A SOCIO-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING AMONG STUDENTS OF BENUE STATE UNIVERSITY AND FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE, MAKURDI

BY

KENNETH KURAM-VANDE ACKA
M.A/ARTS/16577/2011-2012

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,

ZARIA, NIGERIA

NOVEMBER, 2017

A SOCIO-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING AMONG STUDENTS OF BENUE STATE UNIVERSITY AND FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE, MAKURDI

BY

KENNETH KURAM-VANDE ACKA
M.A/ARTS/16577/2011-2012

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUTE STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES
FACULTY OF ARTS
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA, NIGERIA

NOVEMBER, 2017

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation entitled **A Socio-Semantic Analysis of Code-switching among Students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi** has been carried out by me. The information derived from relevant literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this dissertation was previously presented for another degree or diploma at this or any other institution.

_____ _____

Kenneth Kuram-Vande ACKA Date & Signature

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled: **A Socio-semantic Analysis of Code-switching among Students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi,** by Kenneth Kuram-Vande ACKA, meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Master of Arts in English Language, from the Department of English and Literary Studies of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

_____ _____

Dr. (Mrs.) Rashidat S. AbdulRasheed **Date**
(Chairman, Supervisory Committee)

_____ _____

Dr. Isyaku Saminu **Date**
(Member, Supervisory Committee)

_____ _____

Prof. T. Y. Surakat **Date**
(Head of Department)

_____ _____

Prof. Sadiq Zubairu Abubakar **Date**
(Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies)

DEDICATION

Dad, I did it, rest on! Mama, this I share with you! Nathaniel George, you believe I would and God made it happen! Aunty Ashi R. Ahmadu, you challenged me to be better! Dr. Mobolaji Dada, your zeal strengthened my effort! Ngumimi Acka, you'll always be remembered …rest on kiddo! Nancy Ngunan Acka (Naa'naa), why you left a day to my defence, I would never know, but this here is to you!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My profound gratitude goes to God Almighty, the only One who didn't let go off me even when some felt it was impossible, His mighty right hand led me to this destination. Without His love for me and His light guiding my pathway, I would be nothing. For my success is for the Kingdom Lord. Thank You.

I would like to thank my Supervisor; Dr. (Mrs.) Rashidat S. AbdulRasheed for her assistance and useful inputs towards the success of the dissertation. Her words of encouragement were also a great motivation throughout this research experience. I would also like to express my gratitude to my second Supervisor, Dr. Isyaku Saminu for his very useful contributions and directions. To the great professor of all, Prof. A. A. Joshua, who started this research with me at the beginning, God bless you sir, working with you is a pleasure and a privilege, I shall never forget your efforts to make me better.

I also would like to thank my lecturers; Prof. Gbenga Ibileye for being the great brother, uncle and teacher I have always wished, you inspired me to do better. Prof. Dili Emmanuel Ofuokwu, you have been a father to me in both ways and I appreciate you sir. Dr. Edward Abah, words are not enough to say how grateful I am, remain a role model to thousands that would still learn from you. Mama Prof. Gani-Ikilama, God bless you for taking me as one of your own students and sons. Prof. Emmy Idegu; a father of many generations, only time would tell, I am proud to call you father, God bless you. Late: Prof. J. Okwori, would there ever be a replacement of you in the lives of many? No way, my life wouldn't have been the same if I had not met you, rest on sir! Dr. Martins Ayegba, the uncle and brother one could ever ask for, please keep smiling the way you have always tried to put one on my face, rest

on sir! And to my greatest spiritual motivator, Late Prof. Fedelis Awever Tiseer D.Phil, serving God is easy when you showed me I could combine the old and the new to keep me on the right track, rest on sir! They made me see reasons never to be discouraged both academically and in life as a whole. Thank you Prof. A. A. Liman for leaving your seat just to ensure your student is attended to. Mr. Ode Ekpeme, thank you for showing me how to do things with words and be careful with the wrong usage. Thank you Mr. Stephen Joseph, Prof. T. Y. Surakat, Prof. G. Y. Sadiq, Dr. S. A. Abaya, Prof. and Mrs. Chom, mothers come in disguise, Dr. Mrs. Liman, Dr. (Mrs.) S. A. Frank-Akale, you are a mother indeed. I cannot leave out Dr. A. Jonah, I'm most grateful for ensuring I had it to this point, every PG Student of English and Literary Studies are most grateful for your efforts in order for us to graduate. I am also grateful to all my lecturers in the Department of English and Literary Studies from whom I have learnt a lot and for their assistance. I shall not fail to mention Late Prof. J. S. Aliyu for his kind words and relevant suggestions towards the realization of my career.

I am most grateful to the most ever adoring parents: Late Chief. Hon. Peter Vande Acka, rest on old man as I use to call you. Mrs. Rose W. Acka (World Best Mother), Mrs. Rachael A. Ahmadu (World Greatest Aunt), and also to great friends: Dr. Dada Mobolaji Mofoluseke, a brother from the other best mother! Dr. Nathaniel G. George (World Best Friend), you have taught me humility, kindness with a great way to fear and serve God, no one would ask for a greater friend than you. Engr. Oteri Ovie (Hovi), you are family to me more than you can imagine, Mr. Samuel Abdul, thank you for taking every trouble I brought around you. To the best sisters in the world; Ms. Soteria Ahemen Acka, Ms. Stephanie N. Acka, Ms. Maranatha M. Acka, Ms. Jessica M. Acka and Ms. Deborah Deve Acka a reason I never give up. To the

rest of my family Mr. Terhemen Mennix Acka, Mr. Terkula V. Acka, Mrs. N. Akpam, Kelvin T. Acka, Bar. Terance Acka, Ms. Abigail Adoo Tsokar and the entire family of Acka.

This work would not have been completed without the valuable presence and great support from wonderful fathers and friends; Mrs. Mana Ayam, one can never ask for another best mother, God bless you. Hajiya Salamtu Garba, words are not enough to express my gratitude for letting your son bring a stranger to become family. Prof. Ms. Allagh, I am most grateful. Prof. and Dr. Mrs J. B. George, baba, when it dawned on me that I had no father here on earth, I found one in you, thank you for making me one of your sons. Prof. & Prof. (Mrs) Agbaji, Prof. Amana Ocholi, Mrs. Diekola Adejonwo, Engr. Tosin Adejonwo & Engr. Hakeem Adejonwo, God bless you for your relentless support, Ms. Maureen I. Umego, I am out of words to appreciate you, but you and I know, it wouldn't have been possible if you were not here.

My gratitude also goes to all fathers and mothers and those who have always being there encouraging me all through my journey: Late. Prof. (Rev.) I. & Bishop (Mrs.) V. Audu, Bishop & Rev. (Mrs.) David Bakare, Mr. & Mrs. Apeji, Prof. Zakari Mohammed, Prof. B. M. Jahun, Prof. & Mrs. Oyedele, Mrs. F. A. Abdullah, Dr. and Dr. (Mrs.) Ojokuku, Prof. & Dr. (Mrs.) Akodu, Mr. & Mrs. George, Dr. T. M. E. Dogun, Dr. M. Chia, Dr. Akin Oyemakinde, Prof. & Dr. (Mrs.) Mike Musa, Prof. J. N. Kwasau and Dr. Mrs. Bolaji

To my friends; Arch. Moses George (Greatest Architect in Zauzzau), Mr. Percy Y. George, Dr. Usman Adekanye Oladipo DVM, Dr. Emmanuel Gana, Dr. Ola Ifahimiti Dr. Odike Ocholi, Ms. Ruth Ayuba, Mr. & Mrs. Grace S. Daniels, Mr. Perry Yayock Takai, Mrs. Sarah

Balogun, Mr. Tosin Olagunju, Dr. Daniel Ezekiel, Mr. Shedrach Ndonah, Mr. Saldoh M. Kadiri, Mr. Yusuf Wada, Arch. Fame Akpowu, Pharm. Ololobou Eyeororo Prince, Mr. Samuel Esho, Dr. C. Sow (General), Dr. Y. Tanimu, Mr. Maurice Ebinbin Ajagun, Dr. Sam T. Ivande, Mr. Yaariv Apeji Jnr, Dr. Yoni Apeji, Mr. Yanniv Apeji, Mrs. Nsidibe Nwokem PhD, Hajiya Mrs. Zulfa'a Yusha'u, Mr. Chukwuemeka Ummuna, Mr. Timothy Elisha, Mr. Jerry Ezekiel Dock, Dr. Osi Oyati DVM, Mrs. Sarah Jatau, Ms. Gimbyah G. Galadima, Mr. Emmanuel Mashi, Mr. Yakubu Mashi, Engr. Ruben Sani, Mr. Ojonugwa Arkpah, Dr. Inusa Ajene, Engr. Dubem Eze, Engr. Felix Oluwoloni, Dr. I. Nze, Mr. Idris Abdullahi, Mrs. Estrella Gada, Mr. Ishaya S. G. Gamba, Mr. Seun Adeleye, Mrs. Barbara Terpenda, Dr. Desh Yinka Adesina, Mrs. Ezinne Oledi Alum-Udensi, Mrs. Faith Atte, Ms. Judith Dyeme, Pst. Segun Alemede, Dr. Momoh Abede, Mr. Olalekan Hameed, Mrs. Osheiza Sa'adatu Jatto, Ms. Jessica Indywer, Mr. Sunday Abah, Mr. Amos Olu-ojo Bayode, Mrs. Enilolobo Maryam Surakat-Ajoke, Mrs. Nde James Anthony and to those that I have forgotten to mention, I say thank you.

Finally I would like to appreciate my course-mates, members of the M.A. English Class of 2011-2012; they made pursuing this degree a worthwhile course. I appreciate them for their useful contributions and for creating a healthy and lively learning environment while we did our coursework.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ABSTRACT

A bilingual or a multilingual speaker of Nigerian languages tend to fall back to the ethnic languages in the domains and topics, context and situations that require the usage of Standard English Language as result of the predominant Nigerian language(s) in their repertoire. There are different languages (codes) used by Nigerian students for interaction today, this has led to peculiar problems for meaning-making in a context where the standard expression of English language is required. Therefore, this study analyzed the Socio-semantics of Code-switching among Students of Benue State University and the Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi, by examining the users and types of codes switched in order to identify effects on the language use of Standard English language within sociolinguistics domains and formal context. The study adopts an eclectic approach in the analysis of its data; Fishman's (1972) "Domain and Topics Analysis", Labov's (2006) "Quantitative Paradigm Analysis" as well as the "Semantic Model of Conversational Code-switching" by Gumperz further modified by Auer (1984) in order to accommodate the nature of this study. The research design for this study combines aspects of qualitative and quantitative; includes descriptive statistical tools such as frequency distribution, tables and percentages. Data was sourced from the selected universities; random selections of students in the universities constitute the study and population, while three major instruments were used: 'unscheduled non-participatory observation', 'questionnaire' and 'motive-determination interview'. Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used to analyse the variables on the questionnaires to present the results of the data collected. Findings of the study reveal that, the frequency of code-switching among students of the study area, particularly students of English Language indicated that 75.2% of the total respondents "most often", "often" or "seldom" code-switch to Nigerian languages in order to make meaningful conversation. The analysis also showed that "domains of discourse" and "pragmatics", "language use" and "meaning-making" have a significant impact on the Nigerian university students as a result of their frequent code-switching thereby affecting their competent use of English language for a meaningful dialogue in formal context.

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The nature of written or spoken words today is expected to carry a message that should be understood by the reader or listener as intended. However, discourse involving different choices of codes for the expression of and utterance, and the users' ability to freely use languages by switching between predominant languages for the expression, it could become impossible for listeners to understand, again it could be productive if the listener is competent in both choices of codes. The major motivation of this study was a result of the peculiar problems the researcher encountered during conversations that were meaningful to him with other bilinguals of Nigerian languages who most times switched from the Standard English language to Nigerian languages (vernaculars), Nigerian Pidgin English (NPE henceforth) etc., this made conversation almost impossible between him and the interlocutors, in that the research is not a competent speaker of the Nigerian languages in his repertoire.

Code-Switching (hence forth; CS) has become a common feature within almost every multicultural society, people that have more than one ethnic group, tend to have individuals competent to acquire or learn languages within their society. This is achieved to enable one to become a participant in the social/informal and or formal interaction within a society or the situation/context. Trudgill (2000:18) establishes that there is a close inter-relationship between language and society; the linguistic aspects of code-switching and bilingualism/multilingualism have been studied in various fields. Sociolinguistics, however, serves as the adequate theoretical skeleton with which to complement the study of language

use for a meaningful code-switching in all contexts. This is so mainly because; sociolinguistics combines social and conventional linguistic aspects of code-switching, instead of focusing only on structural or functional aspects (cited in Blomquist, 2009).

Social meaning of code-switching is seen by Blom and Gumperz's (1972) as a product of individual interactions to the extent that it is created and negotiated locally as well as formally in the today's Nigerian university context. In other words, social meaning lies not within the act of switching itself, but in the perceived association between speech activities on the one hand, standards and individual's ability of a language choice on the other. It is obvious that there is a well-documented and refined literature which rejects the negative claim that code-switching is a sign of laziness and deficiency in language use, but it claims that bilingual speakers have the prestige of exploiting their treasure of linguistic knowledge to express meaningful thoughts and ideas (Wong, 2000).

Therefore, this study investigates how a network of Nigerian university students, well-read bilinguals and most of all students of English Language in Nigerian universities alternate between English and other ethnic languages in everyday formal/casual conversations, and how their choice of language relates to their social identification and the relation of meaning in every conversation. The study focuses on the sociolinguistic code-switching or fluctuation of the societal language use and social usage, and the meaning placed on codes of two or more conventional languages in a conversation (in this case English Language) and its effects on university students. Boztepe, E. (2005:11-16) in his paper on *Issues in Code-switching*; "*Sociolinguistic Dimensions of Code-switching*, with specific debates on *The Meaning of Social Meaning*; he elaborated on Blom and Gumperz's three types of social constraints

which presumably affects code choices of speakers for meaning making; “setting”, “social situation”, and “social event” (Hymes’, 1972a), in his argument, the choice of codes for “settings”, “social situations” and “social events” are not kept apart, thereby making it almost impossible for speakers to avoid code-switching.

Social structure of language use is referred to by the term 'social-practical structures' as language usage is concerned, the societal meaning and the social meaning basically involves the verbal usage of a language for expression, which all share one core feature; interactions between groups or communities in a relatively decentralized and autonomous manner. To some extent, rely on information and communication language codes which eventually congregate, organize and facilitate large-scale processes of social cognition. In other words, socio-semantics describes the integration of semantics, society and social properties of a language; its system, processes, functions, models as well as the science of the language that also indicates other branches such as; sociolinguistics, semantic interactions.

Additionally, the changes of the conventional language codes reproduction/manipulation and the changes of interactions appear to obey the similar time-scale, virtually by groups' aims and the content manipulation that involves interactions which contributes to shaping a language's future content, either negatively or positive, (in this case negative). This in turn, influences the evolution of the social fabrications of meaning against the conventional language meaning of codes used for expression.

Likewise, the crucial implication is that meanings and semiotic, social sociological systems for meanings are shaped by relations of power shifts in society, our languages and other systems of socially accepted meanings can 'do change' (Halliday, 1978). According to

Bernstein (1970) language consists of linguistic codes, or rule system, and in speech the speech codes must conform to the rules, that is, every speaker must respect the rules of the languages of the environment and the role for the language in every context of usage (Anugerahwati, 2010:205). His study was basically focused in the context of the British environment that has two variants of the same language (social and formal) unlike the Multilanguage nation as Nigeria, where most speakers are not native of English language, but first bilinguals or multilingual speakers of Nigeria ethnic languages.

1.2 Sociolinguistics Profile of Benue State

Benue is a state in the mid-belt region of Nigeria with a population of about 4,253,641 in the 2006 census (Ajaero, 2007); Idoma and Tiv are spoken predominantly. There are other ethnic groups, including Igede, Etulo and Abakwa. With its capital at Makurdi, Benue is a rich agricultural region; some of the crops grown are potatoes, cassava, soya bean, guinea corn, flax, yams and beniseed.

Benue State is named after the Benue River and was formed from the former Benue-Plateau State in 1976, along with Igala and some parts of Kwara State. In 1991 some areas of Benue State (mostly Igala area), with some areas in Kwara State, were carved out to become part of the new Kogi State. Traces of Igbo people and some ethnic groups who likely speak other dialects of Igbo are found in the boundary areas of Ebonyi and Enugu State in Local Government Areas like Obi, Oju etc (http://www.benuestate.gov.ng/).

Benue State has three universities: Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State University (BSU), Makurdi and Mkar University, Gboko. It has two polytechnics: Benue

State Polytechnic, Ugbokolo and Fidel Polytechnic, Gboko as well as the Akperan Orshi College of Agriculture. There are four Colleges of Education namely: Federal College of Education Agasha, College of Education Oju, Apa College of Education, Aidogodo Okpoga and College of Education Kastina Ala.

Fourteen languages are spoken as first languages in Benue State and the major languages are Tiv, Idoma, Etulo and Igede; the other major ethnic groups are; Hausa, Igbo, Yoruba, with multiple groups of ethnic settlers, such as: Igala, Ebira, Edo, Esan, Ijaw, Kanuri, Ibibio, Nupe, Gwari, Itsekiri, Jukun, Urhobo. The Nigerian Pidgin English as a version of the Standard English combined with the Nigerian ethnic languages spoken, although not formally approved as a lingua franca, is used across Nigeria, and is simply called 'Pidgin', 'Broken English' or 'Broken'. It is estimated that Nigerian Pidgin English is the native language of approximately 3 to 5 million people, a second language for at least another 75 million, Benue state settlers inclusive (Rafiu, K. A., 2011).

1.2.1 Dominant Codes used within the State

People use a dominant code for communication in Benue State for the simple reasons that, the three major languages of the state dominate the medium of communication in almost every context/situation, Speakers of the languages spoken as a first language (L_1) in Benue State are Tiv, Idoma and Igede, Etulo, Igala, while the other languages are seen as minority, even though, major ethnic groups such as Hausa, Igbo, Yoruba, with multiple groups of settlers, such as Itiyo, Igala, Ebira, Edo, Esan, Ijaw, Kanuri, Ibibio, Nupe, Gwari, Itsekiri, Jukun, Urhobo live in the state. Nigerian Pidgin English simply referred to as 'Pidgin', 'Broken English' or 'Broken' is the dominant medium of communication (Okwu, O. J., Kuku, A. A.,

& Aba, J. I., 2007; Hilhorst, T., van Liere, M., Ode, A. V., & de Koning, K., 2006; Adzer, V. C. 2012).

1.2.2 Brief History of the Selected Universities of Study

The essence of giving a lengthy account of the background of the area of review is to show the number of ethnic groups that are accommodated within the university communities, starting with Benue State University (BSU) which was established by the Benue State Government with the enactment of the Benue State University Edict No. 1 of 1991. The University took off in the 1992/93 academic year with four faculties, namely, Arts, Education, Science and Social Sciences. Two Faculties, Law and Management Sciences came on stream in the 1993/94 academic year. A post graduate school took off in the 1998/1999 academic year while the College of Health Sciences was established in the 2003/2004 academic session. The University took off Nineteen years ago during the tenure of Late Rev. Fr. Moses Orshio Adasu as Executive Governor of Benue State. Adasu; therefore became the first Visitor of the University. The University which took off in 1992 with staff strength of less than four hundred now has in its employment 1,991 staff, made up of **677** Academic staff and **1314** Non-academic staff (www. wikipedia.com).

The current students' population of the University: Total undergraduate population: Law and others (Undergraduates) 18,383 MBBS: 346 PG School: 1,150 (2010/2011) CCE (Sub-degrees): 1,569 with a **Grand Total: 21,448.** It has a Postgraduate School as well as a centre for Continuing Education which offers Sub-degree programmes leading to the award of Diploma certificates, it also offers intensive one year preliminary Science and French programmes. The University has four Centres, namely, Centre for Continuing Education

(CCE), Centre for Gender Studies, Centre for Peace and Development Studies and the Centre for Research Management. These Centres are manned by Directors and are meant to promote effective research and learning in various disciplines. The Centre for Gender studies for instance offers postgraduate programmes in gender-based disciplines housed in the Department of Sociology. The College has slim internally generated revenue owing mainly to the small student population in the College of Health Sciences. The only sources of internally generated revenue are; School fees (due to stagnation of students, no fees are collected from old students), hiring of auditorium, renting of shops or cafeteria, hostel accommodation (http://www.bsum.edu.ng/dwnloads /BSU_Brief_History.pdf).

The establishment of Universities of Agriculture came into effect on l January 1988 following a demerger process that resulted in simultaneous coming on stream of the two Universities of Agriculture located in Makurdi in Benue State, and Abeokuta in Ogun State. A third one located in Umudike in Abia State was established in 1992. The Federal Government of Nigeria had by the end of 1983 established seven new Universities of Technology, four of which were rationalized in 1984 by merging them with, and as campuses of bigger and more established Universities as a cost saving measure. Following the initiatives and reports of the National Universities Commission (NUC) on the establishment of Universities of Agriculture, the government carefully reviewed the situation against the background of the success stories of Agricultural Universities worldwide and decided to opt for converting the two campuses at Makurdi and Abeokuta into full-fledged specialized Universities of Agriculture.

The Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi (UAM henceforth) is a higher education institution in Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria (Nexus Strategic Partnerships, 2007 cited in

Agber, T. (2015). The university was established in 1988, following the recommendations of a 1987 Federal Government White Paper on Higher Education curriculum and development in Nigeria (Anyanwu, Ogechi Emmanuel, 2011). In general, the objective of the Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi is to put in place a properly integrated system of teaching, research and extension toward appropriate technology creation, transfer and use in Nigerian agriculture. This objective has several specific elements:

- Generating high-yielding crop varieties and livestock breeds as well as other efficient agricultural technologies that are sufficiently adapted and relevant to local environments;
- Accelerating the diffusion and mass adoption of new technologies on Nigerian farms through effective linkages with state extension services,
- Sensitizing researchers to the pressing needs of farmers, agro-industrialists and consumers with respect to production, processing and utilization technologies;
- Bringing the fruits of science to the farm-gate in the form, amounts and time that farmers need them most;
- Training needed manpower that is consistent with the requirements of an integrated national research-extension system; and
- Assisting in substantially raising farm output and incomes of Nigerian farmers as well as marketed quantities of food and fibre.

For outreach and public service support, UAM has established a Co-operative Extension Centre (CEC) and a Centre for Food and Agricultural Strategy (CEFAS) which focus on practical agricultural extension liaison support and public policy support services,

respectively. UAM operates a collegiate system made up of nine colleges and 36 departments which offer Bachelors, Post graduate Diplomas (PGD) and higher degrees. The philosophy of research at the Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi stresses research that is issues-oriented, mission-oriented and problem-solving. To achieve this research mission, research is multi-disciplinary, as contrasted with traditional conventional approaches in general universities where research is mainly along disciplinary lines in academic units. Researchers in the university are encouraged and supported to conduct work that cuts across disciplines and academic units.

Commodity-based programmes: R&D programmes at UAM are issues and mission oriented, farmer/agro-industry driven and utilise the multidisciplinary inputs from 39 Commodity/discipline-based programmes in extension, farming systems, arable and horticultural crops, ruminants and non-ruminants, animal breeding, feed resources, rural infrastructure, mechanization, product transformation, food engineering, clothing and textiles, forestry production, environment and climate change, fisheries, wildlife and range management, natural and applied sciences, agricultural and science education, biotechnology, bio-resource management, animal drugs, seed research and molecular biology. Institute of Food Security (IFS): The IFS serves as the resource mobilisation, development and capacity building strategy for a sustainable road map on national and global food security issues. It runs six programmes, namely, strategy and governance; knowledge and innovation; technology and environment; markets and institution; food and nutrition; and, biotechnology and farm wealth. UAM maintains collaborative and partnership arrangements with overseas universities, international and national agricultural research systems and agencies, federal and

state governments. At 22, UAM continues to generate the human resources needed to support national economic growth through functional integration of teaching, research and extension.

1.3 Statement of the Research Problem

The constant/frequent usage of Nigerian languages has led to peculiar problems with students' ineffective usage of Standard English language in formal contexts/situations for a meaningful expression; students who their first, second and possibly third repertoire languages are all Nigerian languages. Most Nigerian students have been in contact with at least one (1) or several other languages besides their L_1 and L_2 where the environments, the nature of other ethnic groups, classrooms situations, social and religious gatherings, and campus settlements makes switching almost inevitable. Previous researchers indicate that code-switching is a common form in the Nigerian context as a result of the multilingual nature of the country (Adetomokun, I. J., 2012; Ayeomoni, M. O., 2012; Adegbija, E. E., 2004 & Taiwo, R., 2010). The dilemma of choosing the appropriate language to make communication meaningful in different domains and topics is existing within the academic context in Nigeria (which demands the use of Standard English) where a lot of languages are present.

According to Alo (2004:77 cited in Terna-Abah, M. N., 2016), "nonstandard English is appropriate for communication among people who are intimate such as friends, husbands and wife." Non-standard in this sense but could mean the use of pidgin, NPE, vernaculars, vulgar expression of either English language or another conventional language. On the other hand, Corder and Ruszkiewicz (1979:548 cited in Terna-Abah, M. N., 2014) believe that one's language should be suited to the listeners one is addressing. It, therefore, agrees that the choice of Standard English or codes (informal/formal) should be determined by the context to

ensure that the variety chosen is appropriate for that context. Contrary to this assertion, however, the use of code-switching among students of higher institutions of learning in formal contexts that call for the Standard English (British) is now prevalent. For instance, the researcher was in a particular lecturer (MA) and a question was asked to the presenter, during a seminar presentation and the vivid response and only way the presenter could respond was to switch to Hausa in other to express herself, the lecturer quickly cautioned that with a reduction of points on the group presenting. On several occasion, the researcher witnessed students of English Language who switched to other ethnic languages with the administrative staff of the departments and their lecturers. The motivation to carry out this research is that, on several occasions, the researcher witnessed lecturers discussing with their students on academic matters, especially during research base discourse (thesis, dissertation and project), with students of English language speaking the common environment language (Nigerian Pidgin, Hausa, Tiv, Yoruba etc.). Another motivating factor is that, the researcher is not a competent speaker of both his mother tongue (Tiv) and third language (Hausa), so when discussing academics with someone who suddenly switches to any of these languages, it almost impossible for the communication to be effective, and when he tries to explain in English, sometimes the same persons find it hard to understand Standard usage. This prevalence of code-switching in formal contexts among students of the higher institutions of learning cuts across both the learner and the tutor of English Language. The curiosity to find out why there is such prevalence birthed the topic for this research.

Furthermore, some university students who maintain their cultural dialect, language, and accent are viewed as “stupid,’ ‘inferior’ or ‘rudimentary’ by their peers (Matthews, J. J. R., 2006). In addition, most of the studies on code-switching concentrated on the degrees, nature,

people, groups, patterns of occurrence, attitude to, functions, forms, causes of code-switching to draw conclusions on the linguistic aspects of the alternation as an ability of a bilingual or a multilingual; despite this, very few look at code-switching as a way out for making-meaning.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions are generated as guide to this dissertation:

1. What are the effects of social language usage on the Standard English language user by code-switching for a meaningful expression?
2. Why is code-switching prominent among university students and what are the codes, types of situation/context and the implications of code-switching in Nigerian universities?
3. What is the frequency and rate of code-switching among students in Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi?
4. To what extent is code-switching among students in the selected case study proficiency-driven or deficiency-driven?
5. What is the influence of domains of discourse, pragmatics, language use, meaning-making and nature of language alternation on students?

1.5 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate students' code-switching from the formal language (English) to their mother tongues (L_1) and/or to other languages in order to be meaningful and the effects of the usage on Nigerian university student of English Language Studies. The specific objectives of the study therefore are to:

i. determine the effects of social language usage on the Standard English language user by code-switching for a meaningful expression;

ii. illustrate code-switching prominent among university students and what are the codes, types of situation/context and the implications of code-switching in Nigerian universities;

iii. determine the frequency and rate of code-switching among students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi;

iv. determine if code-switching among students in the selected case study is proficiency-driven or deficiency-driven;

v. exemplify the influence of domains of discourse, pragmatics, language use, meaning-making and nature of language alternation on students.

1.6 Justification of the Study

It is not uncommon to see Nigerian university students fluctuating between usages of native languages and the Standard English language. In doing so, the speakers choose the linguistic codes most competent and appropriate for specific situations to express fitted meaning in the context of the expression. They make conscious or unconscious conclusion about the meaning of messages uttered as intended and attitudes that they send. This is seen as a major pragmatic feature of every social or formal Nigerian group.

Standard English Language is a language that empowers a majority, who control the socio-political and economic landscape, except for some few communities that have developed and approved their own medium. Therefore, native speakers of the Standard English language would see Nigerian students or learners of English as cognitively underdeveloped and sub-

standard, and are thus denied social agility. Williams (1991 cited in Matthews, J. J. R., 2006) found that non-standard speakers with equal qualifications were rated as less employable than Standard English speakers. Many sociolinguists, speech pathologists, and educators believe that code-switching is an important indication for previously described African society and that the capability to switch between two or more languages is a key component in educational and social mobility (Seymour & Seymour, 1979; Smitherman, 2000; Taylor, 1999; Filmer, 2003), but when relating to how meaning is made in a conversation however, the context to Nigerian university students' usage indicates otherwise; most bilinguals see this usage as an ability as scholar have always presented data on code-switching users, and not as the users' inability to keep the languages apart for every context or domain of the utterances.

The work is expected to help in evaluating the socio-semantic perception of code-switching effects on Nigerian university students, and contrast them with the reality of actual language and societal meaning, and the perception in an academic environment of the prompt use of code-switching among students for every situation or context. It is assumed that this dissertation would complement the studies of sociolinguists, especially on issues related to meaning and code-switching as the inability of bilingual or multilingual students for meaningful expression. Additionally, the analysis can be useful for readers, especially students of English language or those who are interested in semantics and sociolinguistics.

1.7 Scope and Delimitation

This case study is situated in Benue State, Nigeria, specifically Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi. Students in the two universities constitute the study and population is represented. This study looks at the different types of codes switched

and their effects on language use within two linguistics subfields; socio-semantics and code-switching. It also examines whether students' of the selected area of study place more emphasis on code-switching to make meaning while in a social or formal situation and if these codes are usually the only options during a conversation or it is the societal agreement to code-switch.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Preamble

Scholarly works in this chapter unveil concepts that propose an approach for knowledge representation of language usage meaning in social context, similar to the semantic presentation that builds semantic relations of sociolinguistics and language concepts, through a direct or indirect arrangement consisting of language varieties for conversation even as bilinguals, which represent concepts, and boundaries.

2.1 Conceptual Review

This section presents conceptualized areas related to this current study.

2.1.1 Socio-Semantics

The word socio- is seen by many as either a prefix to a content concept, in this review, it is seen as a combining form that denotes social or the society. A combining form of meaning, “social”, “sociological”, “society”, etc, in the context of the review, “socio-semantics”; where social, societal and sociological usage of language meaning meets.

The social structure is referred to by the term ‘social-practical structures’ on paper, although, when it comes to language usage, the societal meaning and the social meaning basically involves the verbal usage of a language for expression, which all share one core feature; interactions between groups or communities in a relatively decentralized and autonomous

manner and to some extent, rely on information and communication language codes which eventually congregates, organize and facilitate large-scale processes of social cognition. Socio cognition could be understood as society/social-distributed information and processing within a community of a generally large number of individuals (i.e. society/social groups level cognitive processes relying on interacting with others in different communities), rather than the traditional/native cognitive psychological interpretation of society's cognition describing individual native level cognitive processes in the context of human interactions.

The major and recent expansion of various socio-semantic communities of bilinguals that code-switch has been supported by a wide range of groups (age, status, culture, education etc), many of them entirely unique, and have simultaneously led to the availability of large amounts of detailed data on the users' choices of codes to express meaning in whatever context. In other words, "socio-semantics" describes the integration of semantics, society and social properties of a language; its system, processes, functions, models as well as the science of the language that also indicates other branches such as; sociolinguistics, semantic interactions. Social, sociological and society cognition of meaning not only nourished, it also became part of the observation, which paved the way to empirically founded agent (code-switching) based on a model.

Two constituents of the ethnic groups are essential to the social/societal integration of meaning and form; on one side, individuals interacting in diverse manners and, on the other side, a network of information\items (texts, opinions, and more broadly digital content: music, social chat-rooms etc). Additionally, the dynamics of the conventional language codes reproduction/manipulation and the dynamics of interactions appear to obey to similar time-

scale, virtually by groups' aims and the content manipulation that involves interactions which contributes to shaping a language's future content improvement either negatively or positive, (in this case negative) which in turn, influences the evolution of the social fabrications of meaning against the conventional language meaning of codes used for expression. Yet, the co-evolution remains rarely studied on account of today's explicitly descriptive literature models of sociolinguistics or the field of linguistics in general.

Sociolinguistics is the study of the effect of any and all aspects of society, including cultural norms, expectations, and context, on the way language is used, and the effects of language use on society. This review on social/societal semantics as a branch of the field of semantics in linguistics, that investigates human practices in specific social and cultural circumstances, tries to explain meaning-making both as a societal and social practice or integration on language usage. Likewise, the crucial implication is that meanings and semiotic, social sociological systems for meanings are shaped by relations of power shifts in society, our languages and other systems of socially accepted meanings can 'do change' (Halliday, 1978).

Another aspect in understanding this review is the "social semiotics", a study of the social dimensions of meaning, and human processes of signification and interpretation in shaping individuals and societies, visual, verbal native relation in nature (Thibault, 1991). Social semiotics can include the study of how people design and interpret meanings, the study of texts, and the study of how semiotic systems are shaped by social interests and ideologies, and how they are adopted as society changes (Hodge and Kress, 1988). It was influenced by, and shares many of the preoccupations of pragmatics and sociolinguistics, and could be said that slang is one social aspect of the society which as a variable or variety of code is also seen in

this research on the meanings and understanding of code-switching usage among the social groups in BSU and UAM as a society of its own.

Meaning depends upon the communication of facts and ideas agreeable to the hearer or listener, therefore, its misuse or redefinition of words just for social interactions can hinder proper understanding of the intended meaning in a conversation and not every listener understand all varieties or social choice of codes. In the case of various re-definitions that lead to confusion because there are so many potential ways to do that in the mind of the listener, a term that had a single useful meaning in a particular language can become meaningless and confusing as often as it is used interchangeably in terms of context and situation for social interest. A general point here is that the potential for semantic confusion is greatest with an interdisciplinary review of their usage with emphases on meaning-making and in what context. One reason for this is that different fields in linguistics may use the same term "socio-semantics"; (social, semiotics, pragmatics, sociology of language meaning etc) differently.

This idea is an excellent example of a very real and contextual description of how language use, particularly socio-semantics play a role in the achievement of communicative competence. Language, according to Cooper (1973) is "the most complex and sophisticated of our possessions" and we as Multilanguage nation are always interested in studying language in our context. Language has always been regarded as a tool for communication, and learning a language means learning how to communicate appropriately. However, not everyone agrees on what it means to communicate "appropriately". Dell Hymes (1972) created the term Communicative Competence to refer to this ability in which speakers should be able to

communicate with regard to the topic, the interlocutor, and the setting. Halliday (1978, 1985) describes the notion further by emphasizing on the three concepts of Field (topic/subject matter), Tenor (the speakers), and Mode (the channel of communication). It is logical to assume that these concepts are quite difficult for foreign language learners to master, but in fact they are as hard for first language learners/native speakers as well. This research described communication of students' competence of Standard English language and Nigerian Ethnic groups through communication, in the form of speech, is not always an easy skill to acquire as bilingual or multilingual speakers of Nigerian languages.

Halliday (1978) introduces the concept of man as a social being, and in the process of becoming a social being a child has to acquire language, which plays a central role to the communication of university students in Nigeria with English language. According to Halliday, language cannot but exists in society, and any study about language must be done in the context of situation. In line with that, Bernstein (1970 cited in Halliday, 1978) created the terms linguistic codes and speech codes, and Gumperz (1968) created the concept of speech community (cited in Anugerahwati, 2010:203). These authors both refer to language as existing within certain contexts, and to be able to communicate appropriately one has to learn certain "rules" which operate within that context, which, it may be added, may differ from one context to another.

In the case of first language learner, many would imagine that the complexities of learning to communicate appropriately are not faced by the learner, as he has learned, or acquired, the skill since childhood. In other words, they are now native speakers of Standard British English language. Here the concepts of linguistic codes and speech codes come into play; the

speaker is able to identify the appropriate code for the context and the language for social situations. According to Bernstein (1970 cited in Halliday, 1978) language consists of linguistic codes, or rule system, and in speech the speech codes must conform to the rules, that is, every speaker must respect the rules of the languages of the environment and the role for the language in every context of usage (Anugerahwati, 2010:205). Furthermore, different speech forms or codes "symbolize the form of the social relationships". To Bernstein, speech form is a quality of a social structure, and that brings the discussion to a social issue. Language is undoubtedly related to social matters, and one of the most significant matters is the social class. Language, in this case speech, is the direct manifestation of the social class of the speaker. One of the distinguishing factors among the social classes is the different distribution of linguistic knowledge. Tied to this concept is Bernstein's classification of two orders of meaning, i.e. the universalistic and the particularistic order of meaning. The former refers to the meaning in which "principles and operations are made linguistically explicit", whereas in the particularistic order the principles and operations are linguistically implicit. In relation to the two orders of meanings, Bernstein introduces his concepts of restricted and elaborated speech variants. With the existence of the distribution of linguistic knowledge to different social classes, the lower class has limited access to the elaborated speech alternatives; in other words, they only have the restricted alternative at their disposal (Anugerahwati, 2010:205). The universalistic order of meaning is related to the elaborated speech alternative, whereas the particularistic order of meaning is related to the restricted speech alternative.

Any discussion on language and society will not be complete without referring to Gumperz's concept of speech community (Sociolinguistics and Semantics). In his seminal work, *The*

Speech Community (1968 cited in Anugerahwati, 2010:205), Gumperz elaborated the term to mean "any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of a shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language use". Put more simply by Trudgill (1992 cited in Anugerahwati, 2010:208), a speech community is a community of speakers who share the same verbal repertoire and who also share the same standards for language use.

A speech community can be a group of people in an area, such as a village or a certain part of a town/city. These people mostly speak the same way in terms of pronunciation, grammar, and diction (vocabulary). The speech varieties that these people use form a system since they conform to the same set of social norms and values. In a speech community the speech alternatives are mirrors of social facts, and the relationship among the alternatives can be studied in two ways: dialectal and superposed. In dialectal relationship, the speech of local groups is distinguished from that of the other groups within the same broader culture. Superposed relationships, on the other hand, are those where differences refer to distinctions between "different types of activities carried out within the same group", for example religious sermons, technical discussions.

Anugerahwati (2010) Socio-Semantics study of Pygmalion, a story of Eliza Doolittle in the novel Pygmalion is a study of Linguistics. It is commonly regarded as a study of Phonetics, but he preferred to see it as more than that (Socio-semantics). Moreover, the study of how we should pronounce English words, we can also learn the culture and social systems prevailing in England, particularly in London. His study was basically focused in the context of the British environment that has two variants of the same language (social and formal) unlike the

Multilanguage nation as Nigeria, where most speakers are not native of English language, but first bilinguals or multilingual speakers of Nigeria ethnic languages. In addition, Anugerahwati (2010) focus is that man can learn about language which is so closely linked to the social context and situation where it is spoken, and about the system of meaning and meaning potentials of the speakers. Therefore, this BSU and UAM is not mere institution but also a multicultural, language and linguistics, and in particular sociolinguistics and semantics environment of diverse groups. To revisit the initial hypothesis of this research, the ideal of Socio-semantics of code-switching by university students, particularly English language students, shows that the skill of communicating (speaking) appropriately may pose difficulties not only for British English language learners but also for frequent speakers of their "numerous repertoires' Nigerian languages. Therefore, the manner which we employ to put across the meaning we intend to deliver is something that should be learned by all speakers of "the language/code" in use in every context/situation by non-native.

Meaning is a fundamental component of cognitive sociolinguistics. This statement could be made more vigorously, but certainly mot more accurately. Social differences manifested in the language during oral interactions are based on the meanings of linguistic forms. At the same time, the meaning of structures cannot be constructed or reconstructed independently of the meanings that arise from the context of their use. For the Labovian sociolinguistics, linguistic variation requires the variants of a linguistic variable to have equivalent meanings, whether those variables be phonic, grammatical, lexical or discursive (Fernández, F. M., & Moreno-Fernández, F., 2016). If sociolinguistics has considered a variation to be its central object of the study, it has only been possible because of the extent to which semantics equivalence has been elevated as an issue of fundamental importance. Indeed, if such

equivalence did not exist, "variation" in the way that sociolinguistics has conceived it since the 1960s could not endure. For this reason, the possibility or impossibility of the equivalence between variable forms is its pragmatic or semantic equivalence, has been debated by those supporting the existence of syntactic variation and discourse analysts, who denied variation (Fernández, F. M., & Moreno-Fernández, F., 2016). Nowadays, things are discussed differently; sociolinguistics has strengthened three positions with respect to meaning: the existence of lexico-semantic equivalents, the possibility of semantic equivalence between elements of speech, and the presence of semantic variation at the discourse level. The controversy that remains lies primarily in explaining how all these positions are articulated and manifested.

Cognitive sociolinguistics states that variation of meaning is as important as the meaning of variation (Geeraerts, Kristiansen and Peirsman, 2010:6). In maintaining that meaning can be negotiated and shaped during interaction and in response to speakers' social positions, cognitive sociolinguistics introduces new elements for discussion. For cognitive sociolinguistics, it is possible to distinguish the variation that affects signifiers from that which affects meanings. Regarding the former, there is no conflict in being able to negotiate meaning in discourse while maintaining the existence of semantic equivalence between signifiers. What makes it possible, in fact, is that the meaning is the end result of an interactive negotiation in which two focus forms which might not a priori be considered equivalent can be understood as equivalent because of that interactive negotiation. Bakhtin already stated that in 1929 that true understanding is dialogic by nature and that meaning is the effect f the interaction between a speaker and a listener (Morris, 1994:35 cited in Morris, P. (Ed.)., 2009).

Moreno-Fernadez ideal of socio-semantic of cognitive sociolinguistics was explained as a result of these few questions which are central to a cognitive sociolinguistic endeavour: what do speakers know about their language? What do they know about communicative interaction? What do speakers know about sociolinguistic variation? How does social reality influence the origin and processing of language use in formal situations? How does language use affect the configuration, evolution and variation of language? What do speakers know about their socio-communicative context and the formal context of usage? How do speakers perceive sociolinguistic reality? What are speakers' attitudes and beliefs regarding linguistic variation? How does sociolinguistic perception influence speakers communicative behaviour at all levels? The socio-semantic ideal in cognitive sociolinguistics grants absolute preeminence to usage and subordinates semantic processes to both communicative interactions and social context. It is precisely from the latter that emergent meanings originate. This occurs as a result of negotiations that allow us to complete, specify or modify socially accepted semantic substances, then in turn used in the formal context. Fernández, F. M., & Moreno-Fernández, F. (2016) is also concerned about how meaning is highlighted as a "priority matter" of the cognitive sociolinguistics and it's been changed to the meaning's value in the Labovian sociolinguistics as opposed to the concept of meaning from a cognitive perspective.

