwai, and Makgoba (1999: xi in Kamwangamalu, 2004: 36).

1.1.1 The status of English in Botswana

English plays a prominent role in all spheres of life in Botswana (cf. para. 2 above).
For instance, the Constitution of Botswana states in Sections 61 (d) and 79 (c) that it is
a requirement that one should be functionally literate in English to be either a member
of Parliament or a member of the House of Chiefs (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004: 52). This
implies that both English and Setswana are languages of deliberation in both Houses.
Notwithstanding this pronouncement, most members of both Houses continue to
deliberate mainly in English because its use is viewed as a sign of high educational
status. It is ironic that the latter group – the Chiefs -- are seen as the custodians of
culture and language.

The government is the main and active promoter of English to such an extent that most
of its business is conducted in English. For instance, communication with the general
public is conducted in English. According to Nyati-Ramahobo (2004), a study was
conducted in three government ministries, namely Agriculture, Commerce and
Industry, and Health to find out in which language the government communicates with
the public. The study revealed that, in the Ministry of Agriculture, 61% of the
documents were written in English; in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, 95% of
the documents were in English; and in the Ministry of Health 42% of the documents
were in English. This practice is not limited to these three ministries only. In fact, it is
not uncommon for a government representative to address a large audience,
comprising mainly of Batswana, in English with or without a Setswana interpreter,
instead of the other way round. This occurs frequently during Independence Day
celebrations, the day that the Batswana are supposed to assert their nationhood, but
ironically the official programme is often largely conducted in English. In this regard,
Batibo (2006) called for a paradigm shift and a radical change so that Setswana
becomes functional at official events. He cautions that the tendency not to use the
national language during official functions may render it to the mere symbolic status as
opposed to a functional status (Batibo, 2006).

Similarly, English is the main language of the media (both public and private). A
study conducted at the two government-owned radio stations revealed that RB2, the
radio station that targets a youthful audience, broadcasts 70% of the time in English

(Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004). The situation is no better in the print media. The *Daily News*, which is the only government-owned newspaper, prints only two pages out of 24 pages in Setswana. Although no research known to the researcher has been conducted thus far of the government-owned television station, Btv, on the English / Setswana content of its programmes, from an ad hoc observation the situation is no better as most programmes appear to be presented largely in English. Other languages do not feature in the government audio, visual or print media. This is a source for worry because the government should lead by example. However, one government success story is the government-owned magazine, *Kutlwano* which, since its inception after the independence of Botswana, has always been published in both English and Setswana.

The situation is worse in the private sector where the only language of business and administration is English. Setswana is limited to spoken communication only. The private media is no different: of at least eight private local newspapers, only one used to disseminate news entirely in Setswana. This was the *Mokgosi* newspaper launched in 2003 that was unfortunately closed down towards the end of 2005 largely due to lack of advertising. One other newspaper, *Mmegi*, while it publishes mainly in English, used to have some articles printed in Setswana, and a column in Ikalanga, a local language. When the paper changed from a weekly one to a daily publication, Setswana disappeared from its pages, except for occasional announcements prepared by some government departments or parastatal organizations. Instead, a four-page supplement named *Naledi* in the paper is printed entirely in Setswana, while Ikalanga disappeared completely from the publication. This was an unfortunate step backward as this newspaper was viewed as promoting not only Setswana but at least one of the marginalized languages, as well. The only other private television station (the Gaborone Broadcasting Corporation) broadcasts entirely in English. Three privately owned radio stations – Gabs FM (for more mature audiences), Yarona FM and Duma FM (for more youthful audiences) - broadcast entirely in English with some instances of CS or CM as Tshinki (2002) and Ramando (2002) noted, even though they aim to reach a larger audience beyond the capital of Botswana -- Gaborone -- where they are all based.

The use of English is not only restricted to the secondary domain or to a language of communication with foreigners; it is now becoming a language of everyday use even

among the Batswana. This is especially the case in urban centres among the youth and the educated elite. This has resulted in *code-switching* especially in informal public places such as bars, taxi ranks, stadiums, and shops (Tshinki, 2002). In some homes, Setswana or other indigenous languages are not spoken, and English is the main medium of communication. The latter is interesting to note as some language activists advocate for the promotion of their languages through their introduction in schools, yet they fail to teach these languages to their children at home. They do not seem to realize that by promoting English as their home language, they are also contributing to the demise of their languages.

In Botswana, English has always and still continues to play a prominent role in education. When the country gained full independence in 1966, there was no clear policy on the Medium of Instruction (MoI), or the Language of Learning and Teaching (LoLT). Consequently, it was generally understood that English as the official language was also to be the LoLT, and Setswana was the LoLT at lower levels of primary school (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004; Molosiwa, 2006). It is against this background that the two languages gained their role in education and were used side by side at all levels of education rather than by official announcement. Although English was supposedly the LoLT at upper-primary school level, its use was more theoretical than practical. In reality, there was CS between English and Setswana in the classroom and this extended even to other indigenous languages in various parts of the country where Setswana was not the home language of the majority of the learners (Molosiwa, 2006). In that regard, Nyati-Ramahobo (2004: 43) noted that: "In practice teachers actually code switched between Setswana and English throughout the primary and secondary school level. … Practice further indicated that in the North East District, Ikalanga continued to be used as an informal medium of instruction".

It seems, however, that in both instances described above, what was viewed as CS between English and Setswana, or between English and Ikalanga, was in fact repetition of some parts of the lesson in Setswana or Ikalanga, or even the presentation of the entire lesson in either Setswana or Ikalanga in an effort to overcome the language barrier.
An effort was made in 1977, when the first National Commission on Education (NCE 1) of 1975 was appointed to review the education system in Botswana since

independence, observed that the status that English enjoyed in the education system as the only LoLT, with Setswana being denied the same status, was a serious error which did not auger well for national pride. The Commission (NCE 1) further observed that, "The introduction of English as a medium of instruction as early as Standard 3 … clearly discriminates against the national language …. The Commission feels strongly that every nation ought to give a prominent place to its language in its education system" (NCE 1, 1977: 76).

Consequently, the Commission recommended that Setswana be the LoLT during the first four years of primary education. However, this decision regarding the use of Setswana in education was short lived as it was reversed by the second National Commission on Education (NCE 2) of 1993. The NCE 2 was mandated to undertake a comprehensive review of the education system and to develop a system that would enable the country to better meet the demands and challenges of the 21st century (NCE 2, 1993: i, 1). The Commission recommended in Recommendation No. 18a (NCE 2, 1993: 114) that, "… English should be used as the medium of instruction from Standard One by 2000".

In the Commission's view, the use of Setswana in the early years of children's education delayed their acquisition of English as the language they needed for their entire education and training, and eventually in the vocational field; and that their lack of fluency and competence in English was due to the late introduction of English as the LoLT. The government adopted the recommendation with the modification that English shall be the official LoLT from the second year of schooling and throughout the entire education system (Botswana Government White Paper on Revised National Policy on Education, 1994); and this immediately became official policy. The logic was that the first year of primary schooling would allow learners whose home language was not Setswana to learn Setswana first. Thereafter, all learners would be taught in English. The result was the demise of the role of Setswana in education, apart from being taught as a subject, whilst English again took centre stage as the LoLT and enjoys the greatest prominence in the education system in Botswana.

To date English is still the official language and the LoLT from primary to tertiary levels. Setswana is the national language with limited use in administration, the

judiciary and the legislature; and it is only taught as a subject in primary and secondary schools from the second year of primary education (Magogwe, 2005; Molosiwa, 2006). The situation is even grimmer at the University of Botswana where Setswana is taught in English. Despite the official exclusion of Setswana as a LoLT in schools, its use has not disappeared. In fact, as other studies have shown, Setswana is prevalent in Botswana classrooms (Arthur, 2001; Letsebe, 2002; Nyati-Ramahobo; 2004; Magogwe, 2005; Molosiwa; 2006). Magogwe (2005: 1) states that many Botswana students across all the levels of education are not proficient in the English language. It is against this background that the current study will discuss the phenomenon of CS in Botswana classrooms from both the points of view of educational and language development.

1.2 THE PROBLEM AND ITS STATEMENT

1.2.1 The statement of the problem

Code-switching is an accepted phenomenon in the speech of bilinguals and multilinguals in Botswana and has been accepted as a normal occurrence in utterances made during social occasions, both formal and informal. However, it has not gained the same recognition in educational settings despite its common occurrence. Teachers and students at high school as well as lecturers and their students at university levels often code switch from English – the LoLT -- to Setswana – the national language. (This observation is based on the researcher's experience as a lecturer in Communication and Study Skills at the University of Botswana and as a teaching-practice supervisor in secondary schools).

Code-switching in schools is, however, a somewhat problematic phenomenon. It appears, for instance, that from a theoretical perspective, the use of CS in educational settings in Botswana may not be cases of CS. From a general perspective, CS socially functions symbolically, thereby signalling speakers' social identity (or some feature of identity that a speaker may wish to convey) and speakers' perception of the conversational context in which they are operating. Code-switching does not function as a means of conveying objective information. In schools, however, it appears that

CS is used more to repeat information than to convey objective information. A teacher may, for instance, say:

- Do you understand? *A lo a tlhaloganya?*
- The assignment is due tomorrow. *Tiro e tlisiwe ka moso.*

In both examples, what the teacher says is exactly the same thing in two different languages with no new information being given in the language to which he / she switches. The teacher thus translates the English sentence into Setswana to ensure that the learners understand and can follow the lesson, instead of conveying social information.

The issues in this case are as follows:
- Is the phenomenon that occurs in Botswana classrooms really code-switching?
- Does it serve any useful purpose?
- Is it didactically justifiable?

A second problematic issue is that it appears that CS in educational settings in Botswana takes place in violation of the Botswana Language-in-Education Policy (LiEP), which states that English is the LoLT throughout the education system (NCE 2, 1993). Again the questions are:

- Does the use of CS not demonstrate the lack of proficiency in English by both the learners and their facilitators?
- Does it not prevent the educational system from functioning efficiently?
- Is it not possible for teachers to use the time more profitably by instructing the learners in the language that the learners best understand, that is, Setswana?

There are clearly a number of matters that need careful investigation regarding the role of CS in teaching and learning in the secondary schools in Botswana.

1.2.2 Problem analysis

The topic of this dissertation can be described in terms of several sub-problems. These are:

- The first sub-problem: Not enough is known about the didactic value of CS in educational settings.

- The second sub-problem: The occurrence of CS in a classroom situation suggests a lack of proficiency in English as a Second Language (ESL) among the learners and maybe also their teachers, and it is therefore problematic as a LoLT.

- The third sub-problem: CS from English to Setswana in a classroom situation may be discriminatory against non-Setswana speakers.

- The fourth sub-problem: The use of CS in the teaching and learning situation seems to be in conflict with Botswana's Language-in-Education Policy (LiEP).

- The fifth sub-problem: The current LiEP of Botswana promotes English at the expense of Setswana and does not promote knowledge acquisition and skills development.

- The sixth sub-problem: The use of CS in a classroom situation may waste instruction time and slow down the pace of content delivery and learning.

1.3 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Given the preceding list of sub-problems, the following research questions will be asked in the proposed research:

1.3.1 What are the defining characteristics of the phenomenon of CS?
1.3.2 To what extent is CS used in educational settings in Botswana?
1.3.3 Can the phenomenon in the classrooms in Botswana be called CS?

1.3.4 What are the didactic consequences of CS in the schools? Is CS educationally beneficial? Does the use of CS in a classroom situation slow down the pace of teaching and learning to an extent that it is detrimental to content coverage within the prescribed time?

1.3.5 Is the practice of CS from English to Setswana in a classroom situation discriminatory to non-Setswana speakers?

1.3.6 Does the use of CS in a classroom situation violate Botswana's LiEP? Is the LiEP consistent with the practical realities of the classroom situation? If this were to be the case, should the LiEP not be revised to ensure that the LoLT promotes maximum delivery and acquisition of knowledge and skills development?

1.3.7 Does the current LiEP promote negative perceptions about Setswana and other local languages?

1.4 THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Although there are several studies which deal with CS in educational settings (Adendorff, 1993; Moyo, 1996; Hussein, 1999; Moodley, 2001; Martin-Jones & Saxena, 2001; Arthur, 2001; Akindele & Letsoela, 2001; Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004; and Letsebe, 2002), not enough attention has been given to the topic from specifically a didactic point of view -- its nature in teaching and learning situations and whether or not it is of any didactic value. In Botswana, for example, no comprehensive study known to the researcher has investigated why CS takes place, and what effect it has on education at senior secondary school level. This study proposes to investigate this question. In addition, the study seeks to do the following:

- establish if CS occurs in teaching and learning due to the lack of proficiency in the LoLT by both the learners and their facilitators at secondary school level;

- investigate to what extent the current LiEP in Botswana is being properly implemented, whether English is a more effective LoLT and whether CS occurs in the classroom as a result of poor implementation of the LiEP -- thus meaning that the use of English as a LoLT is ineffective (Arthur, 2001).

- establish whether the LiEP promotes educational development, which is important for the self-esteem and the self-confidence of the learners; and

- to determine whether the phenomenon that takes place in the classrooms of Botswana can be rightly referred to as CS as universally defined.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

The study is divided into nine chapters, as follows:

Chapter One is the introductory part of the study and covers the background information about the research topic. The chapter includes also the description of the problem and its setting (the statement of the problem), the analysis of the problem, research questions, the importance of the study, and how the study is organized.

Chapter Two gives a comprehensive review of the literature on CS in general, and CS particularly in education. It is from this review that the theoretical framework that informed this study was conceptualized. The review also included literature on language planning, language policy and the current LiEP in Botswana that came into effect in 1994 (Government White Paper on Revised National Policy on Education, 1994: 59).

Chapter Three discusses the research design as well as the methods that were used for data collection, including preparations that were made in readiness for statistical analysis of the data. Hymes' mnemonic of SPEAKING (Hymes, 1974), which is used as the framework in the analysis of the qualitative data collected through lesson observations, is also described.

Chapter Four presents an explanation of the statistical analysis of the data. Then the quantitative analysis of the respondents' (teachers and learners) demographic details is presented. Then the differences and similarities between the data of the teachers and those of the learners are highlighted.

Chapter Five deals with the presentation and analysis of the quantitative data obtained from the teachers. The results are presented according to their statistical significance or non-significance.

Chapter Six presents the results from the quantitative analysis of the learners' data. Like the teachers' data, the learners' responses are also presented according to their statistical significance or non-significance whilst taking into account the effect size because of the size of the learners' sample.

Chapter Seven presents the results of the qualitative data collected through lesson observations and then analyzed by the application of Hymes' mnemonic of SPEAKING.

Chapter Eight deals with the interpretation and discussion of the results. Both the quantitative (Chapters Five and Six) and the qualitative data (Chapter Seven) are used to answer the research questions. This is done to determine if the results obtained via the two data-collection methods are in harmony with or contradictory to each other. The literature reviewed in Chapter Two is used as the basis or framework for the analysis of the results obtained. Within the conceptual framework set out in Chapter Two, the main topic of the study, namely *The role of CS in teaching and learning in selected senior secondary schools in Botswana* is discussed with respect to the responses to the research questions. The LiEP of Botswana, in relation to the phenomenon of CS, is also discussed.

Chapter Nine presents a summary of the study, conclusions and the recommendations in relation to CS in the classroom and the LiEP of Botswana. The chapter is concluded in the form of a discussion of the limitations of the study, and implications for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter will cover the theoretical framework within which this study will be conducted. It includes the review of related literature that will inform the study. Because this study is two-fold as it covers CS in the classroom and its effect on teaching and learning, as well as the implications that it has on the Language in Education Policy (LiEP) in Botswana, the following aspects will be discussed. An historical overview of CS research; the definition of key concepts; a review of some major studies in CS in general; some studies on CS in teaching and learning in particular; and the social functions of CS. Furthermore, the review will also cover the LiEP of Botswana, which will reveal the status of English in the education system in relation to Setswana as a national language, as well as to other local languages. The LiEP will be discussed within the framework of language planning; the functions of language in human communication; and its role in education and educational development.

2.2 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF CS

CS as a speech phenomenon initially did not receive much attention from researchers on bilingualism. It was merely regarded as interference in the speech of bilinguals (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 47). The earliest known study on CS was based on Spanish-English CS and carried out in the United States by Espinosa in 1917 (in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 257). This study concluded that "… there was no rationale for code-switching, and that code-switching was just a random mixture of the languages available to a bilingual speaker" (Kamwangamalu, 1999: 250). Espinosa's claim received wide support over a long period of time, and continued to be ignored by researchers. Even four decades later, researchers on bilingualism -- such as Haugen (1950: 211, and Weinreich, 1953: 50, in Milroy & Muysken, 1995: 8), continued to share Espinosa's view on CS, and respectively wrote:

"… except in abnormal cases speakers have not been observed to draw freely

from languages at once. They may switch rapidly from one to the other, but at a

given moment they are speaking only one, even when they resort to the other for

instance. The introduction of elements from one language into the other means …

an alteration of the second language, not a mixture of the two".

<div align="right">Haugen (1950: 211, in Milroy & Muysken, 1995)</div>

"… a bilingual's speech may suffer the interference of another vocabulary …, that

is, the limitations on the distribution of certain words to utterances belonging to

one language is violated. In affective speech, when the speaker's attention is

almost completely diverted from the form of the message to its topic, the transfer

of words is particularly common".

<div align="right">Weinreich (1953: 50, in Milroy and Muysken, 1995: 8)</div>

Researchers did not believe that CS existed, and simply regarded it as an interference phenomenon, the use of which demonstrated that the speaker was an imperfect bilingual who could not conduct a conversation perfectly in the language that was being used at that moment (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 47-48). Lance (1975, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 257), also studying Spanish-English CS in the United States upheld Espinosa's view and maintained that, "… bilinguals engage in CS because there are no restrictions as to what they can or cannot mix in their speech". However, this myth has since been dispelled by successive researchers on CS and it is widely agreed that CS occurrence is not random, but it is governed by linguistic and extra-linguistic factors (Gumperz, 1982; Kachru, 1983, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 257). *Linguistic factors* refer to the bilingual speaker and the languages at his / her disposal. These could be his / her attitude towards the codes available to him / her (Agheyisi, 1977, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 257), the use of CS as interjections, hesitation, false starts to mark the discourse (Clyne, 1980, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 257), and the bilingual speaker's level of competence in each of the codes he / she uses (Kachru, 1986, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 257). *Extra-linguistic factors* include the participants in the conversational exchange, the setting, what they are talking about and why they are engaging in the speech interaction (Kamwangamalu, (Kamwangamalu, 1999: 258). Therefore, CS is used to serve various communicative needs, later discussed under social functions of CS (cf. 2.4).