2.1.2 Sociolinguistics of Semantics

Sociolinguistics according to Hymes (1972) is defined as "the relationship between systems of communication and the social situation in which they are used". In other words, it is the study of language and society. Sociolinguistics studies the ways in which language behaves

and the structures that determine the kinds of social behaviour. It is not just the consideration of linguistics and sociology or linguistics and other disciplines; it embraces every aspect of the structure of language that leads to its social and cultural functions. Sociolinguistics, a greatly expanded domain of inquiry, focusing far more on meaning features with several lists of research issues entailed by the conceptual models, with the inclusion of inquiries into recognition criteria for context types, matters of speaker judgment regarding appropriateness of both meaning-types and verbal expressions to a context, identity group and role relationships as mediated by language association, the reasons for semantic variation across class or gender in the same context type, the role of society in constituting and maintaining such variation, the grounds of classification of situation types, the variations in ways of making and acknowledging the very fact of contact or interaction with another, both verbal and in new media, etc.

Sociolinguistics is also a branch of sociology, in that; it reveals the relationship between language use and the social basis for such use (Chambers 1995). It differs from sociology of language, in that the focus of sociolinguistics is the effect of the society on the language, while the later focus is on the language's effect on the society. Sociology of language focuses on the language's effect on the society, which seeks to understand the way that social dynamics are affected by individuals and group language use meaning-making. It would seek to understand individual expression (semantics), one's investment in the linguistics tool that an individual has access to, in order to bring one's self to other people.

The theoretical significance goes well beyond even the important results, for example, educationally, and in terms of social policy, it faces us with the truth of Basil Bernstein's

hypothesis of many years ago, that 'ways of meaning differ significantly across social class positions', and that 'home and school, operating as essential settings for socialization, tend to encourage these ways of meaning and then evaluate and classify them in ways that lead to or at least significantly support the realities of social class differentiation and hierarchy in modern societies (Bernstein, 1971 cited in Halliday, 1978). Although linguistically and sociologically, there are the disagreements on variation in meaning-making, that should be considered as integration and the primary factor in our understanding of the role of language and language in the formation of the social organization of the society.

The dominant view of the concerns of sociolinguistics, as asserted by Labov (1972), excluded variation in meaning to focus on phonological and presumptively meaning-neutral grammatical features. Sociolinguistic theory, built on the social semiotic approach to the language of Michael Halliday (1978), and Bernstein's sociological analysis of class differences in linguistic meaning-making patterns. The theory links register variation, i.e. differences with regard to setting, to classic Labov's user different variation analysis, and does so at the level of meaning. Young people adding registers, genres, and coding orientations with substantial social prestige and practical use value to their repertoires is not simply embourgeoisement (relating to, or characteristic of the townsman or of the social middle class), neither is it just another effort to erase working-class culture and replace it with something 'better'. Rather, it offers something of real value: opportunities and means of making different kinds of meanings, semantics that matter both socially and in operating the machinery of modern society.

In general sociolinguistics, code-switching prefers ‘deep’ semantic variables that are coded natively in a corpus sample, whereas groups or social integration groups rely on surface phenomena that are easily retrievable in the (large) body as a whole. Occurrences of lexemes referred to the concept and usage distributional semantic representation to detect patterns in the conventional language usage of contextual semantics associated with each of the words. Apparent time hypothesis by Labov, explains that, “the linguistic differences among different age groups or generations will reflect the actual diachronic developments in the language” (Labov, 1966), that is to say, sociolinguistic and cognitive approaches complement each other in terms of description and possible explanations of linguistic phenomena relating to meaning. Although, cognitive processes are reflected in the demographic structure of a ‘speech community’, the semantic externalism is rejected by many linguists, because it seems to disagree with the mentalist presuppositions of generative linguistics in the Chomskyan tradition (Chomsky, 1986, 1995, 2000).

Semantics holds that a language belongs to a community (society of native speakers) of language users and that; common language or dialects exist above and beyond individuals. According to this conception, a language has ontology (e.g. words and grammatical rules, or social practices and/or conventions) and norms (standards of correctness) that are in some sense independent of the linguistic competence of individual speakers. In the words of Michael Dummett, an idiolect is merely ‘ a second-order theory: a partial, and partly incorrect, theory about what the meanings of the expressions are in the common language, that may be represented as a partial theory of what the correct theory of meaning for the language is (1986: p.469). As Dummett makes it clear, it is possible for speakers to be simply wrong in their use of language because a language exists independently of its speakers. In

contrast, under the individualist view, 'incorrect usage' is a misty social perception, usually a simple failure of communication.

Wittgenstein argues in "Philosophical Investigations" (1953 cited in Newmark, 1981:25) that 'rule following' and meaning cannot be explicated by mere description of what an individual is doing: to say that an individual is following a particular rule already presupposes community standards about correct application of the rule, while Kripke's "Naming and Necessity" (1980) undermines the claim that reference depends on a speaker's knowledge, and Putnam's paper "The Meaning of Meaning" (1975) show that the reference to natural kind terms like 'water' is also insensitive to speakers' knowledge of reference. He is of the opinion that, their reference is fixed partly by environmental facts, in this case, the actual chemical structure of water. Meanwhile, Burge's argument in 'Individualism and the Mental' (1979), was rather in agreement that, Putnam's argument, suitably modified, extends to all terms. Burge shows that, if a speaker of English was to believe that rheumatism is called 'arthritis' and that he has arthritis in his thigh, the latter belief would be false (since arthritis is an ailment of the joints), rather than being true (in his idiolect) as a descriptive theory emphasizing knowledge of language would predict. Burge concludes that the meaning of 'arthritis' is fixed by the word's use in a community, whether or not an individual speaker happens to know how his community uses the word.

Scholars like Chomsky and Davidson disagree with the hypothesis by the above scholars. Davidson (2005:121) says, "I am not impressed by Michael Dummett's, Burge's and Putnam's insistence that words have a meaning of which both speaker and hearer are ignorant. I don't doubt that we say this, and it's fairly clear what we have in mind: speaker and hearer

are ignorant of what would be found in some dictionary, or of how people with a better or different education or a higher income or social groups use words. This is still meaning based on successful communication, but it imports into the theory of meaning an elitist norm by implying that people not in the right social swim don't know what they mean. In many cases Davidson's comments are very much to the point of this review, but we cannot explain all the externalist arguments as relying subtly on elitism, given that speakers often impose norms on themselves, and it is easy to imagine or indeed locate situations/context in which the 'correct' usage is not included in dictionaries or prescriptive grammars, or is associated with groups outside the elite".

A different but related characterization put forward by Lewis (1975, p.6), explicates that the social aspects of language are mediated by the fact that 'a given language is used by, or is a (or the) language of, a given population'. Lewis takes for granted that there is such an object as the population to be found. This strong form of externalism holds that a language is possessed jointly by a community and that the identity of an individual's language is fully determined by the community to which he belongs. It implies that speech communities pre-exist individual speakers and are capable of determining a unique community language with or without their cooperation. A communitarian can, of course, hold that individualistic properties are relevant to determining which language is being spoken; a point Lewis agrees with.

Three aspects of individual language broadly; construed dispositions to defer, idealized communicative success, and social identification map out the same community language. This community language is systematic and makes predictions about meaning and reference that

are intuitively correct. Given this, we could agree that, Chomsky's challenge to articulate a 'notion of "shared public language" that comes even close to meeting the requirements of empirical enquiry or serious philosophical reflection on language and its use" (Chomsky, 1995:51).

Furthermore, a study of code-switching, semantics, language use in sociolinguistics would not be complete without the explanation of the relation of language registers and diglossia in the context of the usage of language in an environment:

2.1.2.1 Register (Variation)

The term register as Trudgill sees it is used in the sense of a variety of a language determined by topic, subject matter or activity such as the register of Media, Academics, Mathematics, Medicine, Law or the register of pigeon fancying among others. In his words, one can certainly acquire and use technical register without using Standard English just as one can employ non-technical registers while speaking or writing in Standard English. The language of the academic environment, being one of these varieties of Standard English, is used by the teachers, professors, lecturers, scholars or by people who operate within academic setup. Thus, during learning conversation, words belonging to the teacher register (Nigeria official language) are mostly used. It is also asserted that "register" is a variety of language distinguished by according to use (cf. Olu 1995; Wallwork 1969 cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002:43-46). For Wardbough (1980), it is a set of vocabulary items associated with distinct occupational or social group (cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002). Wilkinson (1971) sees it as the kind of variety of English appropriate for a particular purpose in a particular situation having regard to the subject, addressee and context (cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002:43-46).

Register serves as a means of excluding outsiders because unless someone is acquainted with its registers, he or she cannot understand what is being said. The spoken form of the language of medicine is mostly interrogative form, where patient answers the question. It also involves the use of conversation.

Biber (1995:1) talks about a single speaker using different linguistic forms on different occasions in rather different terms, using the concept of register:

> most of this variation is highly systematic: speakers of a language make choices in pronunciation, morphology, word choice and grammar depending on a number of non-linguistic factors. These factors can include the speaker's purpose in communication, the relationship between speaker and hearer, the production circumstances, and various demographic affiliations that a speaker can have. Analysis of the systematic patterns of variation associated with these factors has led to the recognition of two main kinds of language varieties: *registers*, referring to situationally defined varieties, and *dialects*, referring to varieties associated with different groups of speakers (cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002:43-46).

Biber observes that register variation is similar to what the anthropologist Dell Hymes calls "verbal repertoire" (Hymes 1984 cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002). He warns that 'there is no general consensus within sociolinguistics concerning the use of *register and* related terms such as *genre* and *style'* (Biber 1995:8), but generally adopts Ferguson's theoretical distinction which proposes that register be concerned with a communication situation, and genre with a message type recurring in a society (Ferguson 1994:20-21 cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002:43-46).

In his analytical framework for register studies, Biber details the situational parameters of register variation (1994:40-41) to specify the characteristics of registers and how they might vary:

- communicative characteristics of participants single/plural/institutional addressee or addresser; presence or absence of audience
- relations between addressor and addressee power/solidarity; extent of shared knowledge; personal relationship (emotional/social)
- setting private/public; domain (work/school/religious/domestic etc.); mass-media; whether place and time are shared by participants, time of communication
- channel mode (written/spoken/signed); permanence (recorded/transient, published/unpublished)
- purposes/intents/goals whether communication is factual or imaginative; intent to persuade/inform/entertain
- topic/subject specific subject; level of discussion (specialised/general/popular)

Situational parameters of register variation (Biber 1994) changes in any of these situational parameters would, Biber claims, be capable of provoking variation in an individual's speech register. However, it is not just different situations that motivate shifts in style. Blom and Gumperz (1972) famously drew a distinction between situational and metaphorical codeswitching which is equally applicable to style-shift (cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002:43-46).

Motivated stylistic choices may be normative if the switch in linguistic code accompanies a change of topics or participants or a similar redefinition of the situation. This would be regarded as situational code-switching. Alternatively, the factors which motivate a speech-event may be related to interaction management or identity marking. Blom and Gumperz

(1972) termed this second type of switch a metaphorical code-switch. Coupland (1985:155) counsels against being too quick to ascribe a situational explanation to style-shift:

> Normative explanations of code- or style-selection should not be carried too far. Firstly it is not situational dimensions or components themselves that determine speech behaviours as much as participants' perceptions of and responses to these dimensions or components ... norms are rarely to be seen as absolute prescriptions/proscriptions of language usage; rather they set up background expectations against which, often in *contrast to* which, social actors weave their meanings through language choices (cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002:43-46).

Another aspect of Biber's approach to register variation which has received some criticism is the suggestion that variation according to socio-economic group is derived from stylistic variation, rather than vice versa:

> According to this view, the reason that members of different social classes speak different language varieties is that they have access to, and typically utilise, registers with different characteristics ... It does not seem possible to account for Bell's observation that the degree of stylistic variation for a given variant is usually less than the degree of social class variation ... A more serious problem with Finegan and Biber's claim that elaborated forms are associated with prestige social classes and economical forms with non-prestige social groups is that this view sounds dangerously similar to the notion that speakers of low prestige varieties such as African American Vernacular English possess an impoverished communication system, incapable of expressing elaborate sentiments, subtle nuances or even straightforward logical thought. (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998:235 cited in Sangster, C. M., 2002:43-46)

I think that this criticism of Biber's derivation of social variation from stylistic variation is valid; a progression of stylistic variation from socio-economic group seems equally likely, although this may ultimately be a chicken-and-egg argument. However, I feel that the last 'problem' discussed by Wolfram and Schilling-Estes above seems to be based on a rather contorted view of Biber's model and is unfairly harsh in its near-accusation of racism.

2.1.2.2 Diglossia

In linguistics, diglossia is a situation in which two dialects or languages are used by a single language community. In addition to the community's everyday or vernacular language variety (labeled "L" or "low" variety), a second, highly codified variety (labeled "H" or "high") is used in certain situations such as literature, formal education, or other specific settings, but not used for ordinary conversation; (Ferguson, C. A., 1959) also, the H variety usually has no native speakers.

The high variety may be an older stage of the same language (as in medieval Europe, where Latin remained in the formal use even as colloquial speech diverged), an unrelated language, or a distinct yet closely related present-day dialect (e.g. Standard German alongside Low German; or Chinese, with Mandarin as the official, literary standard and local varieties of Chinese used in everyday communication). Other examples include literary Katharevousa versus spoken Demotic Greek; literary Tamil versus spoken Tamil and Indonesian, with its Baku and Gaul forms; (Sneddon, J. N., 2003) and literary versus spoken Welsh. In his 1959 article, Charles A. Ferguson defines diglossia as follows:

> Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any section of the community for ordinary conversation (Ferguson, C. A., 1959).

Here, diglossia is seen as a kind of bilingualism in a society in which one of the languages has high prestige (henceforth referred to as "H"), and another of the languages has low prestige ("L"). In Ferguson's definition, the high and low variants are always closely related. Ferguson gives the example of standardized Arabic and says that "very often, educated Arabs will

maintain they never use L at all, in spite of the fact that direct observation shows that they use it constantly in ordinary conversation" (Ferguson, C. A., 1959).

Joshua Fishman expanded the definition of diglossia to include the use of unrelated languages as high and low varieties (Fishman, J. A., 1967). For example, in Alsace, the Alsatian language (Elsässisch) serves as (L) and French as (H). Heinz Kloss calls the (H) variant exoglossia and the (L) variant endoglossia (Kloss, H. (1968). In some cases (especially with Creole languages), the nature of the connection between (H) and (L) is not one of diglossia but a continuum; for example, Jamaican Creole as (L) and Standard English as (H) in Jamaica. (H) is usually the written language whereas (L) is the spoken language. In formal situations, (H) is used; in informal situations, (L) is used. One of the earliest known examples is Latin, Classical Latin being the (H) and Vulgar Latin the (L); the latter, which is almost completely unattested in the text, is the tongue from which the Romance languages descended.

The (L) variants are not just simplifications or "corruptions" of the (H) variants. In phonology, for example, (L) dialects are as likely to have phonemes absent from the (H) as vice versa. Some Swiss German dialects have three phonemes, /e/, /ɛ/ and /æ/, in the phonetic space where Standard German has only two phonemes, /ɛ(ː)/ (Berlin 'Berlin', Bären 'bears') and /eː/ (Beeren 'berries'). Jamaican Creole has fewer vowel phonemes than Standard English, but it has additional palatal /kʲ/ and /gʲ/ phonemes. Especially in endoglossia, the (L) form may also be called "basilect", the (H) form "acrolect", and an intermediate form "mesolect".

Ferguson's classic examples include Standard German/Swiss German, Standard Arabic/Arabic vernaculars, Standard French/Creole in Haiti, and Katharevousa/Dimotiki in

Greece (Ferguson, C. A., 1959). Creole is now recognized as a standard language in Haiti. Swiss German dialects are hard languages with low prestige in Switzerland (see Chambers, Sociolinguistic Theory). And after the end of the military regime in 1974, Dimotiki was made into Greece's only standard language (1976 cited in Trudgill, P., & Chambers, J. K., 2017). Nowadays, Katharevousa is (with a few exceptions) no longer used. Harold Schiffman writes about Swiss German: "it seems to be the case that Swiss German was once consensually agreed to be in a diglossic hierarchy with Standard German, but that this consensus is now breaking" (Schiffman, H. F., 1993). There is also common code-switching especially in the Arabic world; according to Andrew Freeman, this is "different from Ferguson's description of diglossia which states that the two forms are in complementary distribution" (Freeman, A. (1996). To a certain extent, there is code switching and overlap in all diglossic societies, even German-speaking Switzerland.

Examples, where the High/Low dichotomy is justified in terms of social prestige, include Italian dialects as (L) and Standard Italian as (H) in Italy and German dialects and standard German in Germany. In Italy and Germany, those speakers who still speak non-standard dialects typically use those dialects in informal situations, especially in the family. In German-speaking Switzerland, on the other hand, Swiss German dialects are to a certain extent even used in schools and to a larger extent in churches. Ramseier calls German-speaking Switzerland's diglossia a "medial diglossia", whereas Felicity Rash prefers "functional diglossia" (Rash, Felicity, 1998). Paradoxically, Swiss German offers both the best example of diglossia (all speakers are native speakers of Swiss German and thus diglossic) and the worst, because there is no clear-cut hierarchy.

In most African countries, a European language serves as the official, prestige language, and local languages are used in everyday life outside formal situations. For example, Pidgin English is the everyday lingua franca in Nigeria, Standard English Language being spoken only in very formal situations. However, a European language that serves as an official language is also spoken in informal situations if speakers of two different languages or more communicate each other. In Nigeria, the Standard British English is the prestige language used in media, education, business, politics, etc. while Nigerian ethnic languages and the Pidgin English is the daily language in the street, on the markets, and informal situations in general.

For the sociolinguists, an aspect of the study of the relationships between codes and social structure, diglossia is an important concept in the field of sociolinguistics. At the social level, each of the two dialects has certain spheres of social interaction assigned to it and in the assigned spheres it is the only socially acceptable dialect (with minor exceptions). At the grammatical level, differences may involve pronunciation, inflexion, and/or syntax (sentence structure). Differences can range from minor (although conspicuous) to the extreme. In many cases of diglossia, the two dialects are so divergent that they are distinct languages as defined by linguists: they are not mutually intelligible.

Thomas Ricento, an author on language policy and political theory believes that there is always a "socially constructed hierarchy, indexed from low to high" (Ricento, Thomas, 2012). The hierarchy is generally imposed by leading political figures or popular media and is sometimes not the native language of that particular region. The dialect that is the original mother tongue is almost always of low prestige. Its spheres of use involve informal,

interpersonal communication: conversation in the home, among friends, in marketplaces. In some diglossias, this vernacular dialect is virtually unwritten. Those who try to use it in literature may be severely criticized or even persecuted. The other dialect is held in high esteem and is devoted to written communication and formal spoken communication, such as university instruction, primary education, sermons, and speeches by government officials. It is usually not possible to acquire proficiency in the formal, "high" dialect without formal study of it. Thus in those diglossic societies which are also characterized by extreme inequality of social classes, most people are not proficient in speaking the high dialect, and if the high dialect is grammatically different enough, as in the case of Arabic diglossia, these uneducated classes cannot understand most of the public speeches that they might hear on television and radio. The high prestige dialect (or language) tends to be the more formalised, and its forms and vocabulary often 'filter down' into the vernacular though often in a changed form.

In many diglossic areas, there is controversy and polarization of opinions of native speakers regarding the relationship between the two dialects and their respective statuses. In cases that the "high" dialect is objectively not intelligible to those exposed only to the vernacular, some people insist that the two dialects are nevertheless a common language. The pioneering scholar of diglossia, Charles A. Ferguson, observed that native speakers proficient in the high prestige dialect will commonly try to avoid using the vernacular dialect with foreigners and may even deny its existence even though the vernacular is the only socially appropriate one for them to use when speaking to their relatives and friends. Yet another common attitude is that the low dialect, which is everyone's native language, ought to be abandoned in favour of the high dialect, which presently is nobody's native language.

'Critical Diglossia' and 'Lifestyle Diglossia'

Mukul Saxena has taken the term "diglossia" and applied it to different data, adding both a critical perspective from the Sociolinguistics of Periphery and also making a distinction between linguistic capital and language capital. It is too soon to tell whether this will become a widely used application of "diglossia".

'Critical diglossia', (Saxena, Mukul., 2014) a revised notion of diglossia, underpins the state-sponsored ideological dimension of the High and Low functional distribution of languages and the attitudes towards languages. In contrast to the language-centric notion of classical diglossia, the revised notion contends that diglossia is primarily a socio-cultural, economic and political phenomenon not necessarily accepted as a natural state of affairs by all the minority groups, the speakers of Low languages/varieties. Critical diglossia not only describes how language varieties and languages in a particular linguistic market are functionally distributed in formal and informal domains and their linguistic and language capitals are valued as High and Low, but also studies the reasons why the asymmetrical relationship between the language varieties and languages develops, as well as the role that historical and current political, economic and socio-cultural processes play in its construction. While it draws on the earlier contribution of the sociolinguistics of periphery in acknowledging diglossia as imposed from above, it goes further in incorporating the role of the agency as proposed in another revised concept, 'lifestyle diglossia' (Saxena, Mukul., 2014). Lifestyle

diglossia contends how and why diglossia can also develop from below in the way individuals' everyday socio-cultural practices and projection of identities shape their language practices. For example, when German speakers use English, they are doing more than speaking a foreign language. According to Passmore:

> The use of English doesn't express some asymmetrical power relationship between German and English, nor is it related to class or race or whatnot. Sure, there are poseurs, but it's stupid to think Germans who can speak the language of cars in English because they race them or the language of music because they consume and/or play music are living out some desperate wannabe existence by using and knowing English terms for these things. It's probably because with the English knowledge of these terms, one can find an even larger pool of interlocutors about a specific subject (or "lifestyle" object) online or even within Germany itself. These words become native to the speaker of that "lifestyle diglossia" in ways that those words are not native to the "native" to the speakers of the language where these words ostensibly come from (Passmore, Ashley cited in Maher, J. C., 2017).

Alternative lifestyles reflected in these practices are facilitated by the unprecedented nature of the flows of ideas, people, goods and language practices that are associated with 21st-century globalization. This focus on people's everyday practices allows for observing the language choices people make as inextricably linked to their chosen lifestyles. By capturing the micro-level practices, the 'lifestyle diglossia' suggests that people actively project their group affiliations and individuality by drawing on the global flows of lifestyles and local structural arrangements (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diglossia Retrieved 4 December 2017).

2.1.3 Semantics and Social Semantics

Semantics is the area of linguistics dealing with the meaning of words or the meaning attached to words or symbols. This view places semantics at the core of communication in language; indeed, there is no communication without the sharing of meaning. Semantics as a term was first formally used by Breal in 1897. Therefore, one could infer that Breal was the

first to bring to the fore in a formally acceptable way, the nature of meaning in language. Though the quest for the understanding of meaning has always been of interest to scholars, semantics was not mentioned as a term and did not come up in literature until Breal's first usage in 1897 (cited in Nerlich, B., & Clarke, D. D., 1988).

Semantics is the study of meaning communicated through language (Saeed, 1997); Saeed also stated in his book that, "semantics is the study of the meaning of words and sentences". Bloomfield in his book "Language" (1984) adopted a behaviouristic theory of meaning, defining the meaning of a linguistic form as "the situation which the speaker writes it and the response which it calls forth in the hearers". This definition is applicable to this research since it is talking about the cultural environment to which meaning is connoted to or the denotative usage of code-switching of Nigerian English and ethnic group language words created and used by individuals and or groups. People only understand these code-switched words based on the shared knowledge, context and situation, although, each individual decoding words in a conversation uniquely. Morris (1938) opines that "semantics deals with the relation of signs to … object which they may or do denote, while pragmatics concerns the relation of signs to their interpreters (1971: 35, 43).

Linguists and philosophers agree that meaning is essential to semantics; alternatively, there is considerable inconsistency among different scholars on the exact conception of meaning. Based on their understanding of the meaning of meaning and procedures, there are different "schools of thought" in relation to meaning. The "naturalists" for example, according to them (with Plato as the chief proponent), the meaning of a word is the entity or thing it represents, that there is an intrinsic relationship between sound and meaning. The major criticism of this

view is that there exist very many words in natural languages without physical entities, meanwhile, "the conventionalists", who asserted that words and their meaning do not necessarily have any direct link, whatever connection existing between a word and meaning is through a concept formed in the minds of the users of the language, this school of thought derived from the works of Aristotle. And "the contextualist" school of thoughts according to Firth and other contextualists opined that meaning of a word is derived from its usage as this was present in the works of some philosophers; Rudolf Carnap (1891 - 1970), Alfred Tarski (Born 1902) and Charles Peirce (1839 - 1914).

Each of these approaches has had a profound impact on the practice of linguistics and or sociolinguistics and other subfields. Apart from focusing on the three principal schools of thoughts to the study of meaning, there are thematic, conceptual and associative types of meaning. The conceptual meaning is synonymous with 'primary, central, logical, cognitive or denotative meaning' of a word. It is the first ordinary meaning listed in dictionaries, which is not affected by the context, or emotional overtones associated with the act of communication, and there is a belief in the shared conceptual meaning of every word of a language. There is a universal implication of the conceptual meaning; that a word constitutes a major part of the shared system of a language for all speakers and a criteria element of human communication since it is a major factor in language. Linguistic semantics emphasizes the properties of natural languages while pure or logical semantics is the study of the meaning of expressions using logical systems or calculi (more mathematically related than linguistic in nature).

Associative meaning, on the other hand, is the meaning of a word affected by the context, background, time and the cultural realities of the users of the language. This type of meaning

is not static, it is variable and open-ended, given that, words, structures and styles are usually employed to arouse some emotional reactions in the hearer, by some attitudes and forms of behaviour that are brought out by the associative meaning of the words used in communication. These different reactions are derived from the associations which the words created in the minds of language users; indeed, associative meaning reflects individual differences, the individualised intentions and interpretations. There is therefore, the need for all participants in communication to share common reference points, symbols and background for there to be any meaningful interaction. Most of the problems of communication arise when the associative meaning is assumed to be shared by all concerned; this explains the enormous difficulty second language learners' encounter with decoding the meaning of codes or varieties chosen in a conversation for code-switching and some figurative ethnic group expressions. Users also find it difficult to apply appropriately choice codes to diverse situations thereby making listeners look dumbfounded. Associative meaning is either of these: connotative meaning contains elements of the conceptual meaning of a word and the individual's personal interpretation of communication. Reflected meaning relates to expressions with multiple meanings, such words that have several meanings of the reflected meaning.

Stylistic (or social) meaning, on the other hand, is a particular pattern of speech, language variety or speech form associated with a specific social context where stylistic or 'social meaning' is achieved. It is common knowledge that a speaker's choice of words and structures reveals his/her social, regional, geographical or even economic background. The choices can also reveal the level of familiarity between the speaker and the hearer. Emphasis

is usually on the different stylistic variations open to language users, and it is one aspect of meaning that this study considers in code-switching among students.

Semantic and social facts can be explained only by a theory that takes both levels to be philosophically relevant and explores their relationship. For Bloomfield, the definition of meaning explicitly included "the situation in which a speaker utters an expression and the response it calls forth in a hearer" (Bloomfield, 1933:139). Although, avoidance of the terms "concept" and "feeling," behaviourists clearly see utterance function in context as central to meaning. Structural and generative treatments of language took the word and the sentence as the province of semantic theory. The meaning of sentence was seen as the product of the meanings of its component lexical items and their structural relations, according to the principle, linguist did not give room to the understanding of meaning in the aspect of code-switching words, phrases, sentences in anticipation to be social and at the same time make sense to the hearer or listener.

An important outcome of the study of language in social context is natural to the understanding of semantic structures; an area which is a major concern to linguistic theory. However, when all the apparatus of verbal communication usage are considered, including linguistic, social contexts and presuppositions, these and other socio-semantic patterns appear to be essential in most, if not all, speech communities in which English is spoken. The task of the linguist then, in dealing with any language and any speech community, is to determine in what ways such universal socio-semantic patterns are expressed while code-switching in the obvious surface of the various components of verbal communication.

For a sociolinguistic approach in the study of meaning-making in code-switching to the definition of verbal communication neighbourhood, Gumperz (1968) and Hymes (1972a) proposed important aspects of studying the verbal communication of many speakers in various styles and context, likewise Labov (1970). It is also important to split with the longstanding dichotomies as grammatical/ungrammatical and competence/performance, whose primary function is to classify and remove from consideration data which cannot be easily handled within current theories of the study of meaning when the rules are violated in code-switching. This research, therefore, is a critique of the competence/performance distinction from the conventional norms of a language and its replacement with a socially and realistic meaning to users' environment and the study of linguistics. Hymes (1971) investigates the relationship between linguistic creativity and appropriateness; for a discussion of the relationship of actual language usage to linguistic theory and of the various types of rules that are needed to account for real language usage and meaning. Some assumptions argued in this research may be deemed to be incorrect and lead to theoretical contradictions, especially as social meaning becomes the central concern of linguistics for all varieties or choice of codes for verbal communications if the object of study of language were recognized to be the use of language in social contexts.

Social semantics is a demonstration of how semantics from several different sources can be harnessed and used to enhance the real-world interactions of people at a social gathering. Particularly, the combination of semantic data from social media, musicians' song lyrics with the real world encounter of users provides a new way of connecting to people in the world. In general, this application goes in the direction of making the advancement of the real-world social network that is only transparent to users, unimportant, yet functional. Social semantics

also provides first opportunity to expose the semantics of social meet and investigates recommendation design in bodies of data that mix associations from social media to the real-world context or situation.

Understanding processes of social meaning context and social cognition in addition to the sociology of language meaning as used in code-switching should no longer be seen as a new use of language for meaning-making within Nigerian university communities, initiated by bilingual individual speakers, operating within a group, class, status etc. When accepted by other members of the group, it becomes additional, special vocabulary, and the conventional means to express meaning is probably displaced. As such, the use of many codes in a conversation is, as a result, the ability of the individual to acquire or learn more than one language of a group or sub-cultures of a larger society. Therefore, the assertion that, slang is seen as a society's introduction of language form by social groups to create their own meaning interacting amongst themselves is totally true, although, this ability could be said to have affected the use of language's standard or conventional meaning.

2.2 Language and Semantics

Language is defined as "audible, articulate, meaningful sound as produced by the action of the vocal organs", "a systematic means of communicating ideas or feelings by the use of conventionalized signs, sounds, gestures, or marks having understood meanings" (Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, 2009). The study of the relation between form and meaning, in other words, connotes that, language relates physical phenomena to meanings. Henry Sweet, an English phonetician and language scholar, opines that "Language is the expression of ideas by means of speech-sounds combined into words, words are combined into sentences, this

combination answering to that of ideas into thoughts" (in Grabe, 2000). American linguists Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager also asserted that "A language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a 'social group' cooperates." Any succinct definition of language makes a number of presuppositions and begs a number of questions. The first, for example, puts excessive weight on "thought," and the second uses "arbitrary" in a specialized, though legitimate, way (Britannica, 2012).

As soon as one gives up the distinction between situational and metaphorical code-switching, there is no logical necessity to attach semantic values (meaning potentials) to the two languages. It now becomes an empirical question whether bilinguals who use the juxtaposition of two languages for the sake of a contrastive effect which has an influence on the definition of the situation, additionally build up a context-independent categorization scheme such as "we code"/"they code" applicable to the two languages. In the semantic model, the meaning potentials assigned to the bilingual member's two codes bridge the gap between situationally induced (and therefore predictable) and individualistic but situation-independent code-switching. Metaphorical code-switching can be meaningful only because the juxtaposed languages themselves have meanings which in turn are built up by situational code-switching. The two types of code-switching and the assumption of meaning potentials are inseparable and support each other. The way in which meaning is attributed to the two languages here is mono-directional; meaning is generated by situational code-switching, becomes associated with the two codes, and is then used in those cases of language alternation that cannot be interpreted situationally (Auer, 1984:91).

The subject matter of semantics, on the other hand, is more difficult to grasp than that of other linguistic disciplines. A noise or a scribble and sign-language gestures are physical objects, however, unlike other physical objects, a noise that an individual makes when s/he speaks or a scribble on paper has to mean. The property of 'aboutness' of linguistic signs (symbols) is one of the defining properties of natural language meaning. The things that make words and other expressions meaningful are that they are 'about' the things in the world, their relation to the things in the world. But meanings, the entities that semantics investigates, cannot be directly observed, given that meaning is not only located in any single place, not in the word, not in the objects that are described by words, not in the mind in a separate concept or idea hanging between the word and the things it represents. It is important to notice that meanings are not located somehow in the physical shape of words, nevertheless, meaning is directly related to "the arbitrariness of the linguistic sign" (de Saussure, 1916), the connection between a word and what it stands for is arbitrary; which is the defining properties of human language.

One can conclude that the meaning of words cannot be derived from their physical properties, it cannot be reduced to the real-world objects or their perception, and it cannot be reduced to the particular image in our minds. The meaning of words is to be derived from the relations between words, concepts and things in the real world. Frege's assumptions were that senses or ideas are entities of a particular immaterial kind; that ideas exist outside the physically accessible world (Frege, 1848-1925). Meaning that is conveyed by some marks, scribbles or a noise consists in part in the intention on the part of the speaker or writer to produce some understanding in the hearer. The communication is only successful to the extent that the idea the hearer or reader gets is the same idea that the speaker or writer intended the hearer or reader to get.

Oseghale (2012) asserts that "certain socio-cultural variables influence the variety of English we speak". "Since the realities and experiences peculiar to our communities are expressed in another language, certain differences from the Standard English are expected to occur". "Differences of this nature have produced words whose meanings are peculiar to Nigeria such as 'introduction'". In linguistics, semantics is the subfield that is devoted to the study of meaning, as inherent at the levels of words, phrases, sentences and larger units of discourse/texts. Meanings come as a result of the situation, shared the meaning of the linguistic sub-culture, either in words or sentences, although, with the speaker's choice of words, they are either denotative about and they also connote to other situation or context of the language use. The focus of meaning is on the sociology of language and the social aspect, interpersonal component is another aspect because it deals with the social expressive and cognitive functions of language by expressing the speaker's angle.

2.3 Semantic Network

In the world of communication, meaning, language, association, networks are the physical structures composed of sets of codes connected by a focussed people. A semantic network professes to represent concepts expressed by accepted language words and phrases as codes connected to other such concepts by a particular set of semantic relations. Primitive concepts in this system of semantic networks are 'word-sense meanings'. Prehistoric semantic relations are those that the verb of a sentence has with its subject, object, and prepositional phrase arguments in addition to those that underlie common lexical, classification and modification links.

A complete statement of the semantic network would include all those relations that would be required in the total classification of a natural language vocabulary. Considering semantic nodes as representing human verbal concept structures and semantic relations connecting two such structures as representing the linguistic processes of thought that are used to combine them into natural language descriptions of events, a few psycholinguists supported these hypothesis; (Quillian 1968, Rumelhart, D. E., Lindsay, P. H., & Norman, D. A., 1972, Collins and Quillian, 1972), although necessary research needs to be done with viable facts to accept or reject psychological theory that would elaborate on semantic networks.

Treating semantic networks as a computational linguistic theory of structures and processing operations, would require an understanding of language codes and other world ethnic natural languages, which makes it a stronger ground for the varieties' representation of lexical concepts and the semantic relations, that represent a combination of processes involved or necessary for analyzing language strings, phrase, idioms transformations, for question answering operations, and for generating meaningful English language sentences. Semantic networks are 'simple' and 'even' elegant structures for representing processes of meaning a language strings in a convenient form that supports useful language usage in communities.

As linguistic theory, semantic networks offer a convenient formalism for representing such ideas as "deep structure", "underlying semantic structure", etc, the content of the structure represented in semantic networks depends on the conventions of the linguistic theory that is adopted (Fillmore, 1968), further developed by (Celce-Murcia, M., 1971 cited in Simmons, R. F. (1972). The processes undertaken on the human networks to generate language strings provide a theory of how a language can be generated from underlying semantic structures.

The term “understanding’ is given precise operational meaning by the people’s choices of codes, varieties that could recognize or generate meaning and paraphrases ideas as well as answering questions, in that the extent of the understanding is measurable by the ease or difficulty of the question answering tasks, the size of vocabulary, and the efficacy of the system in handling complexities and details of the language structures (such as English language).

In natural language systems, computational theories have been taken beyond the bounds ordinarily set by linguists, psychologists, or logicians to develop an interdisciplinary theory of verbal communication based on conceptual structures underlying language; lexical, syntactic, semantic operations for recognizing and generating language sequences; and logical operations for determining the equivalence of two or more semantic structures. An extended form of semantic network can be regarded as a syntactic variant of the clausal form of logic, by virtue of its relationship with logic, the extended semantic network is provided with a precise semantics, inference rules, and a procedural interpretation, on the other hand, by regarding semantic networks as an abstract data structure for the representation of world connection of different ethnic groups.

The argument is that there are compelling general principles governing the structure of network representations for natural language semantics and that these structural principles have potentially significant implications for the processes of semantic expression by users. Moreover, these principles are not meant to provide a genuine theory of semantics, nor a belief that networks of codes relations necessarily reflect the most important or deepest aspects of semantic structure but also the users in their context of usage. These principles of

semantic network structure are quite general in scope, appearing to hold for semantic network representations constructed in very different ways, whether from the word associations of adolescent subjects (Nelson, McEvoy, & Schreiber, 1999) or the considered analyses of linguists (Miller, 1995; Roget, 1911). At the same time, these regularities do not hold for many popular models of semantic structure, including both hierarchical or arbitrarily (unstructured) connected networks. These principles may thus suggest directions for new modelling approaches, or for extending or revising existing models, eventually, they may help to determine which classes of models most faithfully capture the structure of natural language semantics.

Therefore, people are now considered not only as individual subjects but also as members of communities that are enabled by social platforms that manage social matters. Social objects connect people in a relationship (no matter the type): these objects could be a language text, a word or just a sound. The interactions among individuals (inside and outside well-defined communities/groups) with the social or societal objects allow interactions that define their semantic networks. In other words, semantic network is directly associated with the convergence between social, sociology of language and semantic components as well as the users.

2.4 Domains of Language Use

The first person who proposed domains of language is Schmidt-Rohr in 1932. It is developed by Fishman. Based on Fishman (1972b:20 cited in Marjohan A., 1988), "domain is a socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationship between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institution, of a society and

the area of activity of speech community in such a way that individual behaviour and social patterns can be distinguished from each other and yet related to each other". Therefore, the languages used by people are influenced by many factors.

The number of languages spoken in Nigeria is still not clear. There have been various views and opinions about it, for instance, (Osaji l979, Bamgbose 1971; Brann 1990) put the number at about 400 (Adegbija, 1991, 1989). The most recent speculation puts the number between 450 and 500 (Omodiagbe, 1992 cited in Ayeomoni, M. O., 2012 and Adegbite, 2010). Undoubtedly, there are many languages in Nigeria both indigenous and foreign that exist side by side. These languages are assigned different roles or functions depending on the domains and occasions. Therefore, language use situation in Nigeria is different from what obtains in other bilingual and monolingual countries like Canada where there are two languages: French and English, and Japan where a single language is used for all activities.

There is the government policy concerning domains of language use in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1979), and the National Policy on Education (1977, 1985, 2004 cited in Akande, J. O., 1982). It is obvious that government understands the importance of clear allocation of roles to languages (both indigenous and foreign languages). The government also recognizes that in Nigeria, language is a means of promoting social interaction, national cohesion and cultures; hence every child is mandated to learn the language of the immediate environment.

Multiglossia' is a term used as an extension of Ferguson's (1959) 'diglossia' and (Adegbija, 2004) to describe language use situation in a multilingual environment like Nigeria. It should be stated that Fishman's (1967) is more appropriate to explain language use situation in

Nigeria, where there are varieties of a language. Language potency and prestige in Nigeria are directly related to language functions. For instance, the English language is used in formal situations, in the media, in education, etc. as a result of its prestige. The functions assigned to a language or languages enhance the prestige of such languages as Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa and English. Various languages in Nigeria have distinct functional manifestations at several hierarchical levels of usage, that is, each of the languages has domains of use different from the others. They are assigned roles based on their prestige and status.

2.4.1 Code-Switching/Mixing

Gardner-Chloros (2009:4) defined code-switching as, "the use of several languages or dialects in the same conversation or sentence by a bilingual person". She further explains that the word 'code' adopted by linguists, originated from a term in communication technology, referring to unambiguous transduction of signals between systems, while 'switching' simplistically means changing of the position of 'the mental key switch' between varieties. Therefore, according to her, code-switching in this sense means switching between different languages or language varieties by bilinguals in the course of a single conversation. Coupland & Jaworski (1997:361) also states that "code-switching can be defined as the use of two or more languages in the same conversation or utterances". In daily conversation, spoken or written language, formal or informal situation, realized or not, people usually use code-switching and code-mixing. The concept of "code-mixing" is used refers to a more general form of language contact that may include cases of code-switching and other forms of contacts which emphasizes the lexical items. This definition is found in the following excerpt: "the term code-mixing to refer to all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from

two languages appear in one sentence" (Muysken, 2000). Another scholar; Bullock and Toribio who also stated that through code-switching in linguistics; many bilinguals will utilize their ability to shift from one language to another to communicate with others in an unchanged setting and usually within the same utterance (Bullock & Toribio, 2009) not necessarily minding if the listener understands intended meaning.

Code-switching is traditionally assumed to be an indication of language knowledge deficiency in bilingual speakers; however, various researchers have proposed that code-switching is also frequently used by bilinguals to achieve particular communication goals in a conversation with other speakers (Shin, 2010), as well as McConvell (1994), Myers-Scotton (2006a) and Heller's (1988) identification of code-switching as having connection to the identity, ethnicity and solidarity associated with each language and it functions in interaction similarly throughout the world. For example, works of Malik (1994), Di Pietro (1977) explained that ethnic groups such as Italians express themselves while telling a joke, to show they belong to the same ethnic group with shared values and experience. Thus, code-switching can help build a relationship between speakers in a particular conversation and this generally applies to most if not all societies.

Additionally, code-switching was viewed as a choice in determining the linguistic choices of varieties used in a conversation where the rewards and costs for using either of the languages are weighed by the switcher to achieve a particular outcome (Myers-Scotton, 1979). The presumption is also represented in Myers-Scotton's (1993) 'Markedness Model', which is based on the 'social motivation of code-switching'. The model centres on the notion of code-switching as language choices made by speakers and it is seen as either an unmarked or

marked language choice in different speech situations. Code-switching is deemed as an unmarked or safe choice when it is more or less expected in a particular type of interaction that is determined by factors other than the conversation content such as social and situational settings. In contrast, the marked choice is unpredictable, disregarding social and situational factors and what is expected in the interaction. Therefore, a marked choice is a negotiation about the speaker and the speaker's relationship with other participants (Myers-Scotton, 2006b).