Furthermore, the *extra-linguistic factors* are based on Blom and Gumperz's notions of situational CS or metaphorical CS to describe types of CS in the interactional approach (Gumperz & Hymes, 1986: 409). The former (situational switching) involves change in participants in the conversation or the strategies they use, or both, triggered by factors external to the speaker's own motivations. These may be the makeup of participants in the conversation, the topic of discussion, and where the speech interaction is taking place (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 52). The latter (metaphorical switching) involves only a change in the emphasis of the topic (Gumperz and Hymes, 1986: 409). Further, metaphorical CS relates to particular kinds of topic or subject matters discussed by the same participants in the same setting (Gumperz & Hymes, 1986). Myers-Scotton (1993a: 52) adds that metaphorical CS does not necessarily refer to CS that takes place owing to a change in topic alone, but also to the self-presentation of the speaker in relation to the topic being discussed or to changes in relationship to other speakers partaking in the speech interaction. Therefore, in metaphorical CS, the participants remain the same but the switch from one language to the other depends on what the participants are talking about (topic or subject matter), as well as how they perceive one another in relation to the topic under discussion.

Although this approach has been criticized by scholars such as Auer (1984), Scotton (1983a: 119; 1983b: 121, in Myers-Scotton, 1993a), and Pride (1979, in Myers-Scotton, 1993a) for its lack of clarity in defining the two notions (situational switching and metaphorical switching) as well as differentiating between strategies and topical emphasis (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 52), it nonetheless laid a foundation for CS research. It positively influenced other sociolinguistic researchers to acknowledge that "CS does not demonstrate lack of fluency in any of the languages involved (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 74). The Markedness Model (MM) (discussed in the next section) of Myers-Scotton (1988, in Myers-Scotton, 1993a), based on the interactional approach, was influenced by the two notions of situational and metaphorical CS. In the interactional approach, CS is viewed as a contextualization cue, meaning the following:

> "It [code-switching] signals contextual information equivalent to what in monolingual settings is conveyed through prosody or other syntactic or lexical processes. It generates the presuppositions in terms of which the content of what is said is decoded".

(Gumperz, 1982 in Kamwangamalu, 2000: 60)

This implies that in the interactional approach, CS is one of the discourse strategies that bilingual and multilingual speakers can employ to perform different social functions such as to negotiate, challenge, or change different conversational situations (Kieswetter, 1995: 2). It is a dynamic conversational strategy that constantly changes according to the participants, the situation, the context and the intentions of the speakers (Kieswetter, 1995: 6) that speakers can employ to meet a number of identifiable communicative needs such as to express confidentiality (Gumperz, 1982, in Kamwangamalu, 2000: 60; Kieswetter, 1995; Tshinki, 2002), in-group membership or solidarity (Kieswetter, 1995; Moodley, 2001; Tshinki, 2002) and modernization (Kamwangamalu, 1992, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 258; Kieswetter, 1995; Tshinki, 2002).

Scholars now agree that CS is a common phenomenon in the speech of bilingual and multilingual speakers in many places, and that it 'does not indicate lack of competence on the part of the speaker in any of the languages concerned, but results from complex bilingual skills' (Auer, 1984: 1; Kieswetter, 1995; Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1993a). They further argue that although some people may view CS as a product of language shift -- defined by Kembo-Sure and Webb (2000: 113) as a process whereby members of a speech community abandon the use of one language for certain functions and adopt the other), CS can also be part of the daily lives of many 'stable' bilingual populations (Kieswetter, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1993a). The following examples (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 1) illustrate the use of CS by speakers fluent in both languages:

- Bilinguals of Hispanic origin in Texas who may switch between Spanish and English in informal in-group conversations;
- Senegalese bilinguals who may switch between Wolof and French;
- Swiss bilinguals who may switch between Swiss German and French;
- a physician of Punjabi-origin in England who may switch between Punjabi and English;
- a businessman of Lebanese-origin in Michigan who may switch between his home language and English; and

- a corporate executive of Chinese-origin in Singapore who may switch between his first language and English.

These examples indicate that CS is a national and international phenomenon that occurs in the speech of bilingual and multilingual speakers, and that it cuts across social, racial, age and professional spectra. Further, as long as the speakers share the same linguistic repertoire, they may engage in CS whether discussing social or professional matters. Since the speakers in each case have a good command of both languages that they are employing, they move freely between them in their speech.

Most of the researchers on CS in Africa treated CS as a social phenomenon and focused mainly on its pragmatic and syntactic aspects (Kamwangamalu 1999: 257; 2000: 59). As a result, many of their studies will a have limited effect on the present study because its main focus is on the didactic significance of CS in the classroom. However, three models (each discussed below) namely the Markedness Model (MM) of Myers-Scotton (Kamwangamalu, 2000; Mandubu, 1999; Myers-Scotton, 1993a), the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) of Myers-Scotton (Myers-Scotton, 1995: 235, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 268) and the Matrix Language Principle (MLP) of Kamwangamalu (1990, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 268) are a result of CS research in Africa and will form the theoretical framework of the current study owing to their interactional nature.

2.2.1   The Markedness Model (MM)

The MM claims that all linguistic choices, including CS, are indications of the social negotiation of rights and obligations that exist between participants in a conversational exchange (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Mandubu, 1999: 8; Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 75). This implies that a linguistic choice made for a conversational exchange is determined by what is prominent about the situational exchange. This could be the status of the participants in the conversational exchange, the topic they are discussing, or even the place in which the conversational exchange is taking place (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61). It is the combined effect of the situational features as well as the individual speaker's considerations that determine the type of linguistic choice that is regarded as appropriate for a given conversational situation or topic.

The MM allows CS to perform three main functions, namely CS as an unmarked choice, a marked choice and an exploratory choice (Kamwangamalu, 2000; Mandubu, 1999; Myers-Scotton, 1993a). First, when CS is an unmarked choice in a given conversational situation, it is the expected choice. It is employed as a communicative strategy in a given linguistic exchange so as to serve a particular communicative function, usually that of inclusion. There are two sub-types that fall under this category of CS – CS as a sequence of unmarked choices or CS as an unmarked choice. The former occurs as a result of a change in the situational factors during a conversational exchange. In the latter, situational factors hardly change during a conversational exchange (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 114).

Second, CS as a marked choice occurs when it is an unexpected choice to indicate the social distance among the participants in a given conversational situation. In such a case, CS is used to exclude deliberately some members present in a conversational situation. The speaker switches to a language that he / she knows will only be understood by a certain section of the audience. However, depending on the situation, CS as a marked choice may be used also to "include" other members of the audience present. For instance, Kamwanagamalu (2000: 62) cites instances during political gatherings or diplomatic meetings when CS is used to express oneness and solidarity with a minority section of the audience; for example Kofi Annan (the former UN Secretary General)'s use of French-English CS at the UN to " include" Franco-phone countries, Nelson Mandela (former and first democratically elected President of the Republic of South Africa) and Margaret Thatcher (former and first female Prime Minister of Britain)'s English-Afrikaans CS at meetings with the Afrikaners of South Africa. Third, CS as an exploratory choice implies that the speaker initiates a conversation in one language, and if the party being addressed does not fully understand, CS takes place. The speaker switches to the most likely language that is intelligible to both parties. CS as an exploratory choice is used where there is some degree of uncertainty about the choice of a mutual language.

The MM was criticized for some shortcomings (Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997 c: 132-133; Kamwangamalu 2000: 63-64; Slabbert & Finlayson, 1999). It does not, for instance, explain why the speakers engaged in CS exchange would not conform to the societal norms or why a speaker would want to increase or decrease the social distance

between him / her and the other speaker (Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997: 132). Kamwangamalu (2000: 62) described the MM as 'static' regarding its functions in multilingual communities and that the premise on which it was based (negotiation of identities, rights and obligations) was too narrow to account for the social functions of CS in the African context. He further argued that not all CS involved the negotiation of identities, rights and obligations; and that, at times, CS can be used to achieve political gains as observed by Heller (1992; 1995, in Kamwangamalu, 2000: 64).

In a classroom situation, the objective is not to exclude any learner from the learning process, but to include him / her. Therefore, CS as an unmarked choice (not CS as a sequence of unmarked choices) appears to be applicable, but CS as a marked choice in a learning process seems an unlikely occurrence. Again CS as an exploratory choice seems possible because the objective is to use the language that learners understand better. The applicability or non-applicability of the MM to the present study will be examined against the data that will be collected.

2.2.2 The Matrix Language Frame model (MLF)

The MLF model based on the interactional approach (Auer, 1984) was first conceived by Myers-Scotton and Azuma (1989, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 268) and Myers-Scotton (1993b; 1995, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 268). It distinguishes between the Matrix Language (ML) and the Embedded Language (EL). The ML is the main language that plays the dominant role in CS and is also known as the 'host language', while the EL (also known as the 'guest language') takes on the morphological and phonological structure of the ML in CS.

The following are examples of the aforementioned:

siSwati-English CS

(CS form): Tennis association ***i-discuss-ile le problem ku meeting*** yabo …
(English): The tennis association **discussed that problem at** their last **meeting**.

(Kamwangamalu, 1994: 75)

Setswana-English CS

Tennis association ***e-discuss-itse problem ele ko*** meeting ***wa bone***.

Discussed   that problem at   theirs.

In the example above, siSwati and Setswana are the MLs and English is the EL in each case. First, the word order '*meeting **yabo***' and '*meeting **wa bone***' follows siSwati and Setswana word order, but not that of English. Translated literally, these phrases equate to '**meeting their**', which is not grammatically acceptable in English, as a pronoun for possession should precede a noun. Therefore, in English, the word order would be '**their meeting**'. Second, the verb '**discussed**' in the code-switched sentences assumes the morphological structure of siSwati and Setswana, not that of English. Thus siSwati and Setswana as MLs licence how CS should occur. Their internal constituent structures remain unchanged while those of English (EL) are adapted.

Instances of CS stated above, are examples of intra-sentential CS, and are often mistaken for borrowing. Both concepts are discussed in detail later (cf. 2.3.1a and 2.3.3 below) to make a distinction between them.

2.2.3 The Matrix Language Principle (MLP)

The MLP is very similar to the MLF. Both models state that in a CS situation, the language that determines how CS occurs is the ML and the follows the morphological and phonological structure of the EL will follow that of the ML. The MLP essentially states that '… in a code-switching structure only the matrix language will determine the acceptability/unacceptability of any participating constituent [from the embedded language] (Kamwangamalu, 1994: 74 in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 268).

Kamwangamalu (1989a, 1990, in Kamwangamalu, 1999: 267) came up with the MLP, (later the Matrix Code Principle). The MLP states that in CS, there is one language that is the ML, and the other language that is the EL. It is the ML that licenses how the EL will be employed in CS. As a result, the morphosyntactic structure of the EL is affected, while that of the ML remains unchanged. Therefore, any use of linguistic items from the EL must be determined by the morphosyntactic structure of the ML (Kamwangamalu, 1999: 269-270).

Kamwangamalu (1994) demonstrated the applicability of the MLP by using examples of siSwati-English CS and Swahili-English CS. In all instances, it was evident that in CS the syntactic structure of the dominant language (siSwati or Swahili) is preserved while that of the guest language or the EL (English) is adapted. Therefore, the internal constituent structure of the guest language (English) has to conform to the constituent structure of the host language (siSwati). In addition, CS was possible between a bound morpheme and a lexical form without the lexical form being phonologically integrated into the language bound as a morpheme. This is possible in CS between many Bantu languages (including Setswana) and a guest language such as English or French. Using CS examples between many Bantu languages and English or French, Kamwangamalu (1999: 264) demonstrated that a complementizer of a complement clause and the matrix verb need not come from the same language.

The MLP remains unchallenged, and having been developed from the African context and empirically tested on CS involving several Bantu languages, it will inform the current study, which also examines CS between English and Setswana (also a Bantu language) in a classroom situation. The data gathered through classroom observations will be examined syntactically and morphologically to confirm their conformity to the MLP model.

The theoretical framework also includes Hymes' mnemonic of SPEAKING. This model will be used as a basis for the analysis of the qualitative data obtained through classroom observation. The model was developed to promote the analysis of discourse as a series of speech events and speech acts within a cultural context (Hymes, 1974: 54 – 60). The model assumed its name from the features of the speech event namely, Setting (Scene), Participant and audience, Ends, Act sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms and Genre. Each of the features, as well as how the model is used, will be explained in detail in the next chapter which deals with the methodology of the study.

2.3 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

Having given an overview of CS research and the theoretical framework of the study, as well as the nature of the study, it is important to define the key concepts (with examples) that will be used throughout this study to demonstrate any relationship that

may exist between them. From the literature review, it is difficult to precisely differentiate between these concepts which are: CS and its three sub-types, namely intra-sentential CS; inter-sentential CS; tag-like / emblematic CS; and *borrowing,* with its three types namely nonce borrowing; borrowing proper; and re-borrowing. However, a discussion of each will follow that will result in definitions that will apply in this study.

2.3.1 CS

Before discussing the definition of CS as given by various scholars, it is important to examine the two words which make up this concept, namely 'code' and 'switch(-ing)'. It is on the basis of the meanings of the two words that the definition of CS, as defined by the different scholars, can be examined in conjunction with examples to illustrate the meaning and use of CS.

According to the *Collins Concise Dictionary of the English Language* (1988: 214), a 'code' is defined as "… a system of letters or symbols by which information can be communicated secretly, briefly"; while the *Oxford Companion to the English Language* (1992: 228) defines a code as "… a system of communication, spoken or written, such as a language, dialect or variety". In this study, the latter definition will be used. 'Switching' is defined as "shifting, changing, turning aside, or changing the direction of (something)"; or "to exchange (places); replace (something by something else)" (*The Collins Concise Dictionary of the English Language,* 1988: 1194). Again, it is the latter alternative, 'replace' that will be used here. Therefore, putting the two words together, 'code' and 'switching', CS refers to a situation in which linguistic forms of a language / language variety are replaced by forms from another language / language variety in a single communicative event, be it spoken or written. The definition above will be used as a basis to examine the definitions of CS as given by different scholars.

CS has been defined by scholars such as Auer, 1984: 1; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Kieswetter, 1995; Milroy and Muysken, 1995; Kamwangamalu, 1997: 45; 2000; Heredia and Altarriba, 2001: 164; Li, 2002: 164; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain, 2004: 502); as "… the alternate use of two or more languages in the same conversation,

usually within the same conversational turn, or within the same sentence or within the same sentence of that turn."

The definition above implies that in any CS situation, there must be at least two languages employed, either within the same sentence or within the same conversational turn. However, the definition does not include the alternate use of a variety of the same language. Therefore the definition above is by no means exhaustive of all that CS entails, and is therefore inadequate.

Examples

1. ***Ngitshele mngane*** how long did you practice? (Tell me my friend …) <u>Zulu</u> (Kieswetter, 1995: 81).

2. ***Mpolelela tsala … ?*** (Tell me my friend …) Setswana translation.
3. ***Inakuwa maana yake*** they go against their wishes … (This is … because …) Swahili (Mkilifi, 1978: 140, in Kamwangamalu, 1997: 47)

In the examples above, the speaker starts off a sentence in one language, in this case, his / her mother tongue, and then switches over to English. Thus, in every code-switched speech there must be at least two languages or language varieties employed by the speaker which show his / her ability to express himself / herself in both.

Myers-Scotton (1993a: 4) talks of what she refers to as a more "technical and more explicit definition of CS: "…*code-switching is the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded language (or languages) in utterances of a matrix language during the same conversation*".

The definition above implies that the examples cited above, in each case, Zulu, Setswana and Swahili are MLs, and English is the embedded language (Kamwangamalu, 1997; Kamwangamalu, 1999; Myers-Scotton, 1993a). Thus in CS utterance, there must be the ML and the EL within the same conversations in which the speakers are engaged. Both definitions above refer to the use of CS in a social setting.

Kamwangamalu (1999: 268) states that, "In code-switching there necessarily is one language, the matrix language, whose morphosyntactic structure determines what

linguistic elements of the other language, the embedded language, can be and how they should be code-switched". This implies that it is the morpho-syntactic structure of the ML that determines how CS can take place because the morpho-syntactic structure of the EL elements should conform to it. Often the speaker's first language is the ML (main language), such as Setswana, and the embedded language is the guest language, which usually has a lesser role in CS, such as English in Setswana / English CS. The use of linguistic items from the EL is determined by the morpho-syntactic structure of the matrix language as illustrated in the following examples of CS between siSwati and English, and between Swahili and English (Kamwangamalu (1994: 73) :

siSwati: ***Kule*** *conversation* ***yabo ba***-*address*-***a liciniso*** *concerning* ***le***-*situation*.
Literal translation: In conversation theirs they …
English: In their conversation they address the truth concerning the situation.
Swahili: ***Kulikulwa na*** *TABLE LONG* ***namna hii, maze, imejaa tu chakula ya kila aina***.
Literal translation: There was a table long like this, my friend, …
English: There was a long table like this, my friend, just full of food of every sort.

In the two examples above, the constituent structure of EL is 'violated', while those of siSwati and Swahili are followed. The grammar rule for English is that, when forming a noun phrase, a determiner or adjective precedes a head noun, but in siSwati and Swahili, a determiner or adjective follows a head noun. For instance, in siSwati, it is correct to say '**conversation** *yabo*' that directly translates to '**conversation** *theirs***' in English, which is ungrammatical in English. The correct word order should rather be '***their* conversation**'. Similarly, in Swahili, the word order '**table long**' from the example is acceptable, but in English it is a '**long table**'. Similarly, in Setswana, the same word order as that of siSwati and Swahili will apply, as illustrated in the example below:

Setswana: **Mo** conversation**eng ya bone ba** address-**a nnete** concerning the situation**.**
Literal translation: In conversation theirs they address truth …
English: In their conversation they address the truth concerning the situation.