In an early research by Blom and Gumperz (1972), they identified two types of code-switching: "situational" and "metaphorical". Situational being code-switching influenced by situation change in a conversation or discourse such as the change in participant, topic or setting. Metaphorical or conversational code-switching, on the other hand, works as a conversational strategy to assist conversational acts such as an apology, request, complaint or refusal.

Code-mixing is the change of one language to another within the same utterance or in the same oral/written text. It is a common phenomenon in societies in which two or more languages are used. Studies of code-mixing enhance our understanding of the nature, processes and constraints of language and of the relationship between language use and individual values, communicative strategies, language attitudes and functions within particular socio-cultural contexts. Code-mixing refers to any admixture of linguistic elements of two or more language systems in the same utterance at various levels: phonological, lexical, grammatical and orthographical. In essence, code-mixing may be more adequately

seen as occurring as intra-sentential switching where code-switching more readily describes the phenomenon that occurs at the inter-sentential level of linguistic usage.

On the other hand, "code-switching" is a term in linguistics referring to the use of more than one language or variety in a conversation. Bilinguals, who can speak at least two languages, have the ability to use elements of both languages when conversing. It can occur between sentences (inter-sentential) or within a single sentence (intra-sentential), although some commentators have seen code-switching as reflecting a lack of language ability to properly explain oneself, most contemporary scholars consider code-switching to be a normal and natural product of the interaction between bilingual or multilingual speakers.

There are different perspectives on code-mixing and code-switching. A major approach in sociolinguistics focuses on the social motivations for switching, a line of inquiry concentrating both on immediate discourse factors such as lexical need and the topic and setting of the discussion, and on more distant factors such as a speaker or group identity, and relationship-building (solidarity). Code-mixing may also be reflective of the frequency with which an individual uses particular expressions from one or more language in their daily interactions; thus, an expression from one language may more readily come to mind that the equivalent expression in the other language.

A second perspective primarily concerns syntactic constraints on switching and mixing code usage. This is a line of inquiry that has postulated grammatical rules and specific syntactic boundaries for where a switch may occur. While code-switching had previously been investigated as a matter of marginal importance within the more narrow tradition of research on bilingualism, it has now moved into a more general focus of interest for sociolinguists,

psycholinguists and general linguists. Code-switching can be related to and indicative of group membership in particular types of bilingual speech communities, such that the regularities of the alternating use of two or more languages within one conversation may vary to a considerable degree between speech communities.

Some sociolinguists differentiate between code-switching and code-mixing while others simply refer to them both as code-switching. Hudson (2001) separates code-switching from code-mixing, by defining code-mixing as alternations that happen when a fluent bilingual talking to another fluent bilingual change codes without any change at all in the situation. Hymes (1875 cited in Nur, N. A., 2015) asserted that, "code-switching has become a common term for alternate use of two or more languages, or varieties of language, or even speech styles"; while Gal (in Wardough, 1986:103) explains that code-switching as a conversational strategy is used to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries, in order to create, evoke or change interpersonal relations with their rights and obligations.

Code-switching is a situation where the speakers deliberately change a code being used, by switching from one to another. It involves the movement, whether psychologically or sociologically motivated, from one discrete code (language or dialect) to another within a communicative event. Code-mixing, on the other hand, means the blending of two separate linguistic systems into one linguistic system. It is also assumed that, code-switching is similar to the phenomena of suspension where the material is mixed into a suspended medium wherein the parts eventually separate and settle out of the mixture. Code-mixing is comparable to the phenomena of a solution where a type of bonding occurs that prevents the mixed elements from separating. Obviously, an intra-sentential mixture of codes in the course

of discourse output is slightly more complex than when a definite switch is made between two languages in the course of moving from one language to another while attempting to provide two different sentences.

Code-switching labelled as “unmarked” or “smooth switching” occurs frequently and is considered an accepted switch between languages, but code-mixing is not considered that way. Unmarked language switches conform to the communities’ language and social norms. Marked switches are in direct opposition to pre-established language and social norms and as a result, social distance is created between the community and the individual who made the marked language choice. Speakers use their language choice to portray their perception of ‘who’ they are (personality).

As stated above, code-mixing is the mixing of pieces of a word or phrase from a language into another language in a single bilingual or multilingual conversation. The bilingual or multilingual usually mix their language because of social factors. Hudson (1996: 53) in his book “Sociolinguistics” says that: “in code-switching, the point at which languages change corresponds to a point where the situation changes, either on its own or precisely because of the language changes. There are other cases, however, where a fluent bilingual talking to another fluent bilingual changes language without any change at all in the situation, this alternation is called code-mixing.

Essentially, it has been difficult to differentiate between code-mixing and code-switching even by renowned scholars. However, they have enabled one to see some indicators related to the differences of these two sociolinguistic terms; code-switching and code-mixing. First, in code-mixing, bilingual speakers seem to apply some words or phrases from a foreign

language, while the other language (code) functions as the base language. Secondly, the assumptions that, bilingual speakers mix codes when there is no topic that changes, neither does the situation (Gumperz 1986 cited in Jendra, 2010:79). A different view proposed to separate the two notes that, if it involves changing into a foreign clause or a sentence, it should be defined as code-switching, but if it involves the use of foreign phrases or group of words, it is identified as a code-mixing. Poemer also added that code-switching and code-mixing are related to the formality of the situation, although, code-mixing is found in the less formal situation, while in code-switching possibly occurs in a formal one depending on the situation and on the accepted code (Poemer, 2011 cited in Singh, S. K. S., 2012). From an additional standpoint, Poplack (1980) categorized code-switching into three types: 'tag-switching', 'inter-sentential' and 'intra-sentential'.

2.4.1.1 Tag-switching: involves inserting a tag or short phrase in one language into an utterance that is otherwise entirely in another language. This type of code-switching occurs most easily for the reason that tags typically contain minimal syntactic restrictions, thus not violating syntactic rules when inserted into monolingual sentences.

2.4.1.2 Inter-sentential switching happens at clausal or sentential level where each clause or sentence is in one language or another. Occurring within the same sentence or between speaker turns, this type of code-switching requires its speaker to be fluent in both languages in order to conform to the rules of the languages.

2.4.1.3 Intra-sentential switching; possibly the most complex type among the three, can take place at clausal, sentential or even word level.

Since the early 1970s, code-switching has gained the interest of scholars as a naturally occurring use of languages by bilinguals (Ariffin & Rafik-Galea, 2009), today, the motivations, functions and reasons for code-switching have been studied extensively by a number of researchers from various sociolinguistics perspectives. Based on the concept of functional specialization by Jakobson (1960) and Halliday et al. (1964a), Appel and Muysken (2006) listed six main functions of code-switching:

- **Referential function**: Code-switching involves lack of knowledge or facility in a language. Hence, bilingual speakers switch code when they do not know the word or when a certain concept is not available in that language. Language is chosen also because it is more appropriate or suitable to be used for a particular topic.
- **Directive function**: This participant-related function of code-switching aims to include or exclude a person from a part of a conversation by using a familiar or foreign language to that person.
- **Expressive function**: Speakers use more than one language to stress their self-identity or feelings to others in the conversation.
- **Phatic function**: Code-switching is used to show a change in tone and emphasize parts of a conversation that are of importance.
- **Metalinguistic function**: Myers-Scotton (1979) asserted that speakers sometimes switch code in order to comment on another language.
- **Poetic function**: Words, puns and jokes in one language are switched to another language for the purpose of amusement or entertainment.

Among bilinguals, code-switching is a wide-spread phenomenon which tends to occur in speech, this is because when two or more languages' users are in contact, they tend to

influence each other. Therefore, bilinguals often code-switch from one language to the other in between conversations, especially while talking to another bilingual with the same language competence or when the languages involved are used in the immediate environment (context). Code-switching occurs when the speakers involved in a conversation use both languages together to the extent that they change from one language to the other in the course of a single utterance (Wardhaugh 1986). Therefore, code-switching is as a result of bilingualism, its occurrence among bilinguals, involving the user switching between languages throughout a conversation, while they alternate languages for better communication and for emphasis if necessary within speeches to make meaning.

Over the past thirty years, and in particular since the publication of the ground-breaking work of Pfaff (1979) and Poplack (1980), a wealth of information about code-switching (CS) between a wide range of language pairs has become available. Poplack and Meechan (1995:200) emphasize the fact that in code-switching the languages are clearly separate from each other, and they define code-switching as "the juxtaposition of sentences or sentence fragments from two languages, each of which is internally consistent with the morphological and syntactic (and optionally, phonological) rules of its lexifier language". This definition is meaningful of McClure's (1977:97) use of the terminology; she uses the term code-switching to cover code-changing and code-mixing. In her definition, "'Code-Changing' is the alternation of languages at the level of the major constituents (NP, VP, and S)". Importantly, she sees code-changing as involving a complete shift to another language system, given that all function words, morphology and syntax are abruptly changed, whereas code-mixing takes place within constituents. Grosjean (1995: 263) defines code-switching along similar lines as shifting completely with emphasis added to the other language for a word, a phrase, a

sentence, etc. However, Clyne (2003: 76) uses the term 'Trans-version' to express crossing over "to the other language rather than alternating between the languages".

Myers-Scotton (1993a) asserts that code-switching does not necessarily involve a complete switch to the other language. In her Matrix Language Frame Model, one of the two languages generally takes a more predominant role in code-switching in that it determines the grammatical frame of the utterance. In what Myers-Scotton (2006:241) calls 'Classic Code-Switching', elements from two or more language varieties are found in the same clause, but only one of these varieties is the source of the morpho-syntactic frame for the clause. Muysken (2000:1) on the other hand, uses the term code-mixing instead of intra-sentential code-switching to refer to all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence.

We do need to keep in mind, though, that researchers 'understanding of separation between languages may not correspond to speakers' perceptions, as Auer (1984:26) pointed in his definition that; code-switching as 'language alternation' at a certain point in conversation without a structurally determined return into the first language, whereas transfer is defined as language alternation for a certain unit with a structurally provided point of return into the first language (Auer, 1984:26). In other words, it describes someone who code-switches using two languages (Interlingua) or dialects (intralingual) interchangeably in a single communication.

Milroy and Muysken (1995:7) sees code-switching as "the alternative use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation". Milroy and Muysken (1995:8) equally mention 'tag-switching', 'emblematic switching' or 'extra-sentential switching' that is used to refer to a switching between an utterance and the tag or interjection attached to it. Communication,

which may involve a native tongue and a foreign language, or two foreign languages or dialects of the same language, can be initiated with one language and concluded in the other.

The use of code-switching by people is dependent on their acquisition level, and the types of socialization (context) and interaction (situation) amongst a particular set of individual native/learner of Nigerian speakers of 'a language', but varies from speaker to speaker (in that there's no homogeneity; Tiv people in Zaria may speak differently from those in Makurdi), it is basically rested on age, geographic location, status, occupation, income, education and context; these are some of the factors that influence usage of code-switching in every choice of expression for meaning-making.

2.4.2 Pragmatics of Code-Switching

This mainly deals with perspectives on language use and context. We use language to do many things, to give and to obtain, to persuade and to order, to interact and create human bonds by the use of words and sentences to acquire meaning in context. And by placing emphasis on the power of context and text to create meaning through numerous relations among the constituents of sentences, and among utterances themselves, which are arranged in discourse following a logical argument. According to Gazdar (1980) cited in Maiyanga (1998), "pragmatics is the actual use of language for communication". He, Maiyanga, further said that "this is the meaning that arises through the use of language and communication".

In recent years, there has been a rapidly growing body of research in the field of cross-cultural study of pragmatics, sociolinguistics and semantics. This section focuses on the pragmatics of 'inter-languages' (English usage and other Nigerian ethnic languages), a focus which is

justified by the growing importance of English as a global lingua franca among the large communities and the local Nigerian English Language and ethnic languages trying to make headway into the global lingua franca, given the fact that cross-cultural contexts of English and other languages are now predominantly used by inter-language users wrongly rather than the native speakers.

Assuming that code-switching theories for spoken conversation were also accepted for written communication, Chen (2007) adopted Gumperz's (1982a) list of conversational functions of code-switching and Appel and Muysken's (1987) categories of functions of code-switching in analyzing the pragmatic functions of code-switching in written texts that are not synchronized. Chen's (2007) research demonstrated the higher exposure to English switched code to a greater degree and used different choices of English words and expressions for meaning-making in a conversation.

2.4.3 Discourse of Code-Switching

The study of discourse requires investigation of language use in social contexts, as part of the processes of social interaction, this point of view, is an interesting development within the tagmemic (relating to, or being a grammar that describes language in terms of the relationship between grammatical function and the class of items which can perform that function) approach shown in the study of the rhetorical devices used in discourse (Grimes, 1972). Shuy and Fasold (in O'Brien, 1973) also mention the study of discourse as one of the areas of current sociolinguistic research and in agreement with Pike that, discourse should be studied in its own right, asserting that, it has a place in sociolinguistic research, considering the

ambiguous role that discourse structure plays in perspective of generative-transformational grammar.

In their influential monograph "The Meaning of Meaning" (Ogden & Richards, 1923), drew a fundamental distinction between symbolic and emotive meaning. The symbolic meaning corresponds to what authors call ideational, descriptive, propositional, or referential meaning, while emotional meaning corresponds to interpersonal, expressive, non-propositional, affective, and stylistic aspects of meaning. The assumption was that ideational meaning could be studied as a part of competence independent of context, while interpersonal meaning was a performance (or discourse) phenomenon unsuitable for systematic investigation.

In a very different vein, around this same time, Sapir (1921, 1929, 1949) and Whorf (1956a in Mey, Jacob L., 2009) raised questions about the relationship between language, meaning, culture, and personality, which remain central concerns of semantic theory and not just the social context of language usage. The degree to which language determines our perception often discussed under the heading of the "Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis," has become an issue, especially in the cognitive semantics of Lakoff and his associates (G. Lakoff, 1987; G. Lakoff and Johnson, 1980; G. Lakoff and Turner, 1989).

Katz (1966, 1972) continued to develop feature theory to describe such semantic notions as meaningfulness, anomaly, contradiction, tautology, synonymy, antonym, paraphrase, and so on. The extension of componential analysis in the direction of logical notation, especially by McCawley (1968a, 1968b, 1968c) and G. Lakoff (1970, 1971), was a major tenet of the Generative Semantics movement. Proposals for the representation of sentence meanings in predicate logical notation, particularly in the intentional logic developed by Montague (1968,

1970, 1974), have continued to flourish as an area of semantic theory surrounding linguistics discourse. Montague's position, deriving from formal logic, equates meaning with truth conditions in a model or a possible world.

The traditional practice in associating 'truth-functionality' with the ideational sentence meaning and competence, leaving interpersonal meaning as a 'non-truth-functional' performance observable fact (discourse), by contrast with other work in semantics, the functional-systemic linguistics of Halliday (1967, 1977, and 1978 quoted in Norrick, N. R., 2001) recognizes not only ideational and interpersonal meaning, but also textual meaning. It associates various sorts of meaning with choices made all along the way in the production of a sentence in a text. Systemic linguistics has operated with the goal of describing 'discourse meaning' all along, given that, the sort of analysis mentioned above, reflects the proposal Firth made about semantic analysis as early as 1935 (Firth, 1957 cited in Hasan, 1985). The notion of meaning has increasingly become bound to discourse contexts, since the early 1970s.

Discourse context has been evoked ever more frequently to handle phenomena not describable in terms of truth-functional and structural semantics. Speaker intentions and audience responses found their way into semantic theory via pragmatics and speech act theory. Research on talk in real contexts showed the necessity for considering the interactional goals and relationship of conversational participants in the description of meaning. Researchers have led the evolution of semantics to include discourse phenomena and the indexicality and anaphora, presupposition, speech acts, entailment, and interpersonal, especially figurative meaning, showing the development in recent linguistic theory, and how

the understanding of them has shifted towards discourse and away from structural and truth-functional semantics. Certain topics arise only within a discourse study of meaning, for instance, cohesion, coherence, register, framing, and the interpersonal meaning of such devices as repetition, parallelism, and allusion.

To show more, discourse-based analysis can shed new light on a traditional language attachment of semantics; figurative meaning which is a concern of semantic theory from the beginning, since figurative extensions of word meaning were characteristic of historical language change. Research on metaphor, hyperbole, tautology, and paradox persisted in semantic theory because they interfere with the truth-functional analysis of sentence meaning according to the "Principle of Compositionality" (Katz, 1964; Weinreich, 1966; Levin, 1977 citted in Norrick, N. R., 2001). Most recent attention to figurative meaning grows out of work in the pragmatics of Grice's implicature or cognitive linguistics following Lakoff (1987) rather than focusing on real discourse.

In treating socio-semantics of code-switching, the examination of discourse in interaction as a way of discovering how social reality is constructed, it is important to situate this concern, which had long been expressed in a variety of ways within the disciplines of philosophy, social psychology, sociology, and anthropology, in the context of new interests in focusing on the structure and function of talk. These new interests can be in part explained through reactions against Universalist non-empirical tendencies in linguistic and social theory, in part perhaps simply through the availability of data collected. In any case, what is central here is a combination of concerns rooted in the emerging disciplines (or sub-disciplines, depending on our point of view) of ethnomethodology/conversational analysis, pragmatics, linguistic

anthropology, and sociolinguistic influences in cognitive science and philosophy of language. These concerns focus on discovering the patterns of discourse as they emerge in interaction, and on understanding them as primary acts of meaning-making. Equally important is the counterpart of the first question, namely where discourse in interaction fits in the spectrum of forms of social action, and the extent to which such discourse deserves the privileged status it has enjoyed in recent decades among those who study the nature and functioning of social action.

2.4.4 Code

Marjohan (1988:48) opines that "code is a term which refers to a variety". Thus a code may be an idiolect, a dialect, a sociolect, a register or a language. A speaker has a linguistic repertoire that consists of a variety of codes. In a monolingual situation, the use of different codes depends on the variability of language. In a bilingual or multilingual society, it is normal for the people to be in a situation where a choice between two or more codes (language) has to be made. In such situation the bilinguals may want to consider for example, who speaks to them, in which language or variety, and when or where the conversation takes place (Fishman, 1965 cited in Gumperz, J. J., & Hernandez, E., 1969).

A world-renowned sociolinguist; Dell Hathway Hymes, in 1964 suggested eight factors that bilingual, multilingual, monolingual speakers do consider when choosing a code to express meaning. The factors were formulated into an acronym, namely speaking: which stands for "setting and scene" (location, occasions and natural situation), "participants" (people, users or speakers), "end" (goals or purpose), "act sequence" (order of speech; conversation, narratives), "key" (spirit, manner and feelings), "instrumentalities" (registers and forms of the

speech), “norms of interactions” (contextual custom in using the codes), and “genre” (lecture, poem, proverb forms) etc (Hymes, 1964 in Giglioli, 1972).

What brings about shifts from one code to another, and why do users regularly prefer to use a code formed from two other codes by switching? In general, however, when people speak they must choose a particular language, dialect, style, register, or variety inherent in a conversation with another. The skill of choosing the language is classified as a communicative competence and it is basically developed by observing factors found in the social context of language users to express meaning.

2.4.5 Code-switching in the Nigerian Context

Nigeria has a very complex linguistic system, with many indigenous languages, various dialects, and the English language, each ethnic language exceptionally fulfils definite functions and a representation of individual identities, and all of them complement one another to serve “the complex communicative demands of a pluralistic society”, (in Verschik, 2004). Nigerian scholars have examined code-switching in conversation and in literary language (Akere, 1980; Amuda, 1986, 1994; Goke-Pariola, 1983; O’Mole, 1987; Lamidi, 2004; Ayeomoni, 2006), English functions as the medium of education, administration, legal system, the press and media outlets, and communication among different language users within Nigeria, whereas indigenous languages essentially serve to institute and strengthen the ethnic identities of speakers and communities. Moreover, in order to meet the complex communicative demands, speakers who live in a community and household where two or more languages coexist, would frequently love to switch from one language to another, either between or within utterances.

A typical urban setting like Makurdi, Nigeria, has a heterogeneous population involving people of diverse ethnic enclaves; like Tiv, Idoma, Igede, Itollu, Jukun, Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa, etc. It is a common phenomenon to see people shift from one variety of language to another, likewise a child, who is a product of the bilingual marriage. For instance, a Tiv speaking mother with an Idoma speaking father living in Zaria will automatically be exposed to at least three or more languages; and one of the major consequences is code-switching. It occurs when a speaker uses two or more languages in the course of a single utterance. It is common to see second language speakers of English usually switch between their L1 (mother tongue) and their L2 (English language) and vice versa during their interpersonal conversation.

Omoniyi, 2009 (in Akande 2013) observes that Nigerian hip-hop artistes facilitate negotiation and construction of identity through language choice. Apart from singing in English, these set of Nigerian artistes use Nigerian Pidgin English (NPE henceforth) and indigenous languages in their lyrics in order to set up what might be construed as a pan-Nigerian identity that is an ideological departure from the kind of establishment identity we may associate with Nigeria's "English as official language" policy. Agbedo, (2011 in Emeka-Nwobia, 2014) observes that code-switching in Nigerian context is not remarkably different from code-switching in other countries of the world; such as slang terms Wenglish an English variety that is being influenced by Welsh, Hinglish an informal reference for the insertion of English words in India, other varieties like Tanglish and Banglish, mixtures of English with Tamil and Bangla respectively; Taglish or Tagalog and English and in Singapore, Singlish, mixture of English with Mandarin Chinese, Chinese dialects and Malay is spoken in Singapore, and Spanglish in the US, Portunol in Brazilian and the Uruguayan border, although in Nigeria; a little more room is given with the multiple languages and dialects.