In the example above, as in the previous examples, English is the guest language whose internal constituent structure is 'not followed', but that of Setswana is preserved. In Setswana '**–eng'** marks the adverb of place if affixed to a noun like 'conversation', but in English the adverb is marked by the phrase '**in their**' preceding the noun 'conversation'. Similarly, in English, verbs are not formed by affixing '**–a,** which denotes action if affixed to a verb stem. Such formation is rather found in Setswana, hence the noun 'address-**a**'. Therefore, what takes place in CS grammatically is determined by Setswana as the ML and English as an EL follows the constituent structure rules of Setswana. The result is that the morphosyntactic structure of the ML is preserved, while that of the EL is not followed, since its constituent structure must conform to the constituent structure of the ML.

The definitions of CS discussed above are very similar because they all state that in CS at least two languages are involved. However, the second and third definitions by Myers-Scotton (1993a) and Kamwangamalu (1999) are more comprehensive in that they further state that one of the two languages involved in CS is the ML, and the other is the EL. The first definition is much more general because it does not indicate the role of each of the two languages involved in CS, therefore assuming that both languages play an equal role in CS. However, all three the definitions do not mention that CS may also involve varieties of a language, yet the original study on CS by Gumperz and Hymes (1986) involved two dialects of the same language.

It therefore appears that from the evidence presented by different scholars, CS occurs:

a. within the same speech event;
b. there must be at least two languages employed within the same speech event;
c. the speaker(s) who engage(s) in CS may be competent bilinguals or multilinguals; in that they can speak both languages fluently;
d. one language is the ML (main language of the interaction) and the other is the EL (guest language); and
e. the morpho-syntactic structure of the ML determines how the linguistic elements of the EL should be used in the utterance; such that the morpho-syntactic structure of the former is preserved while that of the latter is violated; and

    f.   as a result, the internal constituent structure of the EL conforms to the constituent structure of the ML.

Having discussed the views of other scholars on what constitutes CS, the following definition will be applied in the present study: 'The alternate use of forms from at least two languages, or varieties of the same language, one matrix, the other embedded, in the same sentence or within the same conversational turn'.

As previously mentioned, CS is said to occur in three different forms in utterances. It may occur as: intra-sentential CS, inter-sentential CS, and tag-like switches or what is termed emblematic CS. A discussion of each type of CS is presented below:

a. Intra-sentential CS

According to Myers-Scotton (1993a: 4), intra-sentential CS involves using a single morpheme, phrase or clause along with words, phrases, and clauses from another language within the same sentence. This could be a verb phrase within the same constituent, a verb phrase complement or even a prepositional phrase, which are entire constituents. Myers-Scotton (1993a: 5) illustrates intra-sentential CS with the following examples from a conversation conducted mainly in Swahili (the lingua franca of Kenya) in Nairobi, the capital of Kenya; and another conversation conducted mainly in Shona (one of the two dominant languages in Zimbabwe). It should be noted that concerning the English-Swahil CS, Myers-Scotton (1993 a) obtained her data from Kenya where CS of this nature is rampant.

In both instances below, the intra-sentential switches are to English:

Example 1

Swahili: Hello, guys*, shule zitafunguliwa lini*?

English: Hello, guys, *when will the schools be opened*?

Swahili: *Na Kwedi, hata mimi **si-ko sure** lakini **n-a suspect** i-ta-kuwa **week** kesho*.

English: *Well, even **I am not sure**, but **I suspect** it will be next* week.

In Example 1, (*si-k*o) *sure*, **week**, and (*na*)-**suspect** are intra-sentential switches as they appear in the same sentence as elements from the ML.

Example 2

<u>Shona</u>: *Manje hazvibvumirwe waona. Unofanirwa kupedza* **one year** *uinanyo* **motor** *yacho. Wozotegesa* **after one year**.

<u>English</u>: That is not allowed, you see. You should spend one year with that *car*. Then you can sell it *after one year*.

In Example 2, the English verb phrase complement **'one year'** and the prepositional phrase **'after one year'** are used within the sentence, which is mainly in Shona. In both examples, Swahili and Shona are the MLs, while English is the EL.

From the examples above, it is clear that intra-sentential CS is self-explanatory; it occurs within a sentence and that the code-switched form must be in a form of a phrase from an EL and the independent clause must be from the ML.

The following definition of intra-sentential CS will be used in the current study: 'Intra-sentential CS is the use of a verb or a verb phrase, or a verb phrase complement or even a prepositional phrase, or a noun phrase that takes place from the matrix language to the embedded language within a single sentence'.

In the present study, the data gathered will be examined to determine whether the phenomenon that occurs in the classrooms in Botswana conforms to the observations made above about CS and can consequently be referred to as CS in education. Its causes, its role in education, and the effects it has on teaching and learning will also be investigated.

b. Inter-sentential CS

According to Akindele and Letsoela (2001); Moyo (1996); and Myers-Scotton (1993a), inter-sentential CS occurs when the speaker, after he / she has completed a sentence in one language, switches to another language in the next sentence, as illustrated in the following examples demonstrating CS between English and Setswana:

Example

The University has closed for Christmas. **Etla bulwa gape ngwaga e tlang.**

The University has closed for Christmas. **It will reopen next year.**

28

Many scholars (Kamwangamalu, 2000; Khati, 1992; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Poplack, 1980, in Kamwangamalu, 2000) agree that inter-sentential CS is a clear form of code-switching and is the main form of CS. The researcher also shares the same view because as its name signifies, inter-sentential CS is characterized by switches between independent sentences, one in the ML, and the other in the EL in the same conversation. However, the ML remains identifiable as the conversation will mainly take place in it.

Based on the above, the following definition of inter-sentential CS will apply in the current study: 'Inter-sentential CS is switching that takes place from the ML to the EL at sentential level within the same conversational turn'.

c. Tag-like or emblematic CS

Poplack (1980, in Khati, 1992: 183) defines tag-like or emblematic CS as "… a switch that involves the use of single words, tags and idiomatic expressions from one language in another".

Poplack (1980)'s definition was quoted by successive scholars such as Appel and Muysken, 1987: 118, in Gila, 1995: 10; Nwoye, 1993: 369, in Moodley, 2001: 8; and Tshinki, 2002: 73. To better understand what constitutes tag-like / emblematic CS, definitions of the two words 'tag' and 'emblematic' are necessary. According to the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of current English* (1995: 1214), a tag is a label or device attached to something; or, in linguistics, a tag is a word or phrase that is added to a sentence for emphasis. Similarly, the *Collins Cobuild Dictionary* (1987: 1487) defines a tag as a very short clause at the end of a statement that changes the statement into a question. From the two definitions given, it is clear that a tag appears at the end of a sentence.

'Emblematic' refers to something that serves as a symbol (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of current English*, 1995: 376). Therefore, emblematic CS would refer to symbolic CS that is used to symbolize something or to show a particular meaning.

On the basis of the definitions of the two words 'tag' and 'emblematic', the following will be used in this study as a definition of tag-like or emblematic CS: '… *a switch in*

the form of a single word or phrase (from) the guest language attached at the end of a sentence that is primarily coined in the matrix language in order to convey a specific meaning or to (convey) symbolize a particular meaning'.

The following example shows the use of tag-switching in a sentence. The speaker starts the sentence in Setswana but attaches a tag-like switch (in English) at the end of the sentence to show emphasis or to symbolize that he / she is soliciting the opinion of the addressee.

Example 1

Setswana: Go botlhokwa go dira ka natla nako tsotlhe, ***isn't it***?

English: It is important to work hard at all times, ***isn't it***?

While Poplack (1980)'s definition operated as the standard definition of tag-like or emblematic CS for a long time, it is inadequate because it gives the impression that both languages involved in CS play an equal role. The current definition given above therefore explicitly states that the sentence in which tag-like / emblematic CS occurs, appears in the ML, and the tag that is used in the switch is in the guest language.

Gila (1995: 10) gives the following as an example of a tag-like switch in CS between Xhosa and English:

Example 2

Xhosa: … ***so*** *unokothukaxa enokuva kusithwailizwe liphelile*.

English: … **so** he should be shocked to hear that the world has ended.

The speaker is Xhosa, starts his / her conversation in Xhosa, the ML, then switches to English through the use of 'so', implying that English is EL and then switches back to Xhosa to complete the sentence. However, in the researcher's view, this is inconsistent with the meaning of a tag. 'So' in the example above appears medially, not finally, and therefore it cannot be regarded as tag-like switch. The researcher is inclined to regard this as an example of intra-sentential CS. This type of switching (intra-sentential CS) is also possible between Setswana and English, as illustrated in the following example:

Example 3

Setswana: Ke a otsela **because** ke robetse bosigo.

English: I am feeling sleepy **because** I slept late.

In the example above, the speaker is Setswana speaking, starts his/her sentence in Setswana (ML), switches to English (EL) by using **because**, and back to Setswana to complete the sentence. Some scholars, for example Kamwangamalu (2000) regard the use of **because** in this way as a form of nonce borrowing (cf. 2.3.5 below) and not CS. However, using the definition of social integration as a function of the degree of consisitency, regularity, and frequency with which linguistic items from one language are used in discourse in another language, in a given context (Hasselmo, 1972: 180, in Kamwangamalu, 2000: 91), the researcher is inclined to treat the use of **because** in the sentence above as a form of CS and not nonce borrowing. **Because** cannot be regarded as being socially integrated as is the case with nonce-borrowed words; it is an example of CS since it is not socially integrated.

According to Poplack (1980 in Khati, 1992: 183), tag-switches are true types of CS because their use is an application of foreign language elements in an utterance made in another language (in this case Setswana-English CS as in Example 1 above); and that their use does not necessarily imply that a speaker is conversant with the foreign language. Although the researcher (from experience), is inclined to agree with Poplack's observation, in Example 1 above, the use of a tag-like / emblematic switch does not reflect a lack of proficiency in English by the users because the tag-switches have been appropriately used. Other scholars before Poplack, such as Elias-Olivares (1976), in Khati (1992: 182-3) did not consider what Gila (1995: 10) refers to as a tag-switch (as in Example 2 above) as a type of CS, but as examples of 'nonce borrowing' (defined and discussed later in this section). However, the researcher shares the same view as Poplack, namely that tag-like / emblematic switches are a form of CS because their use does not imply that they have no equivalents in the ML. A speaker may use them unconsciously or consciously, and if they are not comprehensible to a monolingual speaker, they can be easily replaced with equivalents in the language that the monolingual speaker understands. Furthermore, tag-like switches normally appear finally in a sentence.

2.3.2 Code-mixing (CM)

Another concept important in this study is CM, which Wardhaugh (1992: 106 and Bokamba, 1988: 24, in Moodley, 2001: 9) define as: '… the deliberate mixing of various linguistic units such as affixes, words, phrases and clauses from two (or more) languages within the same sentence, in the course of a single utterance, without an associated change in topic'.

The definition above seems to refer to intra-sentential CS and not CM since the latter refers to a variety that consists of elements from different languages.

Kieswetter (1995: 22) defines CM as: "… the use of morphemes from more than one language variety within the same word or as … linguistic units which contain morphemes from both languages within single words which have not been lexically, phonologically and morphologically integrated into the host language". For example:

1. *ama-lady* (Zulu form for ladies) (Kieswetter, 1995: 34)
2. *uku-solve-a (Zulu form meaning to solve)* (Kieswetter, 1995: 36)
3. G*o-solve-a* (Setswana form meaning **to solve**)

Looking at the examples given above, it appears that even though Kieswetter's first definition mentions that CM involves more than one language variety (Kieswetter, 1995: 22), in the first sentence two languages not varieties of one language are involved. What takes place in the first sentence is more a case of borrowing, than CM. Sentences two and three are examples of intra-sentential CS as previously explained (cf. 2.3.1 b) and not CM. Kieswetter's definition is in harmony with what takes place in borrowing and in intra-sentential CS.   In the first example, elements from two languages (Zulu and English) have been employed to build a word made up of two morphemes in order to *come up with a new word* (ama-lady) in the ML (Zulu). This is an example of borrowing although the EL can still be recognized from the verb stem. The second definition is more in tune with what takes place in CM than the first one. However, Kieswetter's definition falls short of mentioning that CM is a new variety of a speech community such as Pretoria Sotho, which is a mix of languages such as Sesotho, Setswana, Sepedi, and Afrikaans. IsiSoweto is another example of CM that is

a mix of Setswana, isiZulu and other languages spoken by different speech communities living in Soweto. CM is usually an urban variety of a given language such as urban Setswana spoken in Gaborone, especially among the youth, and is a mix of Setswana and English as illustrated in the example below:

a.   **Go**-sharp**o** fela
b. **It is** just **fine**, or: **it is** just **okay**.

The phrase '**go-sharpo**' above is made up of Setswana morpheme '**go**', its English equivalent is '**to**' or '**it is**' in this case, and 'sharp**o**', which originates from the English word '**sharp**' but with the '**-o**' affixed to it to adapt the word to a Setswana verb formation in a conversation. This phrase is used to mean 'it is just fine' or 'everything is okay' and has come to be accepted in spoken speech among the youth, however, it is restricted to spoken speech only.

The first definition above by Bokamba (1988: 24 and Wardhaugh, 1992: 106, in Moodley, 2001: 9) is all encompassing. It entails mixing affixes, words, phrases, and clauses within the same sentence. While CM takes place when affixes are mixed to form a word, the same cannot be said when words, phrases or even clauses are mixed within the same sentence. This is more consistent with what occurs in CS. Therefore, the definition by Bokamba (1988) and Wardhaugh (1992) is a mixture of what occurs in both CM and CS. In the present study, the definition of CM by Kieswetter (1995) will be applied, with modification, as follows: '… *Code-mixing refers to the use of morphemes from two languages (one the ML; the other the EL) to form a new word in a new variety of a speech community'*.

Myers-Scotton (1993a) used CS as a cover term for both CS and CM but distinguished the type of CS by labelling one intra-sentential CS and the other inter-sentential CS. The same practice was also followed by other scholars such as Akindele and Letsoela (2001), Kamwangamalu (2000) and Moyo (1996).

However, looking at the definitions of the two concepts and their respective examples in different languages as illustrated earlier, in the present study, as in Bokamba (1988) and Herbert (1994, in Kieswetter, 1995: 18-19); and Kieswetter (1995), CS and CM

will be treated as two separate phenomena. Both are a result of linguistic interaction and language contact, which also allow the speaker to coin a new word by prefixing or suffixing a morpheme from the ML onto the stem of the EL. While CM involves the 'consistent' use of a variety that consists of elements from different languages, in intra-sentential CS, a speaker may switch between languages or varieties of the same languages within the same sentence by using either a verb, or a verb phrase complement, or a noun phrase or even a prepositional phrase, as illustrated in examples 1 and 2 below. At times instances of intra-sentential CS, such as example 2 below can also be treated as an example of borrowing (which will be discussed later in this section). Example 3 illustrates an instance of inter-sentential CS from Setswana to English.

Example 1

Ke intend**-a go-**solve**-a di-**problems tsa bone (**intra-sentential CS**).
I intend **to** solve **their** problems (English).

Example 2:

Ke rata *go apaya **exotic dishes*** fa ke nale baeng. (**intra-sentential CS**)
 (**Setswana** and English).
I like to prepare exotic dishes whenever I have visitors (English).

Example 3

Ke ne ke ba solofetse. Yet they did not arrive. (**inter-sentential CS: Setswana** and English).
I had expected them. Yet they did not arrive. (English).

Example 4

Go *sharp***-o go** *s'gela* **ko** *versity* (CM).
It is okay to study at the university (English).

Example 4 above illustrates an instance of CM. Three languages are code-mixed in the sentence namely, Setswana, Zulu and English. The phrase '**go-sharpo**' has been explained already and is a result of code-mixing morphemes from Setswana and English. Similarly, '**go-** *s'gela*' is made up of Setswana morpheme **go-** whose English

equivalent is '**to**'; '*sgela*' has its origin from the Zulu word '*ngena*' which means 'come in' or 'go into' in English. In Setswana the equivalent expression of 'to attend school' or 'to go to school' is **go tsena sekolo.** Therefore, '*go s'gela*' is a result of code-mixing the following: Setswana prefix '**go**', **s'-** is a short form of **se-** which is a prefix of the Setswana word **sekolo** whose English equivalent is school; '-*gela*' is the adapted form of the Zulu verb '*ngena*' but it has been 'lexicalized' such that it sounds more like a Setswana word than Zulu, hence '*s'gela'* and not '*s'gena*'. Therefore, '**go s'gela**' is translated as 'to attend (school)'. In addition, '**ko**' is a Setswana preposition that equates to 'at' in English. The word 'versity' is a short form for 'university' and its use is restricted to spoken communication; in written communication, its use is rare except in note-taking / note-making. Example 4 above demonstrates language use that is typical of a specific social group, usually the urban youth, because of the cosmopolitan nature of urban centres where people of different language backgrounds live in search of jobs and other opportunities.

Bokamba (1988, in Kieswetter, 1995) observed that CM, like CS, commonly occurs in the speech of bilingual and multilingual speakers. However, from the definitions adopted in the current study, the main distinctive feature between the two concepts is that CM is a variety adopted by a speech community for communication purposes that have resulted from extensive language contact -- defined by Kembo-Sure & Webb (2000: 113) as a process whereby members of a speech community abandon the use of one language for certain functions and adopt another, but CS involves the use of at least two languages or varieties of the same language at the same time -- usually as a result of competence in both languages or language varieties. While CS is a common phenomenon in the speech of bilingual and multilingual speakers, CM is associated more with monolingual speakers than with bilingual or multilingual speakers, however, in some places such as in South African townships, for example Soweto, CM can also be a speech phenomenon even among bilinguals / multilinguals because of the historical background of such settlements.

2.3.3 Borrowing

Borrowing is another key concept in the discussion of contact phenomena in language use. Bokamba (1988) and Herbert (1994) (respectively quoted in Kieswetter, 1995:

13-14 and 18-19) referred to borrowing as follows: '… *where ... words or phrases (from another language) are assimilated phonologically, morphologically and syntactically into the host language.*

The definition above is silent on lexical assimilation, yet it is important because the borrowed word become integrated in the lexicons of the borrowing language.

Gumperz (1986: 66, in Kamwangamalu, 2000: 89) defines borrowing as: "… *the introduction of single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one language into another*".

The two definitions above acknowledge that, in borrowing, two languages are involved -- one as a borrowing language -- and another as a loaning language. The linguistic units from the loaning language may be assimilated into the grammatical structure of the borrowing language such that they become accepted as part of such grammar. The first definition by Bokamba (1988) and Herbert (1994) (respectively quoted in Kieswetter, 1995: 13–14 and 18–19) will be adopted in this study to refer to 'borrowing proper' because it mentions that borrowing involves the assimilation of borrowed words into the grammatical system of the borrowing language. This is usually the case where the borrowed word refers to a concept that is foreign to the borrowing language. In addition, the definition will include the fact that the borrowed words are also lexically assimilated.   However, the second definition by Gumperz (1986, in Kamwangamalu, 2000) is much more general and it is not clear whether it refers to borrowing proper or 'nonce borrowing' (discussed below).

Linguistic items, once borrowed, become integrated into the grammatical system of the host language as the examples below illustrate:

Examples of borrowing proper from Ciluba/Kiswahili to English

Ciluba	English	Kiswahili	English
mbulanketa	blanket	dereva	driver
kanife	knife	shati	shirt

Isizulu	English	Ciluba	French

| isikholo | school | shimishi | chemise |
| ibhola | ball | tabulo | tableau |

<div align="right">(Kamwangamalu, 2000: 90)</div>

In addition to being integrated lexically, phonologically, morphologically and syntactically into the host language, these borrowed words become widely accepted by monolingual speakers as they look and sound like ordinary words of the host language (Kieswetter, 1995). The same observation was made by Nyati-Ramahobo (2004) in reference to *Setawana* (a dialect of Setswana in Botswana) and Shiyeyi (one of the local languages in Botswana), that some words from Shiyeyi have been borrowed and integrated lexically, phonologically, morphologically, and syntactically into *Setawana*, and are now used as ordinary words in Setawana. However, such words are restricted to spoken *Setawana*. In writing, the formal Setswana conventions are strictly followed. In fact, the language contact between Batawana and Bayei has rendered spoken *Setawana* more as a form of CM than a variety of Setswana, as the following examples illustrate:

Example of borrowing proper from Shiyeyi to Setawana

| **Shiyeyi** | **Setawana** |
| Shaora (swim) | Go shaora (to swim) |

<div align="right">(Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004: 68)</div>

Examples of borrowing proper from English to Zulu

Zulu	**English**
emaklasini	in the classroom
sikoleni	at school

<div align="right">(Kamwangamalu, 2000: 90)</div>

Kamwangamalu (2000: 89) refers to this concept as "borrowing proper" or, what Kachru (1983, in Kamwangamalu, 2000: 89) earlier referred to as "nativization". The two definitions above (of borrowing) by Gumperz (1986: 66, in Kamwangamalu, 2000: 89), and Bokamba (1988, in Kieswetter, 1995), later reiterated by Herbert (1994, in Kieswetter, 1995), are in agreement and both describe what takes place in

borrowing. Borrowing, like CS and CM, is a result of language contact (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 89**;** Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004: 68); and so are CS and Borrowing.

The process of borrowing from other languages, especially English and Afrikaans, is also common in Setswana (as illustrated below):

Examples of borrowing proper from English-Afrikaans to Setswana

Setswana	English	Setswana	Afrikaans
buka	book	gaisi	huis
poto	pot	heke	hek
kara	car	kopi	koppie

<div align="right">(researcher's own examples)</div>

Although these borrowed words have their original Setswana equivalents, they are commonly used by many speakers and will be readily understood. However, their use is often restricted to spoken communication, whereas in written communication the original words **lekwalo** (book), **mogotswana** (cup), **sejanaga** (car), **ntlo** (huis), **kgoro** (hek), pitsa (pot) and **tsamaya** (trek) are preferred. Speakers use borrowing to fill lexical gaps in their languages (Kamwangamalu, 1999: 260; Moodley, 2001: 10). In other instances, borrowing is used purely to add variety to one's speech and other social reasons, such as to impress the listener, or to demonstrate familiarity with a language from which borrowing is taking place. One main distinctive characteristic of borrowing is that, like CM, it can occur in the speech of monolingual, bilingual, and / or multilingual speakers, and thus differs from CS, that is strictly speaking, a characteristic feature of the linguistic behaviour of bilingual speakers (Kamwangamalu, 1999: 260).

2.3.4 Re-borrowing

Re-borrowing (Herbert, 1994, in Kieswetter, 1995; Kieswetter, 1995) refers to a situation whereby '… bilingual speakers may re-borrow a word even though a particular word had already been integrated in the host language'. This is usually the case with speakers of the same language who may use different communication patterns (for instance rural vs. urban or youth vs. elderly).

For example: **e-school** (the Zulu word for 'school') is used instead of the borrowed word **isikholo** (Kieswetter, 1995: 25).

In some cases, a borrowed word may already be in the plural, but may again be inflected with a morpheme that denotes plural in the borrowing language. Kamwangamalu (1997: 48) refers to this phenomenon as "double plural marking". Although such words may reflect the 'double plural', synchronically they are not 'double-plurals' because, in the borrowing language, it is acceptable to inflect such morphemes to show plurality. This form of borrowing is common in many Bantu languages. Like in CS, it is the *borrowing language* that determines how plurality should be reflected in borrowing, as illustrated in the following examples:

Examples of borrowing proper

Zulu	**English**
Ama-red blood corpuscles	Red blood corpuscles
Lingala	**English**
Ba-jeunes (from French)	Young men

(Kamwangamalu, 1997: 48)

Examples of borrowing proper

Setswana	**English**
di-examinations	examinations
di-computers	computers

(researcher's own examples)

In 'double-plural marking', a word plural in form, may be borrowed from a guest language (English) and used in the host language (Setswana) with a prefix that also denotes plural. However, in the researcher's opinion, these are instances of borrowing proper rather than of "double-plural marking" as Kamwangamalu (2000: 97) states. These words are borrowed from English and have no direct equivalents in Setswana as they refer to concepts that are foreign to the Setswana culture of learning. Because they have been borrowed into Setswana and are used regularly, they have come to assume the Setswana prefix '**di–**' that denotes the plural form, which is appropriate in Setswana. Therefore, in this study, double-plural marking or re-borrowing will not

apply. Instead, examples of this nature will be treated as examples of borrowing proper.

2.3.5 Nonce borrowing

'Nonce borrowing' is a common phenomenon in spoken communication. Nonce implies 'once' or 'once off' or 'for the present time only'. Therefore, nonce borrowing refers to borrowing that is not regular or not lexically and structurally integrated. Kamwangamalu (2000: 91), quoting Poplack (1978), defines this phenomenon as: "… *the use of linguistic items from one language (such as English or French) in discourse in another language (such as siSwati or Ciluba) that show no signs of adaptation to the linguistic system of the latter language*".

This phenomenon is not restricted to the above-mentioned African languages, but also occurs in Setswana, as well. Some examples follow below:

  Setswana: Ba tshwere **discussion** ka tsa madi

  <u>English:</u> They are holding **a discussion** about financial matters.

In the example above, **discussion** is a nonce-borrowed word that resists integration into the borrowing language (Setswana) and is used as in the original language or the 'loaning language' (English). What is important to note is that, in nonce borrowing, the word or expression that is borrowed is used in its original form across different languages; while in borrowing proper, the borrowed word adapts to the grammatical system of the borrowing language such that it slightly differs from one African language to the other, yet is still recognizable. Nonce borrowing is often confused with CS because the linguistic units that qualify as nonce borrowing retain their original phonological and morphological features (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 91); that is, they are not integrated phonologically, morphologically, lexically and syntactically into the grammatical system of the borrowing language. However, in CS, the linguistic items are not socially integrated -- that is, even though a speaker may use a given linguistic item from one language in the other language, the same speaker may choose not to use the same linguistic item in its original form but may convey the same meaning by using its equivalent in the host language (borrowing language).

Example 1

<u>Setswana</u>: *Ke amogetse lekwalo,* **thank you.**

<u>English</u>: I received the letter, **thank you.**

<u>Setswana</u>: *Ke amogetse lekwalo,* **ke a leboga.**

The phrase 'thank you', '*ke a leboga*' in Setswana, is not socially integrated into Setswana and therefore it is an example of CS.

According to Kamwangamalu (2000: 90), expressions of time and the units of currency, as illustrated below, qualify as nonce borrowing, as they are socially integrated in the different African languages without changing their original phonological and morphological structures.

<u>English</u>: How much are the bananas? **Two rand.**

<u>Setswana</u>: *Ke bokae dipanana?* **Two rand.**

<u>English</u>: What time is it? **Two o'clock.**

<u>Setswana</u>: *Ke nako mang?* **Two o'clock.**

However, in the researcher's view, the examples above are more relevant to borrowing proper than nonce borrowing because of the regularity in which they are used in the borrowing language.

Bokamba (1988, in Kieswetter, 1995: 23-24) referred to nonce borrowing as lexical and phrasal expressions. Kieswetter (1995: 23) described lexical and phrasal expressions as small switches that fulfil a lexical need, implying that they are some form of CS. The researcher is inclined to agree with Kieswetter (1995: 23) that they are a form of CS, hence classify them as emblematic or tag-like switching because of their usage in the sentence.

Examples

- **Discourse markers**: anyway, because, that's why
- **Adverbial time** : yesterday, at the end of the month
- **Question forms**: Why? What? When? Whom?
- **Set expressions**: it's true, its lucky for you
- **Exclamations**: Oh! Hey!

- **Term of address**: my friend
- **Bare forms**: together, cheap, free

(Kieswetter, 1995: 23).

Lexical and phrasal expressions are used frequently in conversations and often function as set expressions or phrases. A speaker may use any one of them at some point as they are, even though the speaker may not be fluent in English. At another point, the same speaker may *not* use the same linguistic item in its original form, but may convey the same information by using its equivalent in the language of the conversational exchange. Myers-Scotton (1993: 125) refers to these as "embedded language islands".

Although Kamwangamalu's definition of nonce borrowing (quoting Poplack, 1978) implies that there is no assimilation of the borrowed word into the linguistic system of the borrowing language, it is not clear that nonce borrowing is a temporary phenomenon. Hence, in this study, the following will be used as the operational definition of nonce borrowing: 'Nonce borrowing is the temporary use of linguistic items from one language (EL) into the other (ML) which show no sign of grammatical adaptation to the linguistic structure of the borrowing language'.

In this section, the key concepts in this study have been discussed, with examples, in relation to what other scholars stated about them. From the above, it is clear that the semantic boundaries between these language contact phenomena are blurred. Hence the presentation of working definitions for each of the concepts that will apply in this study is an attempt to differentiate one concept from the other. On the basis of the above, in the present study, the researcher will only refer to two forms of borrowing, namely, 'borrowing proper' and 'nonce borrowing'. In addition, the three types of CS: (i) intra-sentential CS, (ii) inter-sentential CS, and (iii) tag-like / emblematic CS; as well as code-mixing will also apply. The terms: 're-borrowing' and 'double-plural marking' will not apply.

2.4: SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF CS

Studies carried out by different scholars in different parts of the world have produced empirical evidence that CS is not random, and that it can be used to serve a wide range of communicative needs in bilingual interactions (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 60).

Bilingual speakers use CS as a communicative strategy that can perform a number of social functions. Speakers engage in CS to exploit the socio-psychological values that have come to be associated with different linguistic varieties within a specific speech community. Speakers switch codes to negotiate a change in social distance between themselves and the other participants in the conversation. This negotiation is conveyed through the choice of different codes (Myers-Scotton, 1993a).

Although the social functions of CS are not the main focus of the present study, they are, nonetheless, important in that the study will examine the role that CS plays in the classroom. In that regard, the data gathered for the study will be examined to determine whether it shows CS as a communicative strategy that serves a social function in the classroom, or a didactic function that is educationally beneficial, or both. The following are some of the social functions of CS cited by scholars:

2.4.1 CS signals one's identity or group identity (Akindele & Letsoela, 2001; Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Kieswetter, 1995; Moodley, 2001: 56). This could be any of the following:

a. **Ethnic or cultural identity:** The speaker may switch from the language of the occasion (such as English) to his / her mother tongue. When CS is used in this way, it is said to be a 'sequential unmarked choice' as can be seen in the Markedness Model of Myers-Scotton (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Molosiwa, 2006: 101; Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 114). For instance, learners attending a Model C school (mainly an English-medium school) situated in a suburb of Johannesburg in South Africa, who are fluent in English, occasionally switch to Zulu (their first language) to demonstrate their ethnic identity and group solidarity (Kieswetter, 1995: 81). This is a school that uses only English as a LoLT. It is situated in a previously whites-only neighbourhood, but now some of the learners live in the same neighbourhood. For the majority of these learners, English is spoken at home to encourage them to be proficient in it.

Example:
Learner A: *Hey did you see* ukuthi bekumnandi kanjani e-choir nge-**Valediction**? (**Hey did you see how nice the choir was at Valediction?**)
Learner B: Ngitshele mngane *how long did you practise*? (Tell me, friend …)

The example above demonstrates that the speakers switch from English to their mother tongue within the same conversational exchange, not because they cannot speak English adequately, but to show ethnic identity, solidarity and in-groupness identity (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61).

b. **Level of education/ Socio-economic class / Prestige** (Kieswetter, 1995; Molosiwa, 2006; Moodley, 2001; Tshinki, 2002): Often a speaker may switch from his first language to the official language that is regarded as prestigious, a language of intellectuals and achievers, and therefore associated with a higher social class than that of the speaker. This is usually the case in English, French, and Portuguese in many of their former colonies in Africa because these languages are held in high esteem. Therefore, if one speaks any one of them, it is a sign of the speaker's social position, status, and level of education. For instance, CS from Zulu to English by African learners attending a Model C school has already been described in 2.4.1a above. Although these learners can speak their mother tongue (Zulu) very well, they constantly switch to English to signal their socio-economic class. CS is the 'unmarked choice' for these learners (Kieswetter, 1995: 79-80). This is also common in Botswana. A speaker, often a government official addressing a gathering in Setswana, would switch to English to signal his / her level of education / socio-economic class.

c. **Authority** (Adendorff, 1993; Gila, 1995; Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Kembo-Sure & Webb, 2000; Moodley, 2001; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Tshinki, 2002): Often when CS is used to show authority or power, it may also signal annoyance or anger by the speaker in authority.   Within the Markedness Model, CS used in this way is said to be a 'marked' choice (Myers-Scotton, 1993a; 132-133; Finlayson and Slabbert, 2001). To signal power or authority, the speaker normally changes the tone or pitch of his voice, either lowering or raising it, but often the latter to express emotions of anger or annoyance. That way, the speaker is performing a 'phatic function' (Moodley, 2001; Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 132). Kembo-Sure and Webb (2000: 127) state that "Languages are embedded in the power relations in a country or community".

In Botswana, Setswana is the national language, therefore, power relations are embedded in it. Hence, if speakers of other local languages want to progress and to be recognized, they have to ensure that they learn Setswana, in addition to English, very

well. The same applies to English, French, and Portuguese in most of the former colonies. They are powerful languages that must be learnt by all who wish to gain upward social mobility. A speaker, especially someone in authority, would normally switch from any of the African languages to English or French or Portuguese, whichever is prominent in the specific African country, to assert his authority and power. It is rather interesting that in South Africa, only 8.2% of approximately 45 million of the population (Population Census of 2001 by Statistics South Africa) indicated that English was their home language, yet the language has come to dominate virtually all spheres of public life, be it education, politics, business, or the judiciary, to mention but a few. This is mainly due to the international status of English and its association with liberation among non-white South Africans, as well (Strydom, 2002: 200).

2.4.2 CS can be used to accommodate the other speaker(s) or listener(s) (Adendorff, 1993; Gila, 1995; Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Kamwangamalu, 2000; Tshinki, 2002): The speaker would start off with one language and then switch to another language to accommodate those present. This form of CS is described by Finlayson and Slabbert (1997: 128) as 'meeting the addressee half-way with language'. This implies that while one is aware of his / her own linguistic identity, he/she offers other languages to indicate a spirit of willingness to accommodate and to show respect. According to Finlayson and Slabbert (1997: 133), "… *a disregard of this process is considered ... as arrogant and also a form of alienation"*.

In this instance, CS is a 'sequential unmarked choice' within Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Myers-Scotton, 1993a); Finlayson and Slabbert, 1997: 130-132).

Additional functions associated with the accommodation function of CS are:

a. **Having an awareness of what the addressee prefers / A willingness to learn and experiment**: A speaker is aware of the code that the other speaker(s) prefers, switches accordingly to adapt to the code or codes that he / she is being offered, as illustrated in the following utterance made by teenagers who are friends (Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997:128):

*'Ha ke bua le Mozulu ke bua Sezulu, ha ke bua leMotswana Setswana **AND …***

***SO** ha ke bua le motho wa **LANGUAGE** e Ngwe ke **TRY**a ho bua*

LANGUAGE** ya gagwe gore a seke a re **I AM TRYING TO BE DIFFICULT

*ke ba **LIKE TRIBALIST'**.*

Translated to English, the above discourse means:

'When I speak with a Zulu I speak Zulu, when I speak with a Tswana,

Setswana and so when I speak with a person who speaks another language

I try to speak that language of him / her so that he / she cannot say I am trying

to be difficult or that I am a tribalist'.