Ajayi (1989), analyzed the attitudes of University of Ilorin students to code-switching and concluded that course of study had a greater influence on code-switching than gender. Then we ask, what is the influence of English Language as a course of study on the students? Likewise, Igboanusi's, (1990) sociolinguistic perspective on Igbo-English observed the occurrence of code-switching and code-mixing in Igbo-English contact and notes that, in spite of the negative status of a switched/mixed language, it leads to lexical innovation; another question lingers, when the new words are created, it is because students can't figure out the right English words for their conversation, that one has to invent new words?

Professors may also assume that 'code-switch' speaking university students lack an effective education, and the tools that are necessary for success in the university setting and beyond. Such assumptions may lead to lowered expectations for that student, or perhaps even unfair treatment, that a student's grammatical interference from vernacular to Standard English is 'not intelligent enough', senseless and so make erroneous assumptions as to the speaker's or writer's intelligence. It may be perceived that code-switching students are linguistically incompetent at best, and academically substandard at worse for combining more than one language for meaning-making, as could be observed by the general linguistic community (Native speakers). This perception is based on both linguistic ignorance of the listener and longstanding, persisting linguistic prejudice of our developing society (Nigeria) and the education environment.

Code-switching, between ethnic languages, is rare as most people are only able to speak one ethnic language, nevertheless, the hypothesis in Nigeria is changing, although the major switch mixing or switching are Igbo (English-Igbo), Yoruba (Yoruba-English) and Hausa

(Hausa-English) etc, while among the ethnic minorities, we have Ijaw (Ijaw-English), Efik/Ibibio (Efik-English/Ibibio-English), Tiv (Tiv-English) etc. In most major cities, code-switching and code-mixing enjoy popular usage, as they have become a welcome trend in the flow of conversations.

2.4.6 Reasons for Code-switching

Code-switching is a reality in places where more than one language is spoken in everyday communications within the Nigerian environment and other parts of the world. Numerous scholars have extensively reviewed the patterns of code-switching and reasons for code-switching. This study aims to understand how the societal meaning of codes affects the social usage in expressing meaning, and the effect of the social usage of conventional codes of the society's language. Gumperz (1982b), discussing communicative functions, mentioned the discourse function of code-switching, also called the personalization function of language. Gumperz (1982:144b) listed examples of situations created to convey meaning; to appeal to the literate, to appeal to the illiterate, to convey precise meaning, to ease communication, i.e., utilizing the shortest and the easiest route, to negotiate with greater authority, to capture attention, i.e. stylistic, emphatic, emotional, to emphasize a point, to communicate more effectively, to identify with a particular group, to close the status gap, to establish goodwill and support.

Halliday (1975) alternatively, views code-switching as fulfilling the interpersonal function of communication. In other words, it is the use of language to act as a mediator between self and participants in the communicative event. Cheng, K. K. Y. (2003) listed in her article (Code-switching for a Purpose: Focus on Preschool Malaysian Children) a few likely circumstances

for code-switching: lack of one word in either language, some activities have only been experienced in one of the languages, some concepts are easier to express in one of the languages, a misunderstanding has to be clarified, one wishes to create a certain communication effect, one continues to speak the language latest used because of the trigger effect, one wants to make a point, one wishes to express group solidarity, one wishing to exclude another person from the dialogue. She suggested that, it may be possible to predict which conditions act on a particular sociolinguistic context for code-switching, for example, when a person who lacks a word in English due to limited vocabulary code-switches using the lexical component from his/her first language instead of English, therefore, the function here is to overcome the language barrier to meaning-making. Another example is a condition where the speaker, intending to express group solidarity, employs code-switching, in this case, it is to establish goodwill and rapport. Similarly, series of conditions can be established for the phenomenon of code-switching depending on the social context.

Malik (1994) professionally describing communicative functions of code-switching and how they try to accomplish the functions, listed a few more in his work;

- **Lack of facility**: According to him, bilinguals or multilinguals often explain that they code-switch when they cannot find an appropriate expression or vocabulary item or when the language of conversation does not have the particular word needed to carry on the conversation smoothly.
- **Lack of register**: When speakers are not equally competent in two languages and when the speakers do not know the terms in two languages, then code-switching occurs.

- **Mood of the speaker**: When bilinguals are tired or angry, code-switching takes place with a new dimension.
- **To emphasize a point**: Switching is also used to emphasize a point. Gal (1979) explains several instances in which a switch at the end of an argument not only helps to end the interaction but may serve to emphasize a point.
- **Habitual experience**: Malik (1994) stresses the fact that, code-switching often occurs in fixed phrases of greeting and parting, commands and request, invitation, expressions of gratitude and discourse markers, whereas Lyle, J., & Hoffman, H. R. (1971) opined that in Puerto Rican homes, the mother gives short commands to their children in English, such as "don't do that…." and the rest of the mother's warning will be in Spanish.
- **Semantic significance**: Malik (1994), Gumperz (1970, 1976, 1982), and Gumperz and Hernandez (1972) all emphasize that, switching at a particular moment conveys semantically significant information. It is a communicative resource that builds on participant's perception of two languages. Gal (1979) reinforced this view by stating that listeners interpret codes switched as an indicator of the speaker's attitude, or communicative intents and emotions, thus code-switching is a tool for conveying appropriate linguistic and social information.
- **To show identity with a group**: Di Pietro (1977) reports that Italian immigrants would tell a joke in English and give the punch line in Italian, not only because it was better said in Italian but also to stress the fact that they all belong to the same minority group, with shared values and experiences (cited in Malik, 1994).

- **To address a different audience**: Malik (1994) states that, code-switching is also used when the speaker intends to address people coming from various linguistic backgrounds.
- **Pragmatic reasons**: Sometimes the alternation between two languages is highly meaningful in terms of the conversational context (Malik, 1994).
- **To attract attention**: Malik (1994) shows that in advertisements (in both written as well as in spoken) in India, code-switching is used to attract the attention of the readers/listeners.

The language of a particular group of people is usually closely tied to its sense of identity, customs, individuality, and personality, and this certainly holds true in the present Nigerian university communities, with the standard of the official academic language to study depreciating amongst students and possibly academic staff. In other words, students prefer to make sense in ethnic languages than the standard approved language of study, in that when you code-switch, they connote feelings of identity, solidarity and unity within particular groups (family, friends, members of the general community).

2.4.7 Code-Switching and its Tenets

The term 'tenet' is a principle, belief, or doctrine generally held to be true; especially one held in common by members of an organization, movement, or profession. Wardhaugh (1986) suggested two kinds of code-switching; "situational code-witching and metaphorical code-switching", it became major ways of viewing code-switching.

- Situational code-switching occurs when the languages used change according to the situation in which the participants find themselves, therefore, they speak one language

in one situation and another in a different situation, no topic change involved, although, the change over from one language to the other may be instantaneous in this situation, while others may be more cleverly determined. Hudson (2001) describes situational code-switching as switches that occur between languages, coinciding with changes from one external situation to another.

- Metaphorical code-switching on the other hand occurs when a change of topic requires a change in the languages used. Some topics may be discussed in either codes but the choice of code adds a distinct flavour to what is said about the topic as the choice of language to be used may encode certain social values.

Another was put forth by Michael Clyne in a number of his publications (Clyne 1967, 1991, 2003):

- Psycholinguistically motivated code-switching: language alternation that is prompted not by the intentions of the speaker but by the specific conditions of language production. In this case it is not the use of language (as in the sociolinguistically conditioned approach) nor the system (as in the grammatical approach) that is the focus of discussion but the processes taking place in the speaker's brain. In contrast to socio-pragmatically conditioned code-switching, the speaker in this case does not alter the language with a specific conversational aim. This means that the code-switching has no function in the local conversational context, especially when the "global interactional behaviour" (Franceschini 1999:61 in Riehl, C. M., 2005) is based on code-switching, i.e. when languages or codes are not discrete in a given context, (Franceschini 1998:58 in Auer (ed.), 1998b; 51-75.) speaks of "non-functional uses of

> ‘code-switching’”. Because of the obvious difference between these two types of code- switching some scholars have suggested giving them different names; the term code-switching should be used only for socio-pragmatically conditioned code alternation, whereas the psycholinguistically conditioned type should be termed “code-mixing” (cf. for instance Berruto 1997 in Franceschini, R., 1999) or “language mixing” (Auer 1999). But as Franceschini (1998: 59) points out, this does not “present a satisfactory answer, as the basic problem remains: The speakers do use code-switching but what do they do with it?” (cited in Riehl, 2005).

Code-switching is a widespread phenomenon in bilingual speech, and it is therefore not surprising that a great proportion of research on bilingualism focuses on this topic. Most researchers, who have paid attention to code-switching, have however been concerned with the sociological interpretation and discourse functions, i.e. the socio-pragmatic aspect of code-switching, even though, they relate to a point. For this reason, linguists who do not specialize in bilingualism often automatically assume that, research in code-switching means sociolinguistic research, but in this case agreed, it is sociolinguistically related, yet the focus in meaning, both conventional language and social meaning in terms of usage. In the past few years, researches on the patterns of code-switching, i.e. its grammatical structure, became increasingly focused on in bilingualism research (Myers-Scotton 2002:10) and most overlook where meaning is misplaced and code-switching social usage effects on the conventional language. This approach can be described as the semantic approach to code-switching rather than just the grammatical approach put forth by (Auer 1998:3b).

2.4.8 Code-Switching in Nigerian Universities

In Nigeria, there are three major languages namely; Yoruba, Hausa and Igbo, with over five hundred other languages that are considered to be minority ethnic groups, based on the population of speakers. Today, Nigerian universities and other higher institutions are regarded as large communities with numerous ethnic groups, foreign and indigenous teachers, administrative staff, students, labourers etc. These categories live within the same environment; sit in the same classrooms, sleep the same hostels or work in the same place.

Individuals coming from different parts of the country with different languages in their repertoires would find common ground to interact with each other. A speaker who chooses to converse in pidgin (Nigerian Pidgin) does so in order to reach out to and fraternize with groups or associations, by doing so, s/he is not only reaching out to the people in s/he immediate community but strives to expand the user coverage. Nigerian university communities use code-switching as a way of communicating their ethnicity among others. Speakers work towards declaring an ethnic identity as they demonstrate acceptable ethnic group markers to the others (Trimble et al, 2005 in Yun, J. H., 2017).

Babalola and Taiwo (2009) gave a good example of this assertion by some Nigerian artistes who try to relate with their roots. Such artists have consistently strived to make creative use of their indigenous languages in their songs, although most songs are written in the English language. Therefore, in relating language with one's mental image and the importance of identity, an artist could connect with people from his own background. Nigerians listeners within the university community in-turn use the ability to relate to social groups who understand the usage of words or sentences code-switched in Nigerian music. Artistes use of

code-switching in music gives second language learners and bilinguals the opportunity to proclaim their ethnicity and identity.

2.5 Authorial Review

Surakat T. Y (2001) review on code-mixing in the language development of a bilingual Nigerian child concentrated on the linguistic development of a child's grammatical patterns of code-mixing, by examining the motivations and strategies for language mixing. Data was collected using audio-tapes, video and diary recordings. In his analysis, emphases were placed on the two-word and telegraphic utterances of the child between the 18th and 36th months. He identified three CM categories; "pseudo CM, subsidiary CM and Substantive CM (occurred at the rank of the group, clause and the sentences. He also asserted that instances of CM involving nominal group and prepositional group dominated the data collected of the child. He further observed CM in two-word sentences, cleft sentences Yoruba interrogative particles, Hausa items, CM involving three languages, lexical insertion, phrasal insertion, translation etc.

He observed that CM is motivated factors, such as; nature and context of language presentation, the profile of interlocutors, topic of discussion and language gap as well as stylistic and cognitive factors; imitation and speech modelling, creative constructions, simplification, translation and transference. His research further revealed that CM in a child language is more or less a reflection of CM by adult bilinguals. In other words, what teachers of English language in the field or department of the students, students would also adopt to the usage and imitate the teachers of English, that is to say, that, he failed to also identify learners' adoption of bilinguals CM in classrooms or formal setting as teachers of English

language. This is as a result of Mclaughin's (1978 cited in Surakat, 2001) arguments for and against the notion that language mixers are victims Interlingua transfer (cf Hatch, 1976 cited in Surakat, 2001:4). In his study, he asserted that CM further contends that language interlarding is a reflection of deficiency on the part of the bilinguage (Akere, 1981:296; Banjo, 1983:20 and Olaoye, 1991:43 cited in Surakat, 2001:4).

Surakat (2001:51), Identified two definitions of a bilingual (narrow and true), one is in a way related to this present study, which he asserted that "the implication of narrow definition and typologies is that, a true bilingual must have a complete or perfect mastery of the phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic aspects of his two languages. He further exemplified this study's claim that, bilinguals who are students of English language should be competent speakers of their repertoire language in appropriate context or situations; by stating clearly that, "the true bilingual must be able to function effectively or appropriately in all domains of activity in the two languages without noticeable interference between them (Halliday, Stevens and Mclntosh, 1970; and Baetens-Beardsmore, 1982 cited in Surakat, 2001:51).

Sukarat's (2001) study also looked at CS in an aspect that inculcates this research, quoting Banjo (1983:18) opined that, CS is a "…phenomenon in which, in the speech even, two interlocutors (or even the same speaker can) make utterances sometimes in Language A and sometimes in Language B" (Fishman, 1969:37-40 & Olaoye, 1991 cited in Surakat, 2001:57). He further opined that, "CS can be 'Metaphorical", 'Situational' or 'Conversational'", although our study concentrated on basically 'situational and conversational', nevertheless, he asserted that, …metaphorical switching is one triggered off by a new topic while situational

switching is caused by a new social event or situation", that is, the former is caused by a change in the subject-matter whereas the latter involves a change in the participants, strategies and physical situations (Gumperz, 1972a; Adeyanju, 1986 and Olaoye 1991 cited in Surakat, 2001:57).

On the other hand, "structurally or syntactically, CS can be either intra- or inter-sentential, meanwhile, in a conversation or discourse (conversational), "…if a speaker uses Language A in one sentence, and Language B in another, then he is changing codes between sentences; hence inter-sentential CS. "but if within the same sentence, words from two or more languages are used, then it is a case of intra-sentential CS. To point it out clear, according to Surakat (2001), CM is often described at the sentence rank while CS is a discourse phenomenon. In other words, "the domain of code-switching is the DISCOURSE whereas that of language-mixing is the SENTENCE" (Banjo, 1983:19). In this present study, CS and language-alternation are used interchangeably to refer to a situation where users or a speaker uses two or more languages in the same utterance, discourse or conversation.

He further asserted that, tendencies are that, the linguistic background of interlocutors and the non-availability of an equivalent word in one language (i.e., language gap) can make a bilingual to borrow a word from his other language (Rowlands, 1963 and Akere, 1981:296 cited in Surakat, 2001), although, this research is of the opinion that, this is applicable to child's language development and not to adult learners of English language, therefore, it would mean the speaker borrowing from other languages in their repertoire, clearly indicates they are incompetent speakers of their second or third language. That is why he stated that "incompetence or lexical inadequacy may also lead a bilingual to mix languages (63). "He

may be ignorant of, or unfamiliar with the appropriate word in a language. Therefore, the only choice open to him is to switch to the language in which he has substituted (Salami, 1972:167; Akere, 1981:296 and Banjo, 1983:20 cited in Surakat, 2001:63), thereby agreeing with this research's hypothesis that, students' switch of languages is as a result of the incompetency to make-meaning with English language in a single conversation, most especially in Surakat's (2001:63-64) words, "…if a bilingual is communicating with a monolingual or someone who does not share his languages, he would tend to avoid or minimize language mixing in order to maximize effective communication (McClure, 1977:103 and McLaughlin, 1978 cited in Surakat, 2001:64). Although, this is not the case in the today's Nigerian university context, where the demand for English language usage is expected of the English language student, and when the student is not a competent or has lexical inadequacies in English language, it is almost impossible to make meaningful expression without switching to the other languages in his repertoire.

Bashir (2014) review on the effects of multilingualism on the English language in Ahmadu Bello University campus indicated that it has effects on speakers of English language, in their way of conveying meaning. Her focus was to identify the problems encountered by multilingual when they speak the English language and to isolate these problems and difficulties in order to bring to light the extent to which multilingualism affects effective communication in the English language. Using the systemic functional linguistic theory as proposed by Halliday (1985 in Bashir, 2014), with a specific focus on how people use language to negotiate meaning with each other in accomplishing everyday social life and how they interact in naturally occurring social context. This shows that conversational structures describe how the user negotiates the exchange of meaning in a discourse which involves two

variable components; the choice of speech functions and the type of exchange structures. Using the audio recording of data, interviews and observations, then she concludes that, the averaged Nigerian student multilingual nature has affected their use of English language in order to make meaning.

Kajotoni (2000) and Kantiok (2014) sociolinguistic study of CS and CM of the students of Ahmadu Bello University, were concerned with investigating the patterns of CM among undergraduate students living off campus and the linguistic patterns of CS, the social motivations of Yoruba students' CS in the campus. These authors used the Grice (1975) cooperative principles, given both their study was sociolinguistic based on the patterns of CM and CS. It was established that Yoruba students in ABU sometimes CS in order to accommodate participants in the conversation and to show politeness and appeal to ethnic solidarity, while Kantiok (2014) concluded that, CM is motivated by different factors which are influenced by the communicative competence or incompetence of the speaker. These studies were basically focused on the patterns of CS and CM and were not practically concerned with the rate and frequency of usage neither were they concerned with knowing if the usage is a way out to make meaningful expressions as a result of their incompetence in the English language, which this study investigated.

Muma (1992:vii-ix) study was also a sociolinguistic study on the "Bilingualism in Cameroon: A case study of communications difficulties among high school students of Government Bilingual High School (G.B.H.S) Bamenda, Cameroon, with focus on the communication difficulties of high school bilinguals. He utilized Mackey's (1957 cited in Muma, 1992) five factors of bilingualism; aptitude, functions, alternation, interference and degree, with the

intentions to identify the students' communication difficulties, trace their origin and determine their effects on the bilinguals' proficiency. The utilization of questionnaires, oral interview and test papers studied, he concluded that both have the same communication difficulties of grammar, syntax, phonology and spelling. He further established that, as a result of the students' communication difficulties, they evolved a third language, because all their languages were forcefully in constant intercourse (in other words, switched or mixed) and students became more out of confusion than competence; thereby mixed or switched all their codes (ix). This research failed to identify the effects of the communication difficulties in the area semantics, although it captured the sociolinguistic and linguistic features, where our research intends to fill.

Aikhenomian (2011) asserted that "Hausa in the North has tended to share the status of official language in all but name in many domains with English." "This is especially true of the legislature where, in the Old Northern House of Assembly, Hausa was introduced alongside English as the medium of debate (Banjo, 1996 cited in Aikhenomian, 2011:4). She further stated that, among Nigerian bilinguals, the general patterns is that a formal or technical discussion is held in English while intimate ones are held in a common indigenous language, thereby making CS and CM almost inevitable (Akindele & Adegbite, 2004 cited in Aikhenomian, 2011). This situation and much more affect the rate of enthusiasm for English language usage and the emerging patterns of performance in the various segments of Nigerian society. Although her research is text-based and semantic inferencing of linguistic features, he was able to identify the sociolinguistic association to the linguistic signals in a textual analysis and failed to see aspects that inquire on the reasons there is a fall back to indigenous languages in order to express meaning in texts.

Olaoye (1991) is an investigation into language choice and concentrated on the code-switching of Yoruba-English bilinguals in Kano metropolis. His aim was to identify the "different linguistic patterns of code-switching and their social (motivational) correlates and attempt a sociolinguistic explication for the phenomenon. Concentrating on the language use and language choice, specifically the ethnography of speaking in a particular speech community, by providing a rigorous description of both internal (grammatical) and external (discoursal or pragmatic) structure of code-switched utterance, using the Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975 in Olaoye, 1991) Discourse analytical model framework of analysis. He established that code-switching is correlatable with certain social variables, the socio-cultural norms seem to dictate patterns of the switch and the socio-psychological situations also sometimes determine some switch patterns. Using recordings, interviews and observational as instruments for data collected, he established that, code-switching is a co-operative language behaviour which is predicated on knowledge of and respect for socio-cultural norms. Asserting that, "it is a systemic conversational strategy whose motivation is effective communication (ix)." This relates to the opinion of our present study, that, Nigerian university students code-switch because they are largely bilinguals or multilingual speakers of Nigerian languages in order to effectively make-meaning in a conversation.

According to Olaoye (1991:3), the medium of communication for most Nigerians according to Bamgbose (1971 cited in Olaoye, 1991), is a Nigerian language. The reason is that the vast majority of Nigerians do not know how to speak English. "Since almost every Nigerian speaker of English" has a local language, the study of English is the relative use of English in relation to a vernacular by those who know and speak both (Bamgbose, 1971). According to him, the choice of medium and perhaps CS depends on the "degree of formality or

informality" required by the occasion. Stating that, if users wish to be formal, he speaks English and if informal, he switches, though there is no rigidity in the pattern; the social situation may influence code choice (p.4). Researchers have placed emphasis on the linguistic (grammatical) features of CS and have not touched much on the sociolinguistic motivation for this phenomenon, their incompetency of a language, nor have they explored the communicative (discoursal) effects of the CS (Olaoye, 1991:22). Amuda (1986 cited in Olaoye, 1991) study, he extensively explored the syntax, and social motivations for CM and not CS, leaving many unsolved questions; how meaning is made? Why the options to CS? What are the effects of CS on English language learners and speakers? Is CS a way out to meaning-making? Is CS or CM only seen as a bilingual ability, this study addressed some of these issues.