In the instance above, the speaker is using CS to **display linguistic versatility**
(Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Kamwangamalu, 2000): The speaker who wants to
accommodate other speakers who may not share the same language as he or she, may
initially use his language; recognizing that it is not intelligible to the other speaker; he /
she may then switch to the next language he / she speaks. If the other speaker
responds, it confirms that the chosen code is common to both speakers. This form of
CS is common in the urban centres where people from different linguistic backgrounds
migrate in search of jobs, as illustrated in the following example (Finlayson &
Slabbert, 1997:130):

Speaker: ***Nna ke bua kaofela – SeZulu, le Sesotho, le Sepedi.***
  (Translated): *I speak everything Zulu, and Sotho, and Pedi.*

At times a speaker trying to accommodate another speaker of a different language
would switch and try to speak the language of that speaker even though he may not
know it well. By so doing, the speaker is trying to experiment with the other language.
Here CS functions as an exploratory choice within the Markedness Model (Myers-
Scotton, 1993a; Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Kamwangamalu, 2000: 62). CS is used
this way in situations whereby the speaker is uncertain about the expected code choice;
or the unmarked choice is not clear (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). When speakers do not
know much about each other, the speaker who initiates the conversation uses
exploratory CS to establish the unmarked choice of the addressee; not the unmarked

choice for a particular situation because 'they may know which situational factors are salient for such an exchange' (Myers-Scotton, 1993b: 176). A speaker who initiates a conversation in a particular language switches to another language when realizing that the initial language is not intelligible to the other speaker. If the nominated language is mutually intelligible to both speakers, their conversation will continue in that language, because they are satisfied that they have reached the balance of rights and obligations required for their conversational exchange (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 142-143; Kamwangamalu, 2000: 62).

b. Making an adaptation on the variety continuum of 'deep' to urban

(Finlayson and Slabbert, 1997: 129): A speaker may switch from one variety to the other of the same language to accommodate the other speaker who may be having difficulty understanding the 'deep' or 'pure' variety. This usually happens in an urban context where the variety of a language spoken, for instance, Zulu, may not be as 'pure' as the variety spoken in rural settings. The speaker of rural or 'pure' Zulu may need to water down or simplify his / her variety to be accepted. This is also the case with Setswana that is spoken both in Botswana and in South Africa. A Motswana from Botswana may need to switch to South African Setswana to be well understood in the Gauteng Province. Similarly, a Motswana from South Africa visiting Botswana may at times need to switch to a Setswana variety spoken in Botswana to be well understood. About this phenomenon, Finlayson and Slabbert (1997: 131) state that, ... *switching to the preferred code of your addressee, in most cases ... his / her first language would normally be interpreted as decreasing the social distance between participants, or a marked choice*.

2.4.3 CS as a deferential strategy (Myers-Scotton, 1993a): this happens when CS is used to accommodate oneself to the code of the addressee, especially when special respect is called for by circumstances, or when societal norms indicate it as appropriate. In this situation, when the addressee responds to the first speaker, instead of using the language used by the first speaker, he / she chooses a language that he / she feels is appropriate and respectful for the occasion. This form of CS may also be indicated by using 'honorific titles or indirect requests' as illustrated below (Myers-Scotton, 1993: 148):

Father: Where have you been? [English.]

Son: Onyango nendle adlu aora, baba. [Luo]

Translated: 'I've been to the river, father.' [English]

In the exchange above, the son chooses to answer his father in Luo (their home language) as a sign of respect for his father; and even uses the honorific title 'father' in Luo, instead of answering in English in which the conversation was initiated.

Similarly, the first Premier of the Free State Province, Matsephe-Casaburri, when addressing a gathering at her swearing-in ceremony in 1994, started off in English and then switched to Sotho, and then to Afrikaans to accommodate the speakers of these languages who were present (Kamwangamalu, 1998, in Kamwangamalu, 2000: 66-67).

2.4.4 CS to express confidentiality (Kamwangamalu, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Tshinki, 2002): When a speaker wishes to express confidentiality, he / she often switches from a language commonly understood by those present to a language only spoken and understood by those in whom he / she wishes to confide. Here CS is used for exclusion. For instance, members of a community may share a common language, but may also have speakers of different languages within the social group. If they wish to exclude some members of the group, they often switch to their own language so that the rest of the group is excluded from the conversation. This is also true with different social groups who may develop a language only understood by those within their social circle. They would switch to that language or code if they wish to communicate a message confidential to their social circle. In this instance, CS is used as a 'marked choice' within the Markedness Model (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 61; Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 135-136). CS is an unexpected choice within that particular group and setting; but it is used to signal social distance among the participants.

2.4.5 CS used to show emphasis (Gumperz & Hymes, 1986; Finlayson & Slabbert, 1997; Gila, 1995; Hoffman (1991, in Tshinki, 2002; Kieswetter, 1995; Moodley, 2001; Tshinki, 2002): When a speaker wants to emphasise what he / she is saying, CS may be employed, usually in the form of an interjection, or a repetition, to clarify or to ensure that he/she is understood.

2.4.6 CS can be used due to the topic or subject that is being discussed (Blom & Gumperz, in Gumperz & Hymes, 1986; Hoffman (1991, in Tshinki, 2002); Moodley, 2001; Myers-Scotton, 1993a; Tshinki, 2002): When it is more appropriate to discuss a certain topic or subject in a certain language than in the one initially used, CS occurs. About this Hoffman (1991: 115, in Tshinki, 2002: 35) says, "Talking about a particular topic or subject may cause a switch, either because of lack of facility in the relevant register or because certain items trigger off various connotations which are linked to experiences in a particular language".

This form of CS often takes place where a particular language is inadequate to give a thorough description or explanation of what is being discussed. For instance, during the discussion of technical subjects or topics brought about by the introduction of Western technology in developing countries. Where an equivalent expression cannot be found in a local language, CS to a Western language from where the technology originates will take place. However, in the researcher's view, this is more borrowing than CS. The same observation was made by Kembo-Sure and Webb (2000: 123) when they stated the following: "*... technological changes have brought about the addition of new terms and words, as happened when computers became a feature of modern societies ... ".*

This function is also referred to as a 'referential function' (Appel & Muysken, 1987: 118, in Gila, 1995) because it often involves 'a lack of knowledge of one language or a lack of facility in that language on a certain subject'. In such cases, a particular concept is better expressed in a foreign language and not in the mother tongue of the speaker, hence the need to switch from one language to the other. This is often confused with 'nonce borrowing' discussed in 2.3.5 above.

2.4.7 CS for closure: (Blommaert, 1992, in Kamwangamalu, 2000; Nwoye (1992, in Moodley, 2001): A speaker addressing a group of people during a formal ceremony uses the official language. For instance, in Botswana, English is the official language during official ceremonies. At the end of the speech, the speaker may switch to his / her first language or to the national language (Setswana) to make an utterance that marks closure. He / she may utter the word 'pula' that literally means 'rain', but in this instance, the speaker is not using the word 'pula' in its literal sense. He / she is using it

to say, "Let there be prosperity, peace and happiness". To the people of Botswana, 'rain' brings good things. Because the country is very hot and dry, when it rains, their fields flourish and they get good harvests, the temperature cools down, and the people and their animals have enough food to eat and enough water to drink. The word 'pula' in Botswana is used with respect because it is also the name of the national currency.

2.4.8 CS to quote another speaker (Moodley, 2001; Liebscher & Dailey O'Cain, 2004): CS occurs when a speaker addressing a group of people would like to borrow the words of another speaker or writer and use them verbatim. If the speech is being presented in a language different from the one in which the words to be borrowed are in, the speaker switches to that language to quote the speaker; and then switches back to the language of the occasion to present his speech in order to explain what the quoted words actually mean.

2.4.9 CS as a strategy for neutrality (Myers-Scotton, 1993a): here a speaker avoids speaking only one code so as not to commit himself / herself to a single Rights and Obligation set (RO set). The speaker employs two codes at the same time because he / she realizes that 'the use of each of the two codes has its value in terms of the costs and rewards which accrue with its use' (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 147). Therefore, CS is used as a middle path regarding these costs and rewards.

Despite the various social functions of CS articulated above, CS was not an accepted phenomenon in certain societies. For instance, during the socialist era in Tanzania, CS between English and Swahili was considered undesirable and a remnant of colonialism. Grosjean (1982), quoting Mkilifi (1978: 144-145) says: *There is a school of thought which believes that in a situation like that obtained in Tanzania the multinguals concerned fail to master perfectly one of the languages they operate in ...*". However, the attitudes have since changed in favour of English. For instance, Kamwangamalu (2004), quoting Mafu (1999) states that in Tanzania, while expressing official support for Swahili-medium instruction, the elite generally send their own children to 'English academies' that is, to private English-medium schools that have mushroomed in Tanzanian urban centres.

In Ghana, Forson (1979: 200, in Guerini, 2006) reported negative attitudes towards English / Akan CS. CS was either tolerated or condemned, and where it occurred it was denied. Lawson & Sachdev (2000: 1344-1345) reported on the negative attitudes towards CS by a Norwegian visitor to the USA who disapproved of English / Norwegian CS by Norwegian immigrants and referred to it as no language, and a gruesome mixture of Norwegian and English which he was not sure whether to take it seriously or not. Lawson and Sachdev (2000: 1345) further reported on other cases of negative attitudes towards CS in Morocco where its users are seen as suffering from 'colonial hangover'. In Nigeria it is referred to as "verbal salad", and Gibbons (1987, in Lawson & Sachdev, 2000: 1345) reported that in Hong Kong, students found it irritating. Furthermore, Farahlexis (2009) reported that in the Philippines, there were positive, neutral and negative attitudes towards English-Philipino CS. Some of the negative attitudes expressed were that CS: poses a threat to the speakers' ethno-linguistic identity; contributes to communication breakdown because it makes the conversation 'hard to understand'; is used to boastfully assert an individual's education and socio-economic background and social class; was regarded as an insult to the local language and therefore irritating; and a sign of 'colonial hangover'.

Having discussed some of the social functions of CS, it remains to be seen if CS in the classroom performs didactic / educational functions or social functions or both, especially where a second language or even in some instances, a third language is used. However, it is important to review some of the existing literature on CS in education which will inform the present study. A detailed review of some of the literature is undertaken in the following section.

2.5 CS IN EDUCATION

Although research on CS in the classroom has been undertaken in many parts of the world, it is still a relatively under-researched area in Africa, particularly in this part of Africa. Going through the South African research database, only a handful of studies were on CS in the classroom. Some of the known studies on CS in an educational environment are: Adendorff (1993), Gila (1996), Moodley (2001) and Mqadi (1990). There is abundant literature available on CS in domains other than the classroom. Even where the domain was a school or institution of learning, focus was on CS

outside the classroom (for example, Kieswetter, 1995; Moyo, 1996). The situation is even worse in Botswana where CS generally and CS in education in particular as a researchable area has been neglected by scholars for a long time. In some studies where it appears, such as in Janson and Tsonope (1991) and Nyati-Ramahobo (2004) it is only mentioned in passing. However, Molosiwa (2006) discussed CS in education in relation to the analysis of the official language (English) perspective to literacy teaching and learning even though the focus of her work was not on CS per se. She raised a number of important issues which will be pursued later in this chapter.   In Botswana, it is only recently that researchers have begun to study CS. Some of the known studies are Arthur (2001), Letsebe (2002), Ramando (2002) and Tshinki (2002). It is the former two studies that specifically focused on CS in the classroom. The latter two focused on CS in a non-teaching / learning situation. Tshinki (2002) focused on CS in a social setting, while Ramando (2002) focused on CS in the media. All the studies cited above, will be reviewed as well as the following: Akindele and Letsoela (2001), Hussein (1999), Lawson and Sachdev (2000), Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2004) and Martin-Jones and Saxena (2001), as they also discuss CS in the classroom.

CS in the classroom has been neglected by researchers although it is generally acknowledged that it does take place. Some of the reasons for this apparent neglect are: the stigma often associated with CS in education which is often viewed as a sign of linguistic deficiency on the part of its users (Kamwangamalu, 2000: 60); its users deny that it exists (Arthur, 2001: 61-62); it is found to be 'irritating' (Lawson and Sachdev, 2000: 1345); and a combination of policy makers' neutral and negative attitudes towards its use in the classroom (Ferguson, 2003: 38). However, scholars in Africa have now begun to see CS in the classroom as a fertile ground for research as observed by Christa van der Walt (2004: 164) in her article on South African Englishes that:

> The challenge, it seems, is to acknowledge this state of affairs and create space in which to grow tolerance for non-standard varieties of English and for other languages (in other words, for linguistic diversity). This opens up new avenues for research, for example into code-switching practices in the classroom.

She further observed that the *South African Association for Language Teachers Journal* is actively looking for articles on CS.

Webb (2002: 58) in his discussion of LoLT in tertiary institutions in South Africa noted that:

> Sociolinguists call the use of two languages in the same context with the same functions **code-switching**, and it seems to be mentioned more and more in the South African debate on LoLT as a possible "answer" to the problem of selecting an LoLT in multilingual teaching institutions. However, to my knowledge the educational effect of code-switching has not been researched…..

The observations above, made by these two scholars, acknowledge that little is known about the educational effects of CS. What they said confirmed the same sentiments expressed by other scholars, among them Arthur (2001), Ferguson (2003: 38), and Kamwangamalu (2000: 60). On the basis of the above, the present study, although based on the Botswana situation, intends to address this knowledge gap. The study undertakes to answer the main questions regarding CS use in the classroom; that is, is the phenomenon that occurs in the classroom really CS? Does it signal a lack of linguistic proficiency on the part of its users? Does it have any educational and / or language development value? It is hoped that the answers to these questions will inform all stakeholders in the education system, more especially the policy makers, so that they can make an informed judgment regarding the use of what is termed CS in the classroom. Similarly, the teachers, who are the executors of this phenomenon, will also become aware of the consequences of its use in the education system. These include, among others, the acquisition of knowledge across school subjects generally; and the effect of its use on the acquisition of competency and fluency in English as an important language of education, career and job prospects in particular.

As already mentioned, research on CS in the classroom is relatively new compared to research on CS in non-formal domains. Nonetheless, a number of the studies cited above are reviewed below to determine their relevance to the present study, highlight their strengths as well as their limitations with the intention to address the latter in the present study.

Arthur (2001) investigated the role of CS in the classroom through an ethnographic study characterized by lesson observations, questionnaire interviews and direct interviews. Her study focused on two Standard Six (South African Grade 5) classes at two schools located in two different places in northern Botswana. In one place the language of the community was predominantly Setswana (the national language), while in the other the language of the community was Ikalanga (one of the minority languages). In both cases English was the LoLT. According to Arthur (2001: 61), the teachers:

> operated under conditions of tension between institutional pressure to adhere to language policy, that is, the exclusive use of English in the classroom, and their professional and personal instincts to code-switch in response to the communicative needs of their pupils.

From this study, Arthur made a number of observations which led to some important conclusions. Some of the observations were that teachers used CS to perform the following functions in the classroom: to fulfil pragmatic functions such as to give encouragement or praise or reproof to individual learners; (used discourse-related CS in the form of contextualization cues) to capture the learners' attention when moving between stages of the lesson or back to the main topic of the lesson; and (used tag-switches) to prompt learners to respond to the teacher's monologue in the form of 'a chorus of minimal responses'(Arthur, 2001: 62).

CS from English to Setswana was the monopoly of the teacher and the learners were not allowed to code-switch. Where it was made available to them, the learners rejected it because they viewed its use as breaking the ground rule of using English as the LoLT. Learners did not CS to Setswana to make a contribution to the lesson, but rather, to apologize to themselves for failing to respond correctly to the question. Some learners chose to remain silent in class, or mumbled an answer as they were ashamed to give a wrong answer loudly in English, lest they made a grammatical error. As a result, the insistence that the learners use English in the classroom denied them the freedom to use their first language, and consequently stifled their participation in the lesson.

Because the official policy was that English is the LoLT for all lessons except Setswana lessons, and that the learners had to be prepared for primary school-leaving examinations to be written in English, the teachers were compelled to use English predominantly and to use Setswana minimally even though they recognized the benefits of using Setswana to clarify the material learners did not understand. English was used as 'a center-stage language', while Setswana was 'a back-stage language' (Arthur, 2001: 69). For instance, learners were expected to answer questions fully in English in the classroom, while conversations between the learners or even between the learners and their teachers outside the classroom took place in Setswana or Ikalanga depending on the participants' repertoires and preferences. Arthur (2001: 72-73) further observed that at other times CS to Setswana signalled Setswana as:

> …'the language of complicity'…teacher and pupils are mutually interdependent in that all need to keep up the appearance of effective activity in the classroom and of fulfilment of their respective roles. Any problems that arise must, therefore, be glossed over or kept backstage.

This implied that CS to Setswana at times did not occur for any educationally worthy purpose, but rather to gloss over some obvious learning difficulties so that it appears as if learning was taking place.

Arthur (2001) concluded that although it was evident that CS occurred in the classroom, the teachers were, however, ashamed and reluctant to admit to its use. They did not want to be seen to be deviating from the official policy of using English as the LoLT. The requirement to teach in English inhibited learner participation due to their lack of fluency in this language. The teachers at times had to ignore the fact that learners had difficulty with the language of learning because they were preparing them to eventually write their examinations in English.

The observations and conclusions made by Arthur (2001) were very important. They implied that CS took place in the classroom because the teachers realized that the learners had a problem with English as the LoLT and, that when English was used throughout the lesson, there was less learner participation. This implied that either the learners did not understand some part of the lesson, or even if they understood, they

failed to participate in the discussion of the lesson because they could not express themselves well in English. However, where some parts of the lesson were presented in Setswana, teaching became more effective as learners participated more. It appears therefore, that the issue in this instance was the language problem. However, it is important to note that the use of CS in this instance was largely for social purposes rather than academic purposes. Hardly any material which was presented in Setswana was of any educational value. However, that does not imply that reinforcements and / or praises are not important to the teaching and learning processes.

While Arthur's study and the present study are essentially similar, the present one is based on the senior level of secondary education, Forms Four and Five classes which are the terminal stages of secondary education, but Arthur's study focused on the primary level of education. Arthur focused on three subjects namely; English, Mathematics and Science, while the present study, in addition to Science and English, also focused on History and Home Economics, which are content and practically-based subjects respectively, as well as Setswana as a language subject taught in the school. The latter was included as CS in the classroom was likely to occur between English and Setswana. It therefore remains to be seen if the current study will produce results similar to or different from those produced by Arthur (2001)'s study.

Kieswetter (1995) also investigated the use of CS in a school situation. Her study focused on the conversational patterns of African high school learners in three different schools. One was a rural school in KaNgwane, another was a school in Soweto (a township outside Johannesburg), and the third was a Model C school in a suburb in Johannesburg. In the first school, CS was between Zulu / Swati and English; in the second school, CS was between Zulu and English (and to some extent Afrikaans); and in the third school, CS was between Zulu and English. In all three schools the LoLT was English. The following observations were made at each school:

KaNgwane School

Boys tended to use more Swati than girls especially in the greeting and parting phases of a conversation in order to establish solidarity. Girls sometimes switched to Swati when talking to boys. The conversations of the learners had an overall pattern of code-

mixing as 'the unmarked choice' for them; and they used borrowings and re-borrowings. The dominant language (Matrix Language) was Zulu / Swati while English was the Embedded Language (EL). Sometimes learners switched completely to English to make a marked choice in order to emphasize or highlight a particular point. However, this occurred seldom and such switches were relatively short.

Although the school was supposed to be an English medium school, the teachers often resorted to using the mother tongue in order to explain the work more clearly. The teachers also tended to speak more in their mother tongue, but when they *code-switched*, they used actual CS while the learners used more *code-mixes*. This Kieswetter attributed to the fact that the teachers had achieved a much higher level of education.

Kieswetter attributes greater use of Zulu / Swati to the fact that the learners used these languages a lot both at school and at home. She asserts that it is the context which is responsible for the type of overall conversational pattern found among learners. The learners are not surrounded by people speaking English every day, so they tend to use Zulu / Swati more and included mixed forms and English insertions as an indication of some knowledge of English. Although these learners are able to speak English, they do not seem to attach much importance to it.

From the above, one can deduce that to these learners, English is only a language of learning as required by the school; as soon as the learning ceases, so is its use. Also their frequent use of Zulu / Swati may be a sign of lack of confidence in expressing themselves in English. This again brings up the language issue, that is, is English the appropriate medium of learning for these learners? This is also demonstrated by the use of Zulu / Swati by the teachers in the class where they feel that learners do not seem to understand what is being said in English. Again the question is, is the phenomenon here really CS or repetition of material in another language? And what is the cause of this phenomenon? The present study will attempt to uncover the reason behind this phenomenon.

Soweto high school

The study focused on learners who were mainly Zulu speaking and Kieswetter found that their conversational patterns were very similar to those of learners at the KaNgwane high school. Their conversations displayed an overall pattern of CM as the unmarked choice with Zulu being the Matrix Language and English, and at times, Afrikaans being the Embedded Languages. This Kieswetter attributed to the fact that these learners are constantly surrounded by their mother tongue at school and at home. However, she noted that the relative frequency of *code switches* is higher within the Soweto context than at KaNgwane School. This could be due to the urban nature of Soweto where there is free interaction between learners from this Soweto school and those attending Model C schools. In addition, these learners have access to television programmes and shopping centres in Johannesburg where English is predominantly used.

Again fluency in English language seems to be the central issue here. The nature of switching seemed to be determined by how fluent in English the learners were.

Model C school in a Johannesburg suburb

The study also focused on Zulu speakers. These learners comprised only 7% of the school population and as such the school was predominantly English speaking. English was the LoLT, a language of authority at school and a language of interaction outside the classroom for the majority of the learners. It was also a language spoken at home (some of these learners, although of African origin, lived in the neighbourhood suburbs while others lived in Soweto and other townships).

The following observations were made: There was a marked difference between the conversational patterns of these learners and those in the previous two schools. Larger switches were made to English during the period of discourse. There was an overall pattern of CS as the unmarked choice in their conversations which carried social meaning to indicate their identities - first their ethnic and group identity as Zulu, secondly their social identity – their status and level of education. Although a lot of English was used within a conversation, Zulu was still the Matrix Language and English the Embedded Language. Because the majority of the learners and the

teachers at the school were English speaking (English is their mother tongue), the learners of African origin were exposed to spoken English more than their counterparts at the other two schools. As a result, their conversational patterns were influenced by constant exposure to English. Because English was the language of learning and authority, and was also viewed as the language of achievers, a high value was attached to it by these learners and their parents. Consequently, it was also spoken at home. For these learners both Zulu and English represented different sets of social meanings and therefore they freely code-switched between the two languages depending on what social meaning they wanted to convey during a conversation. As a result, they used both languages almost equally within conversations. The overall speech pattern included CS, code-mixing, borrowings, and re-borrowings or what Kamwangamalu (1997) refers to as double plural marking. However, as earlier argued, in the researcher's view, what Kamwangamalu refers to as reborrowing or double plural marking is, in fact, borrowing proper.

In summary, the study showed that there was more CS at the Model C School but there was more code-mixing at the KaNgwane and Soweto schools. However, learners at the Soweto school displayed more instances of CS than those at KaNgwane. It is interesting to note that for the learners at the Model C School, CS was a sign of fluency in both languages and confidence to speak English, while at the other two schools CS was more due to a lack of fluency and lack of self-confidence by these learners to express themselves in English.

Although the study demonstrated that there was both CS and CM in all three the contexts, it did not shed light on their educational effects. This is the deficiency in Kieswetter's study. Also, the examples given in the study are of discourse which occurred in social and informal situations but not in a formal classroom situation; hence it was not clear if CS or CM was of any didactic value. Furthermore, in all instances, only the conversational patterns of the learners were given but not those of their teachers; hence it was not possible to judge when teachers used CS, how, and why. The present study will present the utterances of both the teachers and the learners whenever possible in order to examine their use of CS.

Moyo (1996) carried out a pilot study on CS at the University of Zululand among participants he considered to be competent bilinguals. The participants were Zulu-English, Afrikaans-English, Xhosa-English, and Sotho- English speakers. All four groups had English as their second language (L2). They were all degree holders working either as academic or administrative staff. Moyo (1996: 20) concluded that CS among competent bilinguals was not a result of a lack of proficiency in L2 but rather:

> a spontaneous expression of their ambivalent psychological state, where there is a strong dual inclination to use both their L1 and L2 in specific communicative situations.

Various reasons were advanced by the participants for CS from their first language (L1) to their second language (L2). Some of the reasons were: they *code-switched* in order to maintain a freer flow of communication among those who share a common L1; to identify with both languages the speaker spoke; to show group solidarity and to show association with the cultures of those languages; generally, CS from L2 to L1 at work was meant to ensure that the speaker's first language is not relegated to a lower status compared to English which was associated with professionalism, science and technology. However, some admitted that they *code-switched* due to the inadequacy of their L1 to express professional concepts. From this study, Moyo (1996: 26-27) concluded that:

> this subsequent discourse constitutes a mode of expression or register in its own right. We could therefore describe this register as a third variety which the speakers themselves clearly recognize as their appropriate mode, particularly in many social and informal conversations.

However, the question is, can CS be regarded as a third variety? Does it have its own vocabulary? Does it have its own speakers? In the researher's view, by definition, CS is not a third register; it is a language behaviour pattern. What can be considered a third register, is CM rather than CS. Moyo (1996: 27) went on to say:

> It is generally observed in African contexts, that the use of English and an African language may well point to the class or the elite. Code-switching therefore

becomes the marker of some ambivalent ethnic identity, which usually indicates the speakers' dual affiliation to the two cultures.

Again the question here is: does CS really indicate some identity? If so, which identity is that? In the researher's view, CS between one's L1 and English is more of a sign of educational level than ethnic identity. Even then, CS performs different functions. So it is difficult to assume that its use in a particular instance is a sign of one's dual affiliation with the cultures associated with the languages in use. Furthermore, the use of CS does not necessarily imply complete fluency in both languages or even complete understanding of the cultures of the speakers of those languages, especially the language which is not one's mother tongue.

Moyo (1996) further observed that more competent bilinguals tended to use intra-sentential CS, while less competent bilinguals tended to use inter-sentential CS in the form of 'emblematic' switches. These may be fixed expressions which comprise discourse particles, interjections and tags which tended to be well interspersed in their speech in order to give the impression that they were balanced and competent bilinguals. However, from the study it is not clear how Moyo (1996) measured the English competenc of the bilingual speakers.

Furthermore, even though the setting for this study was an academic environment, it did not focus on CS in the classroom but rather on the use of CS in formal and informal situations outside the classroom. Hence it will not inform the present study to any marked extent.

Akindele and Letsoela (2001) examined the use of CS in secondary and high schools in Lesotho as an instructional strategy. The study involved teachers of Science / Mathematics, English Language and Literature, Geography, and Development Studies in urban and semi-urban secondary and high schools. This study is very similar to the current one except that it focused on the teachers only while the present study focuses on both the teachers and learners. In addition to Science, language and content subjects, the current study also includes a practical subject. Akindele and Letsoela (2001) did not include a practical subject. However, the results of their study are very

important to the current study as they raised a number of pertinent questions which the current study will also seek to address.

From the study, the following observations were made: almost all the teachers (except non-Sesotho speakers), irrespective of the locale and the subjects they taught, code-switched; strongly agreed that CS facilitated teaching and learning because it 'enhanced content delivery, and allowed both the academically-strong and the academically-weak learners to participate actively in the lesson'; that even non-Sesotho speaking teachers who could not code-switch used CS through other learners by allowing those who understood 'to explain concepts in Sesotho to the weaker ones' (Akindele and Letsoela 2001: 92). Teachers code-switched at any point in the lesson and tended to code switch at inter-sentential rather than at intra-sentential level.

CS was used for various purposes such as to mark transition from one stage of the lesson to another, to explain difficult concepts, and to praise good performance, response or behaviour. Similar observations were made by Arthur (2001). In the latter, CS was a positive reinforcement tool when a learner had responded correctly to the teacher's question. However, in the researcher's view, this was more of a socio-psychological function than a didactic one because CS was not used to present the lesson content but to acknowledge the learner's contribution to the lesson. However, Akindele and Letsoela (2001) determined that the downside of CS use in the classroom was that it did not enhance the learners' academic performance. It seemed here academic performance was based purely on how well the learners expressed themselves either in speaking and writing. However, this was inadequate as this view was not based on the learners' achievement in graded work such as tests and assignments or even examinations.

CS did not improve the learners' spoken and written communication in English. Even though concepts had been explained to the learners through the CS strategy, they still found it difficult to explain the same concepts in English. This was an indication that the learners lacked proficiency in English hence they were unable to demonstrate through speaking that they had understood concepts explained earlier in Sesotho. CS also did not improve the learners' written communication because it was limited to spoken communication.

From the observations made above, it is clear that the phenomenon of CS was prevalent across the subjects observed in the schools that were under study. However, these observations raise a number of pertinent questions: Can the phenomenon that occurred in these lessons really be termed CS as per the universal definition of CS by different scholars? If it does not fit this definition, what then is it, and what is the underlying cause of the occurrence of this phenomenon? It is interesting to note that while teachers generally agreed that CS enhanced content delivery and increased understanding and participation, it did not improve the learners' academic performance nor did it improve their spoken and written communication; the latter in English. This observation was strange and contradictory because if CS enhanced content delivery and learner participation, it means that learning was taking place, so academic performance should naturally be enhanced. Again if CS did not improve spoken and written communication in English, can we rightly say it is an effective instructional strategy? Or is it a hindrance to the learners' acquisition of English as a second language, which is important to master due to its status as the prescribed LoLT? Again if learners cannot explain concepts in English explained to them in Sesotho, does this not signal that the issue here is not the difficulty of a given subject or its concepts, but rather, the language-in-education policy problem given that learners seem to understand the presentation of a lesson in Sesotho better than when it is presented in English? Can we not then ask if, in this instance, English as a LoLT is effective? Is the language of instruction not the barrier? Are the learners not being instructed in a language they have not mastered, hence their difficulty in following the lessons?

Furthermore, if non-Sesotho speaking teachers allowed some learners who had understood the lesson to explain to the other learners in Sesotho, can we say this is CS or mere repetition of the same material in the learners' first language? Was that not really a waste of teaching time as it amounted to repetition in Sesotho of the same lesson material earlier presented in English? Can this strategy then not have a negative effect of boredom among those learners who had understood the material in the first instance when it was presented in English? Again where CS was used as a positive reinforcement tool, it appears that its function was more social than academic. The issues raised from the review of this study will be further explored in the current study.

Akindele and Letsoela (2001) also observed that teachers tended to code-switch inter-sententially rather than intra-sententially. This was in contrast with what Moyo (1996) observed in the setting he studied. Moyo observed that more fluent bilinguals tended to code-switch intra-sententially rather than inter-sententially. This contrast is important to note because teachers are supposed to be fluent bilinguals. Therefore, if intra-sentential CS is associated with fluency in both languages, then the teachers at the Lesotho setting should code-switch intra-sententially not inter-sententially. The present study will thus take this contradiction on board and establish whether it is intra-sentential, or inter-sentential CS, or both, and which are used more by fluent bilingual speakers.

In the researcher's view, Akindele and Letsoela (2001) made a number of important observations and arrived at some important conclusions. However, through the present study, the researcher will seek to answer the questions that arise from their study which are at the thrust of the current study.

Martin-Jones and Saxena (2001) investigated the effectiveness of a new form of educational provision known as "bilingual support" which had been developed for bilingual learners from minority ethnic groups primarily in multilingual urban areas of England. In this study, the researchers were, in fact, observing CS in the classroom. The main aim of this form of educational provision was to provide access to the curriculum until the learners had acquired sufficient English to make the transition to monolingual education through the LoLT. Their study involved a number of schools in the Northwest of England and the majority of the learners were from Panjabi, Urdu or Gujarati speaking communities. Essentially teaching was mainly done by a monolingual English-speaking teacher with the assistance of a bilingual assistant who explained what had been said in the language(s) of the learners. In some situations, the lesson would first be introduced in the learners' language(s) and then a monolingual teacher would take over in English. This strategy was meant to assist the learners to follow the lessons without being disadvantaged by the lack of understanding of English as the LoLT.

What was taking place in this situation was the presentation of the same material in two different languages in a class to maximize understanding and learning for the

benefit of the learners. The strategy was meant to address the language problem. The learners were being assisted to learn English and at the same time to follow the curriculum without suffering the setback of lagging behind in the curriculum. Although Martin-Jones and Saxena (2001) refer to this strategy as a form of CS, in the researcher's view, it was mere repetition of the same material initially presented in one language, and then repeated in the other language. It is therefore doubtful if this strategy can be rightly referred to as CS when the two scholars said:

> What was common to both teaching / learning events …was that the
> monolingual teachers assumed the principal speaking rights.
> They took the floor whenever they deemed it to be appropriate.
> They allocated turns to the bilingual assistants and shaped the patterns of
> **code-switching** across turns.

In the researcher's view, the repetition of the same information is not synonymous with CS. The strategy they used worked as an instructional strategy as in the Lesotho study (Akindele & Letsoela, 2001), however, it is still questionable to refer to that strategy as CS. The current study seeks to address this knowledge gap.

Furthermore, it is important to note that this strategy was appropriate for the setting above because England is mainly a monolingual country; therefore the gradual instructional transition from bilingual to monolingual instruction in English was appropriate. However, in situations where English is a second or even a third language, such as in Botswana, this strategy is bound to raise some problems. That is, the education system may be construed as trying to build a monolingual country directed to a foreign language. This does not mean that even in the situation on which Martin-Jones and Saxena (2001) focused, such problems as deculturalization of the learners could not be questioned. Furthermore, one is bound to ask why it is considered paramount for the learners, such as those in the study under discussion, to learn English so that they can learn only in it, while the same does not apply to the learners whose mother tongue is English when they are in a country like Botswana. The native speakers of English are not even required to learn Setswana, let alone being instructed in Setswana. This shows how protective the native English speakers are of their language and culture. They are aware that the two are inseparable. A fact most

governments in former colonies fail to realize and appreciate is that by prescribing that English be a LoLT, they are in the process killing their own languages and cultures. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter Eight on interpretation and discussion of the study results.

Because of the difference in the two situations, the results of the study above will not have much bearing on the Botswana situation because in Botswana, English is a second and a foreign language whereas in England it is the main local language. However, English also function in High Function Formal Context (HFFC) unlike Setswana which is a national language but with limited functions in formal contexts, such as in education in Botswana. Over and above, English is recognized as the international language for education, career and commerce.

Adendorff (1993) studied CS amongst Zulu-speaking teachers and learners. The study focused on the use of CS in a classroom environment as well as its use in administrative matters. The three classes that were involved were English Language, Biology, and Geography, and it was found that CS in all three instances was used to perform the following functions: In the English lesson, CS was used to ensure understanding, to encourage the learners to participate in the lesson, and to mark solidarity. CS was further used as the language of provocation, that is, to raise an issue so that the learners can participate in the discussion. In the Biology lesson, switches were used as contextualization cues to check if the learners were following the lesson, and also to encourage them to have a positive attitude towards the lesson, as well as to mark solidarity. In the Geography lesson, CS was used to establish authority and to exercise classroom control.

In all the lessons of the three subjects, CS was used in the classroom more to perform social functions than to perform a didactic function. Adendorff (1993: 13) acknowledged this fact when he said:

> …the Geography lesson illustrates the teacher's heavier reliance on Zulu to accomplish social objectives…, the Geography teacher uses Zulu as the means of exercising classroom management, rather than as a vehicle for transmitting academic knowledge.

Furthermore, Adendorff (1993: 9-10) confirms the minimal use of Zulu for academic purposes in class when he says:

> Why, one might wonder, does the teacher switch briefly to Zulu… What is the implicit meaning which Zulu conveys? Clearly the words in Zulu…add nothing new by way of content. This fact reinforces the likelihood that if the Zulu words are communicatively significant, it is not because of their semantic content, but because they constitute a meta-message of some kind.

Therefore, the study, although conducted in the classroom situation, largely demonstrated the social function of CS in the classroom in the form of classroom management, and minimally for content delivery. However, classroom management is educationally positive as it reinforces learning.

Even outside the classroom, the use of CS by the school head signalled its use to ensure understanding of the message imparted which was also important in an educational environment. This implied that the learners at times had problems comprehending the message presented in English. As such, English was more of a barrier to communication than a facilitator.

Adendorff's study will, however, have a bearing on the present study because it was conducted in a similar environment as this one. One limitation of this study is that only switches made by the teachers were shown but not those made by the learners. This, therefore, hinders the evaluation of the learners' CS in the classroom.