Terna-Abah (2014) reviewed on the "sociolinguistic study of the patterns of nonstandard English words usage in formal context" using students of institutions of higher learning in Kaduna State; she examined the centrality of the English language in the Nigerian society particularly in the educational sector. Goes on to look at the variability of the English language and the role of social context in determining the most appropriate variety to be used, hence they use standard and nonstandard English in formal and informal contexts respectively. She established that the target group for her study uses nonstandard English words in the spoken and written communication in the formal contexts. This in a way agrees with the objectives of how to study, although, her concentration is on non-standard English words used in formal settings, the research is concentrating on the nonstandard switch (code-switching) choice of language use in formal settings in order to make sense. Terna-Abah concentration is basically lexical identification of the nonstandard linguistic features of

language use, while this study is focussed on the code-switching utterances of Nigerian bilinguals and multilingual students who do so as a result of their inabilities of the Standard English language.

Terna-Abah's (2014) is limited to lexical variants, thus identifies these variant lexical items from students' scripts and recorded discourses and thereafter examines their patterns of occurrences and the factors motivating their usage. They adopted an eclectic approach comprising Fishman's (1972) Domain and Topics also known as "Domain Analysis," Labov's Quantitative Paradigm (which is also adopted for this study) and Giles' (1979) Accommodation Theory. The study establishes the fact that, the context/domain under consideration is formally based on the general subjects' areas under discussion, role-relationships between the participants and the setting of interaction using the Domain Analysis. The study, therefore, examines the social factors responsible for the use of identified nonstandard/non-English lexical items using the Labovian framework and Accommodation theory. She found and established that, social factors of language of the social media/Short Message Service's shorthand, bilingualism used as a source of pity/obtaining undue favours, religion, familiarity/relaxed atmosphere and nature of students' course/question asked motivated their subjects' use of the identified nonstandard English lexical items (p.viii). This study is related to our study in the aspect of domains and topics of discussion and the contexts or setting that the interactions occur, particularly that it affects students choice of whatever variations for formal utterances, which of course in her study is identified as nonstandard and is known to both interlocutors as not acceptable for formal settings. We could also say that her review also concentrated on the CM of the non-standard usage of English language used in the formal setting, while this study focuses on the CS by

university students as a way out because of their inability to make meaning with Standard English language grammar and lexical items.

Kassam (1991:vii, 246-248) study on the language choice among some segments of the Ahmadu Bello University community focused on the language choice and use among English speaking bilinguals or multilingual in Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. The aim was to find the linguistic repertoire of speakers and the pattern of language use in different domains, and determine whether or not speakers are constrained by socio-cultural factors in their choice of and use of language. Applying an eclectic approach in the analysis of data, with the use of functionalist and some empirical theories, she collected recorded data as well as questionnaires, in order to find out whether socio-cultural factors determine speakers' choice of language in various settings, and seem to assert that these norms dictate patterns of language use. Socio-psychological situations also dictate language choice. Evidently, her findings showed that several factors determine the choice of language by speakers of the community in focus, but she all stated that speakers are constrained by the socio-cultural norms which govern the languages they speak. Asserting "that people choose and use language for varied reasons during a social interaction" (p247).

She also stated that English played a diglossic function in this speech community, that is, apart from being the high variety, it was also used as low variety alongside the indigenous languages (in other words, code-switching or code-mixing). This was most true according to her of the Ahmadu Bello university community. In the same vein, the indigenous languages were also found spoken by speakers in areas considered as official domains. In others words, this statement agreeing with this research's opinion that, student or academic community do

not differentiate the choice of language for formal and informal setting, and in the process code-switch and code-mix in order to pass their messages. Kassam (1991) further asserts that the functionality of both English and the mother tongues (L1) is polyglossic one. On the other hand, the address forms speakers chose and used in relationships of power and solidarity depended largely on the interpersonal relationships between them and their interlocutors, as well as the formality and the informality of the speech or social situation.

Her finding on code-switching and code-mixing clearly showed that the majority of subjects who did either of this in their speech behaviour did so for varied reasons, but mostly because they wanted to express themselves better in the second language which the interlocutor also understood. In her opinion, this usage has led to proffer that, the idea of code-switching and code-mixing are fundamental aspects of a bilingual or a multilingual (although she failed to state the languages that are in the individuals repertoire), but concluding that, people switch or mix codes because they are proficient, albeit haltingly, in the two or more languages which they understand and speak. Meanwhile in this study, the opinion is that most Nigerians are either bilinguals or multilingual of Nigerian languages before Standard English language; that said, she failed to capture this in her research, and saw code-switching or code-mixing as an ability of a bilingual or a multilingual speaker, with no evidence to indicate that their choice of language used in formal setting was as a result of individual's inability to make sense with Standard English language in formal settings

2.6 Theoretical Framework

This study adopts an eclectic approach in the analysis of its data. In order to accommodate the nature of this study which involves many distinct but interrelated aspects of language to be

analysed, it is difficult to adopt a single theoretical approach. These aspects include the case study's use of language, choice of codes in their repertoire, lexical, context or situation of usage, the patterns of code-switching occurrence of sentential or lexical items, determining the kind of context under consideration hence suitable variety of language for the contexts and social variables motivating the use of unsuitable identified utterances used in the formal domains. In view of this study, Domain and Topic" analysis was used to establish whether the contexts being considered were formal or not using the factors of role-relationship between interlocutors, topics of discussions and setting of the interactions. Although data were collected in two contexts (informal and formal), the researcher was able to establish that the choice of language used in formal context should be formal, and thus ought to have favoured the "transactional" choice of language, i.e. the Standard British English. On the contrary, there is an extensive use of code-switching (to ethnic languages) by Nigeria university students in formal contexts, given they are mostly bilinguals or multilingual speakers of Nigerian languages and dialects first before the Standard British English language. Therefore, the study adopts a mixture of Fishman's (1972 cited in Terna-Abah, 2014) "Domain and Topics" analysis and Labov's (2006 cited in Terna-Abah, 2014) "Quantitative Paradigm" analysis as well as the Semantic Model of Conversational Code-switching by Gumperz further modified by Auer (1984 cited in Boztepe, E., 2005). The aforementioned models are briefly discussed below.

2.6.1 Fishman's (1972) Domain and Topics Analysis

This model which is known as domain analysis is postulated by Fishman and is representative of the theories from the Sociology of Language. Fishman (1972:587 cited in Terna-Abah,

2014) defines a domain as, "socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication in accordance with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a speech community".

In expressing his views on this theory, Fishman attempts to correlate the physical setting and the social context with language choice by asking the question "who speaks what language, to whom, when and why by using the following parameters; topic, interlocutor and spatial-temporal setting or domains". By domain, Fishman means "institutional context" in which one language variety is more likely to be appropriate than another (Terna-Abah, 2014:63). This is referred to as congruent and incongruent social situation use of language. According to Crystal (2008:155), domain Sociolinguistics refers to:

> A group of institutionalized social situations typically constrained by a common set of behavioural rules, e.g. the domain of family is the house, of religion is the church, etc. the notion is seen as of particular importance in the analysis of multilingual settings involving several participants, where it is used to relate variations in the individuals' choice and topic of language to broader socio-cultural norms and expectations of interactions (cited in Terna-Abah, 2014).

Explaining the assertion by Crystal further, Saville-Troike (1982) opines that certain factors determine domain. These factors may include the general subject area under discussion (e.g. education, work, family, friendship etc), the role relationship between the participants (e.g. teacher-students, employer-employee, father-son, etc.) and setting of the interaction (e.g. school, office, home, market, social gatherings etc.). Fishman (1972:588 cited in Terna-Abah, 2014) sees role-relationships as implicitly recognized and accepted sets of mutual rights and obligations between members of the same socio-cultural system. He argues that:

> speakers are constrained in their choice and use of language by the role relationships which exist between them and their interlocutors. Some role-relationships may

> experience some degree of role change or fluidity while others do not. For example, a lawyer and his client may also interact as relations, as friends, as members of the same church etc, while a king and his subject (in the same speech community) may not experience such a role range. In the case of the former, the interaction is 'personal' while in the latter, it is 'transactional' (cited in Terna-Abah, 2014).

"Social situations" associated with "Domain Analysis" is another important factor for language choice and use. Fishman remarks that, "Social situation" is responsible for some interactions being "personal" sometimes and "transactional" at other times. By "social situation", he means "that the time and place of any social interaction must be suited for the kind of role-relationships that exist between interlocutors." In other words, role-relationships can change depending on whether or not a social situation is congruent i.e. right behaviour at the right time and the right place (cited in Terna-Abah, 2014:64).

2.6.2 Labovian Framework of Quantitative Paradigm

The first wave of variation studies launched by William Labov in 1966 laid a foundation for the study variation by establishing broad correlations between linguistic variables and the primary social categories of socioeconomic class, sex, and age in his study of the social stratification of English in New York City (Labov, 2006 cited in Terna-Abah, 2014). This approach is considered a statistical data on the frequency of competing forms used by different speakers and then looked for correlations with non-linguistic factors hence quantitative approach which has since then proved outstandingly successful. What Labov and his successors found is this:

> if we merely observe a speaker, or a group of speakers, all we can notice is that speakers sometimes use this form and sometimes that one, in a seemingly haphazard manner. However, if we tabulate the frequency of each competing form, we often find first that, one individual differs notably from another and second, that the frequency of a particular form correlates strongly with some non-linguistic variable. Most of the

> non-linguistic variables are obvious ones like sex, age, social class and degree of formality, but sometimes we find more unexpected correlations (cited in Terna-Abah, 2014:65).

What these studies have shown is that, variation is not haphazard at all, instead, variation is highly structured: statistically speaking, each individual behaves in a highly consistent way, with some individuals behaving differently from others, depending on some of the variables just mentioned and moreover, the behaviour of each individual changes in a predictable way when the context of speaking becomes more or less formal. The quantitative approach has revolutionized the study of language by demonstrating that linguistic behaviour is even more highly structured than had previously suspected; it has contributed enormously to the study of language change, and it has provided a resolution of the Saussurean Paradox (Stockwell and Trask, 2007:240-241 cited in Terna-Abah, 2014:65-66).

According to Terna-Abah (2014), this approach assumes that language is inherently variable and that a great amount of this variability adheres to definite patterns determined by the linguistic environment on the one hand and the social environment on the other. The linguistic variable has been defined by Wardhaugh (1980:135 cited in Terna-Abah, 2014) as "a linguistic item which has identifiable variant." Hudson (1980:157) observes that linguistic variables "are those where the meaning remains constant but the forms vary." While Lehman (1976:280 quoted in Terna-Abah, 2014) opines that, "it is any feature of a language that is represented in differing forms in the speech of one person or a social group…." The social variable, on the other hand, refers to "the behavioural factors that may be isolated to correlate with linguistic variation. Such factors include region, social class, age, sex, ethnicity, etc." Agbedo (2000:177) maintains that it is "the interaction of the various social factors that account for language variation in individuals and in a speech community." Although the

Labovian framework holds that a community of speakers shares the same underlying grammar, what distinguishes them is their differential production of diagnostic linguistic variables, which is amenable to quantitative analysis and also sensitive to various kinds of social structures. Individuals may then be grouped into various social categories by virtue of the frequency of occurrence of a particular variable feature in their speech as constrained by the different social contexts. This effectively demonstrated in the study of the distribution of the variables (r) in the New York City speech community by Labov (1966, 2006 cited in Terna-Abah, 2014:66). It is worthy to note that stages of quantitative paradigm outlined by Hudson (1980:144 cited in Terna-Abah, 2014:67): selection of speakers, circumstances and linguistic variables, a collection of texts, identification of linguistic variables and variants, processing of figures and the interpretation of results.

The adoption of these theories for the analysis is in order to determine whether it is a way out by interlocutors in order to make-meaning as a result of their incompetency of the standard English language and its context of usage, whether interlocutors are considerate of the formal contexts or not hence the appropriate of or competent choice of language using the factors or role relationships, topics of interactions and the settings of the interactions.

2.6.3 The Semantic Model of Conversational Code-switching by Gumperz in (1982)

In interactional sociolinguistics, a model of code-switching which has gained prominence is that proposed by Gumperz in 1982. This model was later referred to as the Semantic Model of Conversational Code-switching by Auer (1984). In Gumperz's framework, code-switching is conceptualised as situational and metaphorical in its functions. Situational code-switching accommodates a change in setting, topic or participants (Blom & Gumperz, 1986) and serves

to redefine the situation. For instance, Blom and Gumperz gave the example of teachers giving formal lectures in Brokmal but shifts to Ranamal when they want to encourage open and free discussion among students to illustrate how the teacher's change in language can facilitate a shift in activity.

Gumperz (1982a) calls his approach "semantic" as opposed to 'merely' functional analyses. This label seems to have been chosen because, according to his model, each language of the bilingual speaker has a meaning (potential), just as a lexical entry has a core meaning that can be stated independently of its actual usage on a particular occasion. Gumperz proposes that the semantic value attached to the two languages of a bilingual speaker is in most communities that of the "we code" and the "they code": "the tendency is for the ethnically specific minority language to be regarded as the 'we code' and become associated with in-group and informal activities, while the majority language serves as the 'they code' associated with the more formal, stiff and less personal out-group relations" (Gumperz, 1982). This meaning potential is part of the cultural/linguistic knowledge of any member of the bilingual community and is 'retrieved' on the specific occasion of code-switching (Auer, 1984:88).

The ascription of meaning to each of the languages has to be justified, that is, it has to be shown how they come to be associated with certain values. In the "semantic" model, this problem is solved by the important distinction between metaphorical and situational code-switching. At the heart of this distinction lies the assumption that there are situational parameters such as participant group, topic, mode of interaction, etc., that allow one to predict language choice; there is a "simple almost one-to-one relationship" (Gumperz, 1982: 61)

between extra-linguistic parameters and the appropriate language for this situation (cited in Auer, 1984:88).

In contrast to situational language choice, metaphorical language alternation during an episode is not predictable but open to the individual speaker's decision. As the language of interaction has already been established on the basis of the situational parameters, digression from this language is seen by members as the violation of a Gricean maxim (the maxim of manner). It, therefore, initiates an implicature involving the categories "we code" and "they code" and makes them relevant to the local interpretation of the metaphorical code-switching.

In contrast, metaphorical code-switching in Gumperz's semantic model of conversational code-switching happens without any change in the social situation. Instead, metaphorical code-switching enables speakers to evoke a certain mood or to change their footing or relative status with other speakers. For instance, Blom and Gumperz explained that residents carried out a business transaction with the clerk in the standard language but engaged the same clerk on family affairs in dialect because it alludes to a personal and local relationship in the context of the business relationship. Gumperz out-lined six metaphorical functions of code-switching, namely, quotation, addressee specification, interjections, reiterations, message qualification and personalisation versus objectivisation. According to Onyango (2009) the strength of Gumperz's semantic model lies in its ability to provide tools to account for why a speaker switches language in a particular context and explain how speakers exploit linguistic choices to convey intentional meaning. In this sense, language is a function of dynamic interactions and the semantic model is able to encompass "the multiple relations between

linguistic means and social meaning" (Onyango, 2009, p. 153 cited in Then, D. C. O., & Ting, S. H., 2011).

2.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter is a presentation written of works related to this study, and such aspects that are covered in the chapter are; Socio-Semantics, Sociolinguistics of Semantics, Semantics and Social Semantics, Language and Semantics, Semantic Network, Pragmatics and the Semantics of Code-Switching, Discourse and Semantics of Code-Switching, Code-Switching, Code, Code-Switching in Nigeria Context, Reasons for Code-switching, Code-Switching and its Tenets, Code-Switching and Code-Mixing, Code-Switching in Nigerian Universities, Theoretical Framework. All the sub-topics presented are discussion of works related to the study, given they all deal with societal, Nigerian universities, language and language use, meaning-making, code-switching, cause and effect of usage.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Preamble

This chapter presents a research method adopted in assessing students' linguistic competence and/or deficiency to making-meaning while code-switching in a conversation with or without a bilingual speaker/listener. It provides a general description of the range and status of students that are assessed in the review as well as a specification of the methodology used in the study.

3.1 Research Design

The research design for this study combines aspects of qualitative and quantitative; includes descriptive statistical tools such as frequency distribution, tables and percentages. This method was adopted in order to determine accurately the responses of the students to the different questions (Creswell, 2008). Although, this mixed method added technical hitches, the researcher used both the hitches and advantages in other to analyse and present data collected. The components of design allowed the researcher to rely on codes, varieties, languages and dialects used in code-switching alongside English Language by students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi in relation to their expression of meaning-making as related to the study of 'socio-semantics' in code-switching. The qualitative research design is constructed with the types of knowledge intended to form a better argument within the framework and theoretical concepts of the thematic; thereby

bringing an understanding and a perspective towards Sociolinguistics, Semantics, and Linguistics at large.

3.2 Population, Sample and Sampling Procedures

The population for this study is a portion of students in Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi, in Benue State, Nigeria. In the assumption that, most of the students in each of the above stratum are either or not competent bilinguals of Tiv, Yoruba, Igala, Idoma, Igede, Etolu, Hausa, Jukun etc and L_2 speakers/learners of English language given it is a naturalistic case study on student's language use; the researcher therefore, randomly selected an agreed number of students by the dissertation supervisors, in their natural situations to assess their conversations or interactions.

This suitably fulfils the assumptions that the population should share some common characteristics in their daily interactions. The target population comprises male and female students in the above universities with basic emphases on students in the Humanities, which was particularly in BSU. A sample of about two hundred and fifty students (250) was incidentally selected from the universities made up of students studying either the Higher National Diploma or Degrees of the selected institutions. A great number of this population are students of the departments of English language studies and General English Studies (UAM). The data collected is stratified along the domain of languages used and the technique is adopted in selecting students from natural contexts of language use that formed the population, sample, and sample techniques for the study.

For this purpose, the random selection and technique is taken to consider the nature of interaction/conversation among students considering the large number of ethnic groups all coming to study in one university and the nature of the thematic review. Therefore, this selection is taken based on the two universities and comprising of English Language students of the institutions and the university community students as a whole. The sampling frame is a combination of categorical sampling techniques based on the situations, users and acquisition mapping involved in every sub-group of the users' languages in their repertoires, with codes selected for the analysis, which falls under specific categories needed in the discussion of the case study.

3.3 Research Instruments/Materials

The approach used in collecting the data on language usage and other relevant information consists of phrases, sentences, codes, situation/context, and users' application of code-switching. Choosing the qualitative research method helps the researcher to use fewer and deeper in-depth resources in order to analyze the phenomenon (socio-semantics of code-switching). It can be used to understand the world "out there" by explaining phenomena "from the inside" (Kvale, 2007: 10). Qualitative research methods reveal the kind of information required, given that we are trying to understand the individual's everyday experience within a society or groups' usage of language with the purpose of interacting and being understood.

Data collection instruments on phenomena of 'socio-semantics' and 'code-switching' cannot be extracted directly, therefore, natural settings and sociolinguistic interviews which aim at extracting casual, incidental, and undirected speech are usually adopted, and the choice to use

all these paradigm is as a result of the needs for the analysis. Four major instruments are used in this study for data collection namely:

3.3.1 Unscheduled Non-Participatory Observation and Audio Recordings

It involves recording spontaneous naturally occurring conversations of the target population without their consent, which is used as the primary data for the review. The researcher covered classroom conversations, before-during-after lectures in classrooms, social grounds or groups and gatherings of users in the selected universities. This is used to start track the data collection, and a tape recorder was used to collect data in the non-participatory interaction of the thematic of the study, but on the natural and daily conversations in order to collect natural switching by students.

3.3.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire relates to domains of pragmatics, socio-semantics, semantics, language use, discourse of code-switching, and is aimed at collecting preliminary information on the psycho-social variables of age, gender, education, location, and the domain of language use. It is divided into sections (A, B, C and D): Section **A-Preliminary information** on the psycho-social variables of age, gender, education, and location, Section **B-Domain of Discourse** and code-switching containing questionnaire items that deal with the influence of domain of language use on code-switching. The questionnaire items are constructed to reflect the context of language use (the domain and the receiver). The liker four-scale response rating pattern is used most often (4), often (3), seldom (2) and never (1). Meanwhile Section **C-Domain of Pragmatics** and code-switching includes questionnaire items that deal with the influence of

domain of pragmatics on code-switching. Section **D-Domain of semantics**, language use and code-switching, it includes questionnaire items that deal with the influence/effects of a users' socio-semantics code-switching on the conventional language as well as the listeners' competence in decoding meaning.

3.3.3 Motive-Determination and/or Face-to-Face Interviews

This interview is a follow-up to the observations from the spontaneous recording of verbal conversations. The interview is carried out much later after the initial recording (observational) to determine from the respondents whether the meanings and switches in their utterances were done as a result of bilingual proficiency or deficiency.

This has a distinctive advantage of enabling the researcher to establish rapport with potential participants and therefore gain their cooperation. These interviews yield highest response rates in survey research. They also allow the researcher to clarify ambiguous answers and when appropriate, seek follow-up information.

3.4 Validation of Data Collection

'Socio-semantics' in the field of Sociolinguistics and Semantics validate the extent to which qualitative collection of data and conceptual analysis of the research results is applied to real life situations outside research settings. Bryman (2008) opines that, there are three most prominent criteria for evaluation of social research: reliability (the degree to which a measure of a concept is stable), replication (the degree to which the results of a study can be reproduced) and validity (a concern with the integrity of the conclusions that are drawn from the research). These criteria fit qualitative research method adopted although not so perfect as

it would be for a quantitative research, while it is related to external validation that covers the question to what degree investigational findings mirror what is observed in 'the real world expression of language use' (the socio-semantics of interaction between bilinguals, learners, second language learners, etc and its environment while code-switching).