Although CS was not the main focus of their study, Bissoonauth and Offord (2001) when investigating patterns of language use, language choice and language attitudes of Mauritian adolescents in full-time education, found out from teachers of the three subjects chosen for the study, namely Art, Economics, and Mathematics, that although English is the LoLT, they often switch to French and even Creole in the course of the lessons to match the linguistic ability of their learners 'with the aim of facilitating comprehension, since these two languages are best understood by the pupils'

(Bissoonauth & Offord, 2001: 396). To confirm this, one Science teacher was quoted as saying (Bissoonauth & Offord, 2001: 396):

> […] I am obliged to use it [Creole] when they [the pupils] do not understand certain topics like Maths, Science…

Arthur (2001), Kieswetter (1995), Akindele and Letsoela (2001) and Adendorff (1993) also made similar observations in their studies, viz. that CS in the classroom is mainly used to facilitate comprehension. If the role of CS is mainly to facilitate comprehension of instructional material, it implies that the learners do not grasp the lessons well when they are presented in English. This, therefore, implies that English as the LoLT is problematic in all the situations outlined above. It therefore, appears that in this study, like in other studies above, the underlying problem is the Language in Education Policy. Learners lacked proficiency in English yet they were receiving their education in this language, hence the use of CS in teaching and learning. Bissoonauth and Offord (2001), like other scholars, refer to the use of two languages in a classroom situation as CS. Their study does not provide analysis of the utterances made to determine if indeed it is CS that is being used, or if it is mere repetition of instructional material in two different languages. This is what is at the centre of the present study: to investigate the nature of this phenomenon, its causes, its strengths and limitations, and to suggest ways of how it can be rectified, if necessary.

Hussein (1999) and Lawson and Sachdev (2000) investigated CS in university environments in Jordan and Tunisia respectively. Although their studies focused on the attitudes of the participants towards CS, to some extent the two studies have some bearing on the present study as they were based on academic environments and the respondents based their responses on their use of CS within and outside the classroom environment. Both studies reported negative attitudes towards CS by their respondents because it was either seen as 'polluting' the Arabic language (Hussein, 1999: 6) or it was 'devalued', in a formal language learning environment (Lawson & Sachdev 2000: 1357).

Hussein (1999) reported that various studies showed that, ironically, anti-code-switching proponents themselves code-switched in the midst of their conversations

(see also Pandit, 1985: 17; Torres, 1989: 424, in Hussein, 1999). He further observed that some of them calling for the use of Classical Arabic, which is the high variety, to the exclusion of colloquial Arabic, a low variety, they themselves code-switch consciously or unconsciously to colloquial Arabic in their conversations. His study also confirmed this when his respondents (the learners) were of the view that the speakers of Arabic who code-switched or code-mixed with English were polluting the Arabic language. However, the same respondents indicated that they use CS for both academic and social purposes. In their academic conversations, they switch from Arabic to English when English terms have no Arabic equivalents, or where scientific concepts can easily be expressed in English. For social reasons, CS is used to greet, apologise, or to compliment a person. The limitation of this study is that the examples from the data were not provided; therefore the nature of CS could not be examined.

Lawson and Sachdev (2000) carried out two studies on attitudes towards CS at a university in Tunisia. In both studies, the participants reported very little CS in the classroom. This the two researchers attributed to the fact that participants in the study were mainly learners of English; and more so, that the general attitudes towards CS in a formal learning environment like the classroom, were negative. However, they observed that usually in an environment like the university, where status was important, it was possible for the participants to under-report their actual engagement in CS in favour of more prestigious varieties such as English, French, or Tunisian Arabic. Although Arabic was used to learn other subjects, its use during English lessons was discouraged. This confirmed the observation made by Kamwangamalu (2000: 60) that CS in educational settings carried a stigma of a lack of proficiency in L2 by the user. The present study wishes to investigate whether this stigma is justified or not.

Mqadi (1990) investigated CS among the learners at the University of Zululand. From his study it emerged that the learners code-switched more in informal situations than in formal situations because the latter normally did not accommodate CS. In informal situations, CS was used to show one's educational level, familiarity or affinity between speakers, group membership, to exclude other listeners and even out of habit. Mqadi (1990) observed that the learners at this university tended to switch between their languages and English because of the latter's status as the language of education,

science and prestige, but in formal situations like the classroom, when they code-switched from English to their mother tongue, it was when they were unable to come up with a correct word in English that appropriately put across the message they wanted to convey. It is, however, not clear whether the learners, in this instance, engaged in CS per se, or if it was nonce borrowing simply because they could not remember the appropriate word to use in the language being used; or whether it was due to a language deficiency. Therefore, in this study, CS mainly serves social functions. None of the functions outlined above indicate that CS served an instructional function -- to present the lesson content.

On the use of CS out of habit, Mqadi (1990) says most of the learners at this university code-switch because they come from the townships where people from different ethnic backgrounds live together, hence children grow up in an environment where CS is a common occurrence. Furthermore, when these children begin school, they are exposed to English and then Afrikaans. The dual learning of these two languages further encourages switching between their languages and the new languages they learn at school. In this context, CS is seen as playing a vital role in unifying different cultures while at the same time serving its basic function of facilitating communication. It enables its users to express their thoughts precisely. So if CS does facilitate communication, why can't the learners be allowed to employ their L1 so as to communicate effectively? Again, the question here is, "is what is taking place in the classroom really CS?"   The researcher is of the view that the study revealed the socio-psychological functions of CS. None of the functions outlined above indicated the educational effect of CS in the classroom. The main shortcoming of the study is that only a summary of the study was given and the actual data was not presented, hence it was not possible to evaluate it. Again the study only focused on CS among the learners and left out the lecturers.

Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2004) focused their study on learner CS in a foreign language classroom. Their study was based on a seminar for advanced learners of German at the University of Alberta, Edmonton in Canada. They conceptualized CS not only as a strategy for second language learning, but also as a resource for effective bilingual communication (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004: 503-504). As a strategy for second language learning, the learners were allowed to use English as the main

language of learning where they were deficient in German. That is, one's L1 plays a very important role in learning even if it is in the learning of another language.

Liebscher and Dailey O'Cain (2004) suggested that when the classroom is conceptualized as a bilingual space by both the students and the teacher, CS patterns emerge that are similar to those found in non-classroom situations. The members of this classroom view themselves as a community of practice which adjusts to rules and shared views about their actions and about themselves as members of a community. Through their practices, they show how such a community can facilitate their development from second language learners to bilinguals (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004: 502). The notion of this study is important to the current study because in Botswana, the learners are not only expected to learn English as a second language, but also to become competent bilinguals. Hence, like in this study, the classroom is conceptualized as a bilingual space. In analyzing the data, the researchers adopted Auer's conversation analysis approach (Auer, 1984). This approach is characterized by two main distinctions of CS functions -- discourse-related functions and participant-related functions. The former (discourse-related CS) organizes conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance, and in the latter (participant-related CS), switches correspond to the preferences of the speaker who switches or those of other speakers partaking in the conversation (Auer, 1984, 1998, in Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004: 502). This distinction was originally based on the observations of bilingual interaction taking place outside institutional settings like schools; however, Martin-Jones (1995, 2000, in Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004: 502) argued later that this distinction could be applicable to the claasrrom environment because classrooms often comprise groups of people with differing language abilities and communicative repertoires.

From this study, it emerged that CS in the classroom follows two patterns; discourse-related and participant-related patterns. Unlike earlier studies which said only teachers can use discourse-related CS patterns while learners can only use participant-related CS, this study also demonstrated that both teachers and learners can use both discourse-related CS and participant-related CS. Teachers use discourse-related CS to make asides, to quote, and to move in and out of the teaching / learning context (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004: 503). Some of the discourse- related functions

that the learners can use CS patterns for are to show contrast, to sum up, to think aloud, to mark the content of a meta-linguistic comment (or to set-off an aside), to mark a quote, to mark a topic shift, to mark a change of footing and to mark a turn in a conversation (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2004).

Participant-related CS patterns largely address the roles of the learners and the teacher in the classroom and the teaching context. Teachers use participant-related CS when they anticipate that the learners would not understand what is being said in the target language (usually L2), and therefore will use L1 to facilitate understanding. The same strategy was observed by Adendorff (1993), Akindele and Letsoela (2001), Arthur (2001) and Kieswetter (1995). The learners use participant-related CS when they use L1 in order to overcome a communication difficulty in a target language or language of instruction.

However, various uses of CS outlined in this study appear to be used more for social functions than didactic functions. Evidence of the didactic function of CS is minimal as in other studies (Adendorff, 1993; Arthur, 2001), except perhaps, when it is used to sum up or to mark a quote.

Again what comes to the fore in this study is that both the learners and their teachers appreciate the importance of communicating in one's first language in order to overcome communication difficulties. Therefore the question is, "can we say it is CS that is being employed in the classroom?" If it is not CS, then what do we call this phenomenon?

Applying the principle of participant-related CS, the present study will also investigate if Setswana is given any room in the learning of English as a second language and if so, whether the strategy is effective. The Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2004)'s study is similar to the current study in that both focus on the learners and the teachers in the classroom. However, the current study will, in addition to focusing on the target language, include a content-based subject and a practical subject. Thus, CS as a teaching and learning strategy will be observed across three categories of subjects, namely a language-based, a content-based, and a practical subject. Again like other previous studies, it seems that participant-related CS patterns are largely due to

inadequacy in the target language especially on the part of the learners. This is what the present study will address and also whether CS is of any didactic value; that is, whether CS use yields any positive educational outcomes or whether it acts as an impediment to effective learning.

Molosiwa (2006) in her work on 'secondary school teachers' perception of literacy instruction in an examination-oriented environment' touched on the role and effects of CS in the classroom. She asserted that CS exists in Botswana classrooms even though it is not officially sanctioned and therefore denied. She mentioned that CS is used to serve a number of communicative functions, some of which are to compensate for some language difficulties experienced, to express solidarity, to convey an attitude or to show respect (Molosiwa, 2006: 101). While the latter three functions were social, the first function 'to compensate for some (language) difficulty,' is of interest here. It implies that when a speaker encounters difficulty in self-expression in English, he or she would switch over to Setswana in order to provide continuity to the speech or vice versa. This scenario is in conflict with the definition of CS as espoused by different scholars and also subscribed to in the current work. Therefore, based on the data gathered for the current study, the researcher will revisit this issue in order to establish if indeed what takes place in Botswana classrooms is CS or not.

Letsebe (2002) is one of the few researchers in Botswana who investigated CS in the classroom. In fact, very little research has been undertaken on CS in Botswana as rightly observed by Tshinki (2002). Tshinki (2002) and Ramando (2002), independently researched CS in a social setting and in the media in Botswana respectively. In his interactional study, Letsebe (2002) focused on teachers' explanations and the learners' views on CS in selected primary schools in Gaborone (city), Tlokweng and Mogoditshane (peri-urban areas). From his study, Letsebe (2002) observed that many teachers code-switched in their daily teaching regardless of the subjects they taught. Some teachers reasoned that they CS in order to emphasize a point and to promote understanding among the pupils. Others said they CS because they had difficulty in expressing themselves in English. However, the learners did not object to the use of CS by their teachers. In fact, they felt more at ease when teachers code-switched to Setswana in class than when they taught in English.

From what the teachers and the pupils said, it appears that lack of proficiency in English as the LoLT was the central issue here and that what is termed CS seems to be repetition of the lessons in Setswana initially presented in English or delivery of the lessons in Setswana for most of the time. Furthermore, Letsebe (2002) raised a very important issue that if teachers use Setswana most of the time to teach in class so as to promote learning among the learners, are they really helping these learners who then are required to write their tests, assignments and even Primary School-Leaving Examinations (PSLE) in English? This important question the present study will seek to address; that is, to find out if CS is of any didactic value in a teaching and learning situation. Again the present study will attempt to determine if CS in the classroom is not a contravention of the Language in Education Policy (LiEP). The issue of LiEP is discussed further in the next section.

In conclusion, the studies reviewed above raise a number of pertinent questions which are central to the research problem under investigation in the present study. Some of the questions are: Is the phenomenon that occurs in the classroom really CS? If it is not CS, then what is it? It appears that in a number of these studies -- Adendorff (1993), Akindele and Letsoela (2001), Letsebe (2002), Martin-Jones and Saxena (2001) -- what is referred to as CS seems to be the presentation of lesson material in two languages. Some studies, Adendorff (1993), Akindele and Letsoela (2001), Arthur (2001), Bissoonauth and Offord (2001), Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2004), and Letsebe (2002) point out that the teachers use the learners' L1 instead of the official LoLT in order to accommodate the linguistic ability of the learners and to ensure that learning takes place. Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2004) refer to this strategy as participant-related CS. In that regard, the following questions arise: Are the scholars referring to the use of the learner's L1 as CS? If it is not the case, then what is the difference between the two? Is the use of any of the two strategies (if they are different) in harmony with the language in education policies that obtain at those institutions? Specifically, is CS an educationally effective strategy? What underlies the use of any of these strategies? What are its strengths and limitations in teaching and learning? What are the possible remedies to problems related to the use of this strategy? These questions will be answered in the present study in relation to the Botswana situation. The use of the learner's L1 or what several studies refer to as CS signals an underlying problem, which could be the language of instruction. This brings

into question the LiEP that applies at the respective institutions where these studies were conducted. Therefore the following questions need to be asked: "Is the LIEP appropriate? Is it effective?"

Consequently, in its attempt to contribute towards bridging the knowledge gap in relation to CS in the classroom, the current study will, in addition to answering the issues raised above, also address what Kamwangamalu (2000: 60) calls the stigma that CS use in education carries: that it signals a lack of proficiency in the LoLT on the part of either the teacher or the learners or even both. This stigma is partly due to inadequate research of CS in educational settings such as the classroom. Van der Walt (2004: 164) attests to this inadequacy when she said there is renewed interest in CS research regarding its use in education. More importantly, Webb (2002: 58) stated that there is no research thus far that has addressed the educational effects of CS. This is the thrust of the present study. Many studies mention that CS is used in the classroom to perform academic functions; but looking at the studies discussed above, although most of them are directed at the classroom situation, the CS functions they identify are largely social or psychological. The researcher, however, does not imply that socio-psychological functions of CS are not important in teaching and learning. In fact, it is the psychological functions which are often referred to as academic. For instance, when CS is used as a positive reinforcement tool when the teacher uses it to praise, complement, or encourage a learner. In other instances, it is CM or some form of borrowing which are also referred to as instances of CS used to perform an academic function. However, the difference between these concepts has already been discussed earlier in this chapter. Therefore, CM or some form of borrowing cannot pass as examples of CS use for academic purposes. In the researher's view, evidence of the academic functions of CS has not yet been established. The current study will therefore attempt to address the issues raised above, and by so doing try to extend the frontiers of knowledge.

The occurrence of CS in the classroom contravenes Botswana's LiEP that states that English is the LoLT throughout the education system (Botswana Government White Paper No. 2, 1994). However, CS in the classroom also demonstrates that Setswana as a national language has an educational role to play. In the next section, The LiEP of

Botswana will be discussed to establish whether or not it contributes to CS occurrence in the classroom.

2.6 BOTSWANA' S LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION POLICY (LIEP)

Botswana's LiEP gives prominence to English as the official LoLT. As alluded to in Chapter One, the status of English in education is historical. When Botswana gained independence in 1966, English was understood to be the LoLT, and Setswana was the LoLT at lower levels of primary school (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004; Molosiwa, 2006). However, the role that Setswana played in education was removed in 1993 when the second National Commission on Education (NCE 2) recommended that English be the LoLT from the second year of primary schooling and throughout the education system and that Setswana as a national language be a LoLT only in the first year of primary school. Thereafter, it is only learnt as a school subject in primary and secondary schools (Magogwe, 2005; Molosiwa, 2006). At the University of Botswana, Setswana is taught in English for reasons that are not clear to the researcher. The LiEP did not provide for the indigenous languages.

Botswana, like other ex-colonies of Britain opted to use the language of their former colonial masters in the education system that was a continuation of the colonial practice. According to Bokamba and Tlou (1977: 36, in Rammala, 2002: 74) in the African context, pedagogical considerations are not primary in influencing decisions relating to the use of particular languages as media or subjects of instruction, even though they are relevant. Rather, the LiEPs of most African countries are based on the following three practical considerations (Bokamba & Tlou, 1977, in Rammala, 2002: 75-76):

a. For efficiency and expediency: African languages were considered insufficiently developed to function as LoLT.
b. National unity or political considerations: African languages were perceived as politically divisive and seemed to encourage tribalism which was against the 'national unity' that many African states were striving to achieve after independence. Therefore the choice of ex-colonial languages or languages of wider communication (LWC) as LoLT was more political than pedagogical.

These languages were seen as a uniting force, and their choice as LoLT was designed to create the perception of a common destiny for the citizenry.

c. National progress: African languages were not associated with national progress that comes about as a result of industrialization and associated technological achievements. Ex-colonial languages were well established as LoLT and their use was perceived as symbolizing progress. Therefore many African governments opted for an easier solution of using ex-colonial languages as LoLT instead of developing their own local languages to the same status.

In Botswana, while English was chosen on similar grounds, the decision that it be taught in the first year of primary schooling and then used as LoLT from the second year onwards seems unrealistic. This approach is more theoretical than practical and it is doubtful if one can study a foreign language in one year and then be able to effectively function by using it in a learning situation. Botswana's LiEP is against Cummins' Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) (Cummins, 1979). These concepts -- BICS and CALP- - are used to differentiate between social and academic language acquisition. The former (BICS) is required in social situations, and the latter (CALP) in formal academic learning environments.

According to Cummins (1979) one needs up to two years to acquire BICS in English in an environment where English is the main language such as in the USA or in the U.K., and approximately five to seven years to acquire CALP. Therefore, in the case of Botswana's LiEP, learners are exposed to English for one year (which is shorter than the period to acquire BICS) and then expected to function in it at CALP level. This approach manifests in problems such as a lack of understanding of the subject content owing to the lack of the required proficiency in English. The end result is low academic achievement among learners. Code-switching seems to be a possible solution to the language problem. Consequently, in the classroom, teachers continue to code-switch between English and Setswana in an effort to impart knowledge to their learners, and learners code-switch as well in an effort to participate in the learning process (Arthur, 2001; Letsebe, 2002).

The practice of CS appears to continue into secondary schools. The current study seeks to establish whether this is the case or not. The argument advanced by NCE 2 (1993) that the introduction of English at Standard 4 level was too late and contributed to the learners' lack of fluency in English was flawed. In fact, CS in the classroom appears to be a result of the very policy that was meant to address the problem of a lack of fluency in English among learners. This policy was a direct opposite of widely accepted results of research from many parts of the world that indicated that cognitive development was achieved faster in mother tongue instruction than when an LWC is used as LoLT in primary school education (Nyati-Ramahobo, 2004; Rammala, 2002). In this regard Bamgbose (1991) questions why an asset that a child possesses should be ignored, and also states the following:

> Literacy through the mother tongue or any other language that the child already speaks means that he will not be grappling with two difficulties at the same time, that is, learning a new sound system and learning to represent such sounds in writing. Using the sound system of the child's language for teaching literacy means that he will only be concerned with how to reduce the sounds he already knows to writing; and once he has learnt to write such sounds, this should facilitate his writing of any other sounds ….(Bamgbose, 1991: 66)

The LiEP of Botswana is not only prescribing a foreign language as a LoLT but is also devaluing Setswana, hence giving a false impression that Setswana as a language is not capable of functioning at high function (Formal Context) level. Rammala (2002: 76) argues that:

> Every language can be put to any use … after careful consideration of the language situation is made and a number of necessary steps taken to develop, elaborate and revalorize the language. Any spoken language can be written and teaching and learning material can be developed in such languages.

Furthermore, Botswana's LiEP seems to ignore a number of disadvantages that result from the promotion of English at the expense of Setswana and other local languages: First, English generally lacks reinforcement outside the classroom because most learners (and even their teachers) view English only as a LoLT and it is hardly used outside the classroom between the teachers and learners. English is used by a few of

the privileged elite outside the classroom but the majority of the learners use their mother tongue. As a result there is no reinforcement of language acquisition between the school and the home. Second, the learners' inability to fully comprehend English is also detrimental to full comprehension of the lesson delivered in English. This has an adverse effect on learning and eventually the learners' academic success.   Third, many of the school dropouts gradually lapse back into illiteracy after being detached from situations that require the use of English. This problem was acknowledged by the NCE 2 (1993) hence the recommendation that learners be allowed to learn their languages at school because

> "Literacy in these languages has the potential to provide pupils who drop out of the system with a fall-back position if they should lose literacy in English and Setswana" (NCE 2, 1993: 114).

Finally, the use of English as LoLT hinders the development of Setswana and its culture (including other local languages). This may create negative perceptions about Setswana that may result in learners considering Setswana as an academically unsuitable language. The end result may be alienation of the educated from the uneducated. A similar observation was made by Bokamba and Tlou (1977, in Rammala, 2002: 78) quoting Ansre (date not stated) that:

> … some Ghanaians look upon their own languages with a certain amount of shame, and regard them as not worthy for their children to learn.

Molosiwa (2006: 102) also made a similar observation that learners often ridicule their fellow learners who score high marks in Setswana and ask them if they plan to become Setswana traditional doctors.

On the basis of the aforementioned, Botswana's LiEP will be evaluated against the basic principles of language planning in order to determine whether its formulation adhered to these principles , and therefore meets the expectations of Botswana society. In that regard, an overview of what constitutes language planning is given below.

2.6.1 Language planning

In this section, the following will be discussed: language planning, language in education policy, what language is and its functions; and the role of language in education and its effect on human development.

Language planning forms the basis for any country's LiEP. Grin (1996: 31 in Strydom, 2002: 1) defines language planning as:

> … a systematic, rational, theory-based effort at the societal level to solve language problems with a view to increasing welfare. It is typically conducted by official bodies or their surrogates and aimed at part or all of the population living under its jurisdiction.

This implies that language planning does not address language problems only. Rather, it is a conscious effort on the part of decision-makers to explore a number of alternatives before formulating a policy that will meet the linguistic and developmental needs of the nation with the view to empower the citizenry by 'democratizing access to skills and knowledge, which in turn would ascertain equal participation in a national…economy' (Strydom, 2002: 39). It is evident from the definition above that language planning is a compulsory exercise that every multilingual country should undertake.

In deciding on a country's language policy, the decision- makers should ensure that the national language(s) and official language(s) meet the linguistic needs as well as the developmental needs of the nation-- in the case of Botswana, Setswana and English. Therefore, 'the question is not if language can be planned but rather how and by whom language can be planned.' Reagan (2002: 419). In response to this question Cooper (1989: 182, quoted in Reagan, 2002: 419) states that: to plan language is to plan society. This implies that language planning has a direct bearing on society, therefore it is important to actively involve the society for whom language is planned to ensure that all aspects related to linguistic and developmental needs are taken into account during the planning process. This will also ensure that the language policy which is the by-product of language planning is relevant, succeeds and enjoys popular support of its beneficiaries, which is the citizenry of the country at large.

Language planning involves public decisions about language, its use, status and development (Reagan, 2002: 419). These decisions have social, economic, educational and political significance for society and the individual. This is so because language planning can serve opposing functions; as a tool for empowerment and as a tool for oppression (Batibo, 2004: 33; Kamwangamalu, 2004: 243; Webb, 1995: 85). As a tool for empowerment, language planning can serve 'as a tool for empowering groups and individuals, for creating national bonds and ties, and for maximizing educational and economic development'. As a tool of oppression, 'language planning can be used to maintain and perpetuate oppression, social class discrimination, and social and educational inequality' (Reagan, 2002: 420). Therefore it is rather short-sighted to disregard any of these issues when embarking on language planning.

On language planning, Eastman (1983: ix, in Mesthrie, 2002: 420) states that it is 'a developing field that sees language as a social resource'. Eastman further says:

> "Language planning is done through the cooperative efforts of political, educational, economic and linguistic authorities"
>
> (Eastman, 1983: ix, in Mesthrie, 2002: 420).

It is therefore important that language planning is a democratic process that involves all stakeholders at all levels. To that end it should include four main components: fact-finding, establishment and articulation of goals and strategies, implementation and evaluation (Reagan, 2002: 420). Because of its direct effect on society and the individual, language planning should have four main features: it should be a conscious and deliberate activity; be future oriented; involve choices; and involve decision-making processes in making those choices (Reagan, 2002: 420). Therefore language planners should ensure that they are familiar with the language landscape in which language planning is done. They should clearly state the goals of language planning as well as the strategies that will be used in the language-planning process; and there should be an implementation stage characterized by implementation strategies. Thereafter, there should be an opportunity to evaluate the entire process to determine whether it is consistent with its goals and is in harmony with the social, economic, educational, and political landscape. This process can be illustrated diagrammatically by using Webb's framework for strategic planning (Webb: 2002: 38, in Strydom, 2002:

192). The framework uses basic principles inherent in strategic business planning and in applying it, Webb (2002) outlines the fundamental factors on which the design and implementation of a language planning policy should be based. The framework is later discussed in the final chapter of this study and also produced as Addendum A.

Language planning essentially involves two distinct phases: corpus planning and status planning. Corpus planning involves the expansion of a language to enable it to perform the functions allocated to it (Webb, 1995: 109). In Botswana only English and Setswana have gone through the corpus-planning stage and, to some extent, a few other indigenous languages such as Ikalanga and Shiyeyi. However, pressure is increasing that all other indigenous languages should also go through the corpus as well as status-planning phases. Status planning involves the selection of a language or languages to function in high function (formal) contexts. In Botswana, English enjoys that high status as earlier explained in the introduction to this study. To some extent Setswana is used in some public domains. Other languages are restricted to low function (informal) contexts mainly used by their speakers within a family unit, and within religious or cultural groups.

To ensure that language planning and policy is positive and in harmony with its society Donna Kerr (1976, in Mesthrie, 2002: 420) suggests that such a policy must pass the following four tests and the questions that they raise:

1. The desirability test – does the community as a whole believe that the goal of the policy is desirable?
2. The justness test – is the policy just and fair, that is, does it treat all people in an equal and appropriate manner?
3. The effectiveness test – is the policy effective? Does it achieve its objectives?
4. The tolerability test – is the policy resource sensitive? That is, is it viable in the context in which it is to be effected?

Linguists and policy makers unanimously agree that language can be planned, and a LiEP is a result of this planning. LiEP refers to a policy that specifies a language or languages that should be used in the education system as a medium or mediums of instruction (MoI) or (LoLT) and of study. Robinson (1996: 13, in Strydom 2002: 2) describes language policies as '… language planning decisions generally most evident

at national level, affecting language use through the society, either actually or potentially'. According to Cooper (1989, quoted in Reagan, 2002: 419), 'Both status planning and corpus planning affect the choice of language for development communication. Status planning leads to decisions about the allocation of codes to societal functions, and corpus planning may precede or result from such decisions. The formulation and implementation of language policy is planning by the state'.

LiEP falls within the larger and general framework of language planning and policy of a given country. Therefore, before language planning is undertaken and a language policy formulated, the goals and the results of the policies thereof should be taken into account. Similarly, which language to use and what its functions will be, including its role in education should also be taken into consideration. These considerations are important as language is central in human communication.

2.6.2 Language and its functions

Language has been defined by Finocchiaro (1964: 8, see Brown, 1994: 4) as '… a system of arbitrary, vocal symbols which permit all people in a given culture, or other people who have learned the system of that culture, to communicate or to interact'. Wardhaugh (1972: 3, in Brown, 1994: 8) echoes the same sentiments by defining language as '… a system of arbitrary vocal symbols used for human communication'.

These two definitions essentially imply that language is systematic; that it is used by humans to communicate and to interact with one another; and that it is through language that humans express their culture. Therefore, it is important for humans to learn a language that they can use to communicate with one another to show emotions, and to develop self-esteem. Guiora *et al*. (1972 b, in Brown, 1994: 62) talks of a 'language ego', referring to the identity that a person develops in relation to the language that he or she speaks. This implies that one's self-identity is intertwined with language and ego development because such identities are confirmed in the communication process. For a person to effectively communicate in a given language, he or she has to learn its vocabulary, grammar rules, discourse rules, and other organizational competences. These forms are learnt to transmit and receive thoughts, ideas, and feelings between a speaker and a listener (in oral communication), or between a writer and a reader (in written communication) (Brown, 1994: 231). Thus

language facilitates communication between humans that, according to Austin (1962, in Brown, 1994: 232), is '… a series of communicative acts or speech acts which are used systematically to accomplish particular purposes'.

To that effect, language performs a number of communicative functions that Halliday (1973, in Brown, 1994: 232-233) classified as follows:

i.   An instrumental function: brings about a particular condition or causes certain things to happen;
ii.   a regulatory function: controls events without exercising too much power;
iii.   a representational function: allows the speaker to use a language to make a statement, convey facts and knowledge, to explain, or to report;
iv.   an interactional function: ensures social maintenance by allowing communicative contact between and among human beings in order to establish social contact and to keep channels of communication open;
v.   a personal function: allows the speaker to express feelings, emotions, and personality;
vi.   an heuristic function: involves the use of language to acquire knowledge and to learn about one's environment; and
vii.   an imaginative function: creates imaginary systems or ideas.

It is therefore important for a speaker to use linguistic forms effectively to perform any of the language functions outlined above.

Essentially, language can be used to perform a primary or a secondary function. Primarily, language is used to serve socio-psychological functions. These are mainly instrumental and symbolic functions. The instrumental function is concerned with language as an instrument of communication that enables its user to transfer information and to have access to information. Through language we create ideas in our minds, recall and memorize information, reason and put our ideas across to other people. We can also express our feelings, views, needs, wishes, and aspirations to our family members, friends, communities, religious groups or cultural groups. This is considered to be a low-function (informal-context) level.

Performing a symbolic function, language enables us to handle our social relations and to socialize with others. We construct, express, and maintain our personal and group identity and loyalty, for example, institutional identity and social identity, through language. In this context, code-switching is used: we can code-switch when we speak to establish our identity within our social or ethnic groups. Language can bind a community as a common denominator, yet it can also separate communities if they do not have the same language as a common denominator. In all the instances mentioned above, language is used to perform its primary function.

In its secondary function, language is used in various public domains locally, regionally and internationally. Such domains could be the education system; the mass media; official business; the legislature; the judiciary; trade; and commerce (Webb, 1995: 104). Examples of languages that enjoy this status are English, French, and Portuguese in most of their former colonies; and respectively Swahili and Somali in Tanzania and Somalia (Webb, 1995). As a secondary function, a language functions at a high-function, formal level, such as in education. Consequently the role of language in education and its implication for educational development are discussed below.

2.6.3 The role of language in education and educational development

Language plays a very important role in education as it is primarily through language that knowledge is transmitted and acquired. Bamgbose (1991: 63) states that language may serve three purposes in education, namely, literacy, subject, and LoLT. In literacy, language is used to introduce a child to the rudiments of reading and writing, or to teach adults how to read and write. As a subject, a language is taught in schools without any further implication of it being used as a LoLT. In Botswana, Setswana and French are examples of subjects that are taught in schools but have no implication for further use as LoLTs. The former (Setswana) is taught in all government schools and some private schools while the latter is taught in some government schools and other private schools. The LoLT is also taught as a subject. This applies to English in Botswana and in many other African countries that were former British colonies; French in former colonies of France and Belgium; and Portuguese in former colonies of Portugal. It is the latter purpose -- that of using a particular language as LoLT -- that is important or at stake in this context.

It is important to carefully consider which language should be used as LoLT because the language that is selected for use in the education system should facilitate transmission and acquisition of knowledge, and not act as an impediment to these. Bamgbose (1991: 62) states that ' Education is a means of upward social mobility, manpower training, and development in its widest sense of the full realization of human potential and the utilization of this potential and the nation's resources for the benefit of all'. Therefore, education is central to development in general and human development in particular.

According to Brown (1994), language plays a very important role in educational development because through language, cognitive and meta-cognitive skills are developed and knowledge is accessed. Language also plays a role in the development of affective skills, such as a respect for knowledge, professional integrity, and a sense of self-confidence. All the above-mentioned skills (cognitive, meta-cognitive and affective skills) develop systematically and through guidance as interaction takes place between the students and their learning material and teachers through the use of language. Therefore, the LiEP should ensure that the LoLT facilitates the acquisition of these skills.

When language plays a role in educational development, it means that the language of education should facilitate the acquisition of knowledge, understanding and skills, which will lead to development in general and human development in particular. Human development is defined as a situation whereby an environment is created in which people can develop their full potential and lead productive, creative lives according to their needs and interests (UNDP Report, 2004). In a nutshell, human development is 'development of the people, development for the people, and development by the people' (UNDP Report, 1999: 16). Development of the people should involve building human capacities through the development of human resources; for instance, educating people to play meaningful roles in society. Development for the people implies that the benefits of growth must be translated into the lives of the people; that is, people should lead better lives if the development is meaningful to them. Development by the people emphasizes that people must participate actively in influencing the processes that shape their lives; that is, people must chart their own path to their destiny. This is possible through the acquisition of

education that can be facilitated by the use of a language that enhances learning instead of acting as a stumbling block.

The importance of language in human development was appropriately expressed by the Minister of Education in Lesotho – the Hon. Mosisili -- in his opening address during the International Conference on Language in Contact and Conflict in Africa (LiCCA) held in Lesotho in 1993, when he said:

> Language is traditionally defined as a richly structured system of human sounds used for communication … and it is said to be the most highly developed and most commonly used of all forms of symbolism. Language permeates virtually every aspect of our lives; it is used for interaction in all domains of life, as well as all levels of human development. (LiCCA (Lesotho) Report, 1993)

Consequently, in deciding on the LoLT, it should be ensured that maximum knowledge acquisition will be possible. In this regard, language planning should take place prior to the formulation of a LiEP that will stipulate which language to use as the LoLT.

Finally, in examining Botswana's current LiEP against the four tests for language planning and policy by Donna Kerr (1976, in Mesthrie, 2002: 420) as aforementioned, it appears that the LiEP of Botswana has completely failed all four tests. It is not a desirable situation as it excludes the national language from playing a meaningful role in education. English is given prominence and Setswana is given a subordinate role. It is not just and fair because the policy does not seem to treat all languages equally. It is not effective because it continues to promote a language that is foreign to the citizens of the country in the education system, yet it does not seem to be functioning effectively as a LoLT. In this context then, there are continued reports of CS in the classroom. The application of the fourth test (that language planning should be resource sensitive and viable) specifically applies to the promotion of other indigenous languages. The main argument advanced by Government against the promotion of many languages is hence based on the premise that it is not financially viable to teach all the indigenous languages so that they can eventually reach the status of an instrument for use in a high-function (formal) context. It seems that Government assesses this issue superficially; its focus is mainly on the financial costs that will be

incurred, such as translation and publishing costs, as well as on training of educators in these languages. There is no regard for the long-term benefits of empowering citizenry through language-related investments and the appeasement of the sections of society that feel excluded by the current language policy. The long-term benefits of empowerment are priceless as it is a major contributor to national harmony and peace.

The speakers of other indigenous languages are not convinced by the arguments of Government, and dissatisfaction continues to be expressed by those who feel that the promotion of their languages should be viewed as a right and as a resource, not as problematic. Government should demonstrate its willingness to gradually take all languages on board. The promotion and development of all indigenous languages are inevitable and cannot be done cheaply. Therefore, the sooner Government embarks on this task, the better, not only for the appeasement of the speakers concerned but also because it is the right and just thing to do. Failure to embark on this exercise will result in the continued feeling of marginalization of their languages by some members of the population, which threatens the nationhood that has thus far been achieved. Promoting only one local language at the expense of others is in direct opposition to the very principle of building and promoting nationhood.

2.7 Conclusion

The present chapter has given a detailed review of literature on CS in general, and CS in the classroom in particular. The review was in the form of the definition and explanation of CS and its types (inter-sentential CS, intra-sentential CS and tag-like / emblematic CS) and the concepts related to it, namely, CM and borrowing (including its two types -- nonce borrowing and borrowing proper). The attempt was to point out the differences between them, blurred as they are. Social functions of CS were also discussed. It is against this background that the theoretical framework of the study was conceptualized. Furthermore, as a basis for the discussion of the second part of the study's question, an overview of Botswana's LiEP was given within the framework of language planning. This was discussed in relation to language, its functions and its role in education and educational development as a central focus of language planning and LiEP.

In the following chapter, the study design and the methodology used in data collection will be discussed.