Socio-semantic validity is partly related to the issue of daily language usage (whether it is misused) versus observation, although, the humanities collect real world information on interactions that relates code-switching and semantics, social and societal, sociology and language use. Armed with the knowledge that, scientifically there are two domains of a research, 'observational (passive) and experimental (active)', therefore, this study is not only validated by mere words, but as a result obtained. One could say as a result of the data collected, it would be realized that conventional language choice for making-meaning has been misplaced, particularly by English language L_2 speakers who would switch from English to other ethnic languages to express meaning.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

Casual observation of students' 'language use' in everyday life is the starting point of this sociolinguistic study. It is also used to complement customary sociolinguistic interviews (Labov, 1972:43). In the case of a sociolinguistic study that focuses on code-switching, choice of diction, codes, the emphasis on language use in everyday life becomes paramount, because language alternation is in its essence a spontaneous conversational doings. Therefore, the researcher personally recorded the utterances of the target population in natural speech situations, after which the questionnaire items were administered to facilitate the labelling of the data collected via spontaneous recording. The motive-determination interview was

conducted afterwards, although, interviews remain the most common data collection method in qualitative research and are a familiar and flexible way of asking people about their opinions and experiences. One attraction for researchers is that, a considerable amount of data can be generated from an interview lasting one or two hours, although considerable time may have been expended, setting up the interview and subsequently on analysing it.

3.6 Data Analytical Procedures

A frequency count of the code-switching that occurred in the utterances of the respondents were made, those wrongly used are selected, the collection of information on listeners, if they understood or rather prefer the switched code to decode meaning in the conversation is also measured, as well as the awareness by speakers that code-switching is their inability to acquire full knowledge of the language in use (either as L_1 or L_2). The rates of these occurrences of code-switching were analyzed using the frequencies and percentage with the use of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS henceforth). Decimals were also used to avoid the dangers in round up percentages, which could distort accurate results. The aim is to ensure the results are presented factually as they were collected.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Preamble

This chapter dwells on the presentation and analysis of data gathered for the study. Data was collected from two (2) study areas; Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi by few hours of audio selective recording, questionnaires and brief follow up interviews. Primary data was collected on the students code-switched utterances recorded on a mobile phone; the data is presented below to enhance the findings of this research. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS henceforth) was used to analyse the variables on the questionnaires to present the results of the data collected. A summary of the findings is presented for easy comprehension aimed at drawing a valid conclusion.

4.1 Evidence of Code-Switched Utterances in Formal Setting of the Universities

Following the theoretical frameworks adopted for these analysis, and the data below; evidence of code-switching from Standard English Language to either NPE, NE, Vernaculars etc by students in formal situations and context; based on settings, location, context, interlocutors etc.,:

EXCERPT ONE: Student and Physician *(Appendix One: Conversation Eight)*

Doc: How old are you? Because, the problem with hypertension is that it is not something that just heals once and for all. No, it does not heal completely. You can only take drugs to manage it. Anyone who is hypertensive needs to come to the hospital regularly so that the B.P can be checked and monitored. So that whenever it rises, then drugs will be given. Plus, you have to sit with a counsellor, because, you look too young to be having this issue.
A8: *(Silent)* 24 years old, doctor
Doc: Do you understand?
A8: Yes.

Doc: What about sleep?
A8: I don't sleep doctor. ***That na why I bring the drug wey you give my roommate, yesterday, the tin been disturb me, so I take her medicine, no be the drug dey cause the trouble ko?***
Doc: (*Shocked)* you took her drug!!!
A8: ***Wait, make I show you***
Doc: So without a doctor prescribing the drug, you just took it?
A8: It is the one that the she too brought ***na, and she dey fine sir***
Doc: But it is not yours and you took it!
A8: That is why she told me to come with it so that you will see. ***If you say make continue take am, then I go***…. ***and if you say make I stop, I go stop***.
Doc: Okay. Now I am saying ***make you stop dey take am*** **(**you should stop taking it) because it is not yours and it can cause additional problems. Please, stop taking drugs that are not meant for you.
A8: Okay, wait, ***my body dey always dey weak*** (my is always weak) both day and night, ***wetin me suppose do na?*** (What am I suppose to do?)
Doc: We would do some tests now, afterwards, provide proper medication for whatever is wrong with you.
A8: Truthfully doc, ***the way dis body dey shake, e dey fear me.***
Doc: Don't worry, God's grace, you will be well….
A8: But doctor, ***I fit collect ur number*** (could I collect your number), call you even when ***you no dey work make I fit show*** (you are not at work so I could show) or tell you what is happening?
Doc: NO!

The above excerpt was a conversation between a student at the clinic to see a doctor, a setting that demands students' use of the language for formal settings or situation. The utterance presented above was secretly recorded during a visit at the clinic, and instead of a transactional conversation, it was almost impossible for the interlocutor to relate with the physician without code-switching to Nigerian Pidgin English (NPE). Here, the domain of language use was the medical centre within the academic environment, presumably the environment that demands formal usage of language, where interlocutors are controlled to maintain the role relationship between speakers in the situations or settings on the choice of languages in the speaker's repertoire (Fishman, 1972b), quite the opposite, the patient here code-switched to NPE about nineteen (19) times, if not almost all the time, and instead of a transactional conversation, it was almost becoming an intimate one, to give room for the

student's inability to relate with the use of Standard English language. And based on the previous information given by the student's friend, it gave room to the patient's abstracted atmosphere for familiarity with the doctor, which Labov's model which explains utterance behaviour of social groups' members. The student's information on the doctor, presumable gave room for her to create an informal familiarity setting in order for her to express herself freely with whatever choice of codes. These sociolinguistic factors of social variables that brings familiarity, and the settings giving room for whatever choice of language for the interaction not concerned of the domain, relationships and topics of the discourse (Labov, 1966). In Gumperz's framework, code-switching is also conceptualised as a result of the situational functions, which code-switching accommodates a change in setting, topic or participants.

EXCERPT TWO: Interaction between the Researcher, Two Students, and the HOD's Secretary and the HOD *(Appendix One: Conversation Nine)*

R9: Good morning please
B9: Morin…. (an aside: ***or tamen, u nder ver***? (sir, good morning), HOD responds: ***msugh ne*** (I greet you all))…. Ehen, ***tuma nya, orvesen va nyor higen*** (yeah, sit down, senior man has just entered right now)
R9: Sorry, you said?
B9: ***Sit don, oga just enter office, you no be Tiv man?***
C9-1: (*students walked in and greeted in unison*) ***U nder ver*** (good morning)
B9: ***nyor nen shimin, ngu ke office*** (you should enter the office, he is inside)

(From the HOD's office)

HOD: class rep***, nyor, se mbaa class higen?***
C9-1: ***en! Yes sir! Orvesen, u nder ver!*** (sir, Good morning)
HOD: ***okay, se yem nen!*** (Okay, let's go) Where are my files? ***Or ne, wer ngu er class pepe ne ga?*** (this man, you don't have class this morning?)
R9: Sorry sir, I didn't get what you said?
HOD: ***Ka or Tiv ga zer?*** (He is not a Tiv man?)
R9: ***mngu Tiv kpa*** (I am Tiv), I didn't what you said
HOD: ***M ngu er class pepe ne*** (I have a class this morning), I have a class…. ***Wer fa tyogh u keghn mo yo*** (If you can wait for me)…..

R9: Okay sir!
B9: ***So, u ngu or tiv?*** (So, you are a Tiv person?) And you were doing as if ***you no dey hear wetin me bin dey talk*** (you couldn't understand what I was saying)
R9: Please, where could I find the HOD of English department?
B9: Go down there, ***u nenge*** (you would see) department ***shon*** (definite article), ***pine*** (ask) ***any person*** (NPE), ***ver tese jii shon*** (they would show the place)……

EXCERPT THREE: Conversation among Students during a Lecture *(Appendix One: Conversation Seven)*

A7: ***or ne, u ugwa bute*** lecturer a lu orlun jeh? (This man/Guy, you heard the English this lecturer is speaking at all?)
B7: ***Wetin him bin dey talk that time? (NPE)*** (What was he saying at that time?)
A7: ***shen a ahir kwagh u*** Politics ***la….*** (when he started about politics)
B7: wait, ***pine un ga, moom soo ugwan*** lectures ***ne***, ***make I listen na***, later (Wait, ask him, I want to listen to the lectures eh, later)
LEC: Stop disturbing my class ***weh wan kwase ne***
B7-1: Sorry sir… excuse me sir, you said something about semantics… ***em em em, m zua kwagh u lu orlun gah*** (em em em, I didn't get what you was saying)
LEC: Of course, why would you? Besides, ***u lu elen liam gah?*** (were you not making a noise?)
B7-1: No sir, I was asking my ***friend to tell me (NE)***
LEC: what?
B7-1: ***m lu pinen boki wan megh a wasem pesan!*** (I was asking my friend to help me explain)

EXCERPT FOUR: Conversation between a Student and the Researcher
(Appendix One: Conversation Fifteen)

TR: Hey, hi, what are you doing here this early?
A15: Hi, King, ***me been just taya for caf*** (I got tired of sitting in the cafeteria), that's all. I have an hour break before this class, and I usually, spend it there... but it's so noisy today! Why are you here early as well?
TR: Oh, I always come in about now; it's ***kinda*** (slang: kind of) quiet now, I just try to go over my notes before class.
A15: ***Gee, no be you be the grand linguist!*** (Gee, aren't you the linguist!)
TR: I just find it's a good way to review and at the same time try to keep up with where this course is going. This literature class is too difficult for me. Why's the cafeteria so noisy? There shouldn't be many people there at three in the afternoon.
A15: There's a rally going on for the one demonstration. Wait, ***you been start with us for year one?*** (Wait, you started with us in year one), ***m hungu jii e moo meeti u la*** (I have forgotten where I met you).
TR: Not saying more than you already know, I don't know much about you either, by the way, demonstration?
A15: Yeah, Friday.
TR: Really? Against who or what? What is it about?

A15: Wait again, ***you be student for this school?*** (NPE: are you not a student of this school?), anyway, it's about tuition. It's about the tuition increase.

TR: Oh, yeah, the tuition increase is ***kinda*** (slang: kind of) high. They're holding a demonstration?

A15: ***wanda, or ne, shi u gu pine moo?*** (exclamation, this man/guy, you are still asking me?) or you don't even go around campus often? ***See posters dem posters for everywhere na*** **(**They've got posters plastered up all over the place.)

TR: No, I guess I don't. I just come in for this class and for….um… never mind. I didn't think this fee rise was such a big thing, though. It seems to occur for many years or so, in fact, regularly

EXCERPT FIVE: Conversation between a Patient and a Doctor at the Medical Centre *(Appendix One: Conversation Seventeen)*

A17: Good afternoon

Doc: Hello, how are you?

A17: Fine sir.

Doc: Okay…. *(A nurse walks in and speaks in Tiv to the doctor)* **ahirde, kpaa e zuagh shuu la ga fa** (he is back, but they didn't find that fish). ….sorry o, just a minute *(Interruption)*

Doc: Sorry please, let me just get this done.

A17: Okay sir.

Doc: *(After some minutes)* Okay, yea, ***ehen***, how are you?

A17: Fine sir.

Doc: What is the problem?

A17: v***angeh gu yoon moo***, for some days now.

Doc: Okay, which side exactly?

A17: *(Touching the area)* here

Doc: Noooooo… Nurse! *(calls out to nurse)* ***doctor u kwase gu around a***? (any female document is around?) Nurse: ***ehyi*** (No), Okay, ***assist moo hen*** (help me here). (To the patient) ***Ehen,*** but that is not your chest now, it's your breast. Your chest is kind of at the same place with your chest. Please show the nurse, let her feel it and tell me.

A17: But...

Doc: *(Interrupts)* madam, ***no remove your breast in front of me*** just like that, is it not there? *(Points to the area)* Madam that is not just your chest, that's your breast (speaks to the nurse, please what can you feel, **nurse**; nothing doc).

EXCERPTS SIX: Conversation between an Admin Staff and a Student *(Appendix One: Conversation Three)*

A3: Show me your school fees slip

B3: ***Or tamen***, sorry sir, ***m hugu shin ya***, (senior man, sorry sir, I forgot it at home), M ***zambe,*** sign ***moo kwagh shon, kpegh tsa meh va mi*** (Please, sign the thing for me, tomorrow I would bring it)

A3: You this girl, leave my office, ***du wegh ke woon yor!*** (go outside)

B3: Sir, ***m zambe wegh ga*** (Sir, I am pleading)

The above excerpts are a presentation of utterances that occurred in formal settings of the institutions of the study. The domain of language use are conversations between "the researcher, two Students and the HOD's Secretary", "conversation between students during a lecture", "conversation between a patient and a doctor at the Medical Centre", where the speech situation requires formal, while the role relationship that makes it formal is that of admin, lecturer and student relationship. But the transactional role of interaction here is changed in most cases by the students, while in some cases it involved both parties in the conversation. From the foregoing, it could be inferred using Labovian's theory that, the motivation of code-mixing in this context of discourse is not also as result of the familiarity between the participants but also as a result of the freedom to do so and the inadequacies or incompetency of the conscious use of English language in formal settings.

We saw evidence of students being able to choose formal codes suitable for the above domains, settings and situations, but later switching to informal usage, either by code-switching or mixing ethnic language of NPE etc., we could say it is as a result age and their bilingual ability as key elements to the motivation of the use of their linguistic items, which according to Gumperz's framework, code-switching here is situational in its functions, situational in the sense that, it accommodated change in topics or participants of the utterances. Despite instances, where one of the interlocutor's avoidance of the use of informal language, students still ended up where their abilities are, we could say that, social factors between interlocutors and the situation of a bilingual influenced the use of the identified ethnic switches in the utterances and not the standard English usage in the above excerpts according to Labvo's suppositions.

The role relationships between the participants in the excerpts is mostly that of students-lecturer, doctor-students, students-students (in classrooms or on academic discourse), while the topics or subject matter is that of academics, medical. But the choice of language use or their variety considering the above factors, Fishman's suppositions, these utterances ought to have been transactional but students made it personal as a result of their inabilities in the use of their competent bilingual languages. And the language could be identified under the social variables of locations, ethnicity, solidarity and age, which motivates the language varieties in the use of code-switching in formal settings.

All the factors in the excerpts above put together makes the domain formal, however, the formal discourse is often turned into an informal one at one point or the other for whatever the reasons, where even the lecturers involved are prompt to deviate from the standard usage that utter to be formal, thereby making different from the required usage. That said, the use of NPE and the ethnic switches are in response to the bilingual's inability of the standard language, the listed expected and their unprofessional usage for the discourses, which means, the familiar role relationship and tone by interlocutors, ethnic groups languages in their repertoire and the solidarity influenced the above identified switches in their utterances. Other reasons may be the inability of a speaker to express him/her self in one language, so switches to the other languages in their repertoire in order to compensate for the deficiency.

4.2 Preliminary Information on the Psycho-social Variables on the Questionnaire

A total of two hundred and fifty (250) copies of questionnaires were distributed supported with interviews. Respondents were drawn from: Benue State University and Federal

University of Agriculture Makurdi. Two hundred and thirty eight (238) questionnaires were filled and returned, some were not completely filled.

Table 4.2.1: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	183	76.9
Female	55	23.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The results showed that 76.9% male students responded to the questionnaires, while 23.1% are females. The result reveals that there is no significant influence of gender on code-switching, though male students' code-switch more frequently than their female counterparts.

Table 4.2.2: Distribution of the Age Range of Respondents

Age Range	Frequency	Percent
18-24	55	23.1
25-30	157	66.0
31-35	26	10.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table above shows that twenty six (26) students representing 10.9% fall between 31-35 age bracket, fifty five respondents between the ages of 18-24, while one hundred and fifty seven representing 66.0% are between the ages of 25-30 years. This indicates that there are students who are older and probably more experienced and those who are younger and are possibly bilingual speakers.

Table 4.2.3: Respondents' Educational Faculties

	Frequency	Percent
Science	96	40.3
Social science	48	20.2
Art	41	17.2
Management science	43	18.1
Educational foundation	10	4.2
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The above table reveals that the Faculty of Science has the highest number of respondents-96 students representing 40.3%-while Educational Foundation with 10 respondents or 4.2% has the lowest.

Table 4.2.4: Level of Education of Respondents (Class)

Level	Frequency	Percent
400 and above	238	100.0

In analysing the Level of Education influence on Code-switching, it is not always easy to categorize individuals into classes, because such categorizations may not be very adequate for empirical research. Chieni (2001) suggests that there are different scales used to classify people within a social system such as; occupation, education, income, where people live and so on. The assumption is that each group's level of education (100 Level to 600 Level and Masters Level) is likely to affect its language use and the representation in the **Table 4.1.4** above shows that all the respondents were either in 400 Level or above do code-switch.

Table 4.2.5: Distribution of Respondents According to their Institutions

Institutions	Frequency	Percent
Federal Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi	95	39.9
Benue State University, Makurdi	143	60.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table shows that a total of ninety five students responded from the Federal University of Agriculture with 39.9%, while 60.1% of the respondents are from the Benue State University.

Table 4.2.6: Respondents Residing on Campus

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Yes	186	78.2
No	26	10.9
No response	26	10.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This indicates that 78.2% of the respondents are campus resident students, while 10.9% are off campus resident students, the other 10.9% respondent refused to disclose their location.

4.3 Domain of Discourse on Code-Switching Meaningfully

Language makes it possible for one to communicate one's thought, as languages, dialects, groups codes are increasingly coming into contact as a result of the impact of scientific and technological developments; it is imperative for thoughts to be wider than one's cultural setting. In fact, the domain of discourse determines the register to be employed, although the register for some of the new concepts may not exist in these languages, where they exist, they may not be popular among majority of the language speakers. This implies that code-switching is most likely to occur at such points where the appropriate registers are not readily available or that users are not competent in using them. As participants, setting and topic are the three psycho-social factors important in code choice; competent bilinguals often find it easier to discuss particular topics in one code rather than the other.

Fishman's (1972:587) domains and topic analysis is a clear model for this aspect of the analysis, to correlate the physical setting and the social context with language choice by asking the question "who speaks what language, to whom, when and why by using the following parameters; topic, interlocutor and spatial-temporal setting or domains". Appel and

Muysken (1989) function model observes that, switching can serve the referential function. According to them, topics related to switching may be thought of as serving the referential function of language. The interactional sociolinguistics model of code-switching by Gumperz in 1982, a model referred to as the Semantic Model of Conversational Code-switching by Auer (1984), asserts that, code-switching is conceptualised as situational and metaphorical in its functions, particularly that, situational code-switching accommodates a change in "setting", "topic (domains) or "participants" (Blom & Gumperz, 1986) and serves to redefine the situation. **Tables 4.3.1-4.3.20** capture students' response to their discourse of language use when code-switching, where certain subjects may be more appropriately discussed in one language and the introduction of such a subject triggers a shift or change in the domain of discourse, what Myers-Scotton (1993) calls situational code-switching. Alfonzetti (2002) also states that, "speakers switch to the code they consider more appropriate for a given topic" (p.197), she adds that although this sometimes happens, it simply fails to account for many other contextual implications of the occurrence (effective meaning-making).

As a result, code-switching may be seen as a means by which the task of changing topic in a discourse could be carried out by the initial language of the conversation by incompetent bilinguals vice versa. According to Alfonzetti (2002) it is a contextualization cue used to signal a change in the conversational context. Normally topics are firmly associated with a particular code and the topic itself can trigger borrowing, a switch to the appropriate code (Nartey, 1982). The general pattern among bilingual speakers in Tiv, Idoma, and Ibibio-English environment is for normal or formal discussions to be held in English while informal and intimate ones are held in the State's major languages. Holmes (1992) reiterates that there are domains of "language use" that induce language choice for situational meaning-making.

This is exemplified with the questions on the questionnaire (Section B: 1-11 and 1-10) refer to (Appendix 2).

Table 4.3.1: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching with Parents at home

Responses	Frequency	Percent
Never	77	32.4
Often	110	46.2
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table indicates a greater percentage of respondents switch in a conversation with parents at home. One hundred and six one (161) summing up 67.6% of the total respondents agreed they "often" or "most often" code-switch when discussing with parents at home, in other words, parents also condole Nigerian languages with their children more than the standard English language for relation, although, this is as a result of the speakers' repertoire competency.

Table 4.3.2: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching with Friends at Social Gathering

	Frequency	Percent
Never	26	10.9
Often	106	44.5
Most often	106	44.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The above table presents detailed response to the variables in relation to the discourse of code-switching situation with friends at social gatherings. Responses showed that 44.5% "most often" and 44.5% "often" representing two hundred and twelve students code-switch, while 10.9% said they "never" code-switch among friends at social gatherings.

Table 4.3.3: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching with Relatives while Telling Stories

	Frequency	Percent
Never	4	1.7
Seldom	4	1.7
Often	130	54.6
Most often	100	42.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table shows detailed response to the discourse of code-switching situation with relatives while telling stories, and the results show that 54.6% 'often' and 42.0% "most often" accepted that they code-switching in this domain of discourse, while 1.7% 'never' and 1.7% 'seldom' code-switch in this situation.

Table 4.3.4: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching with Sport Coaches during School Games

	Frequency	Percent
Never	55	23.1
Seldom	12	5.0
Often	26	10.9
Most often	145	60.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Details of response regarding the discourse of code-switching situation with Sport Coaches during games in school, shows that 60.9% of respondents 'most often' code-switch and 23.1% 'never' code-switch in this domain of discourse. Thirty eight students say they either seldom or often code-switch during games.

Table 4.3.5: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching when Planning Family Home Parties

	Frequency	Percent
Never	81	34.0
Seldom	10	4.2
Often	51	21.4
Most often	96	40.3
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Eighty one (81) respondents representing 34.0% disagreed that they code-switch in this domain, 21.4% 'often' and 40.3% 'most often' code-switch, while a hand full say they rarely code-switch.

Table 4.3.6: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching of Academic Issues with Relatives

	Frequency	Percent
Never	26	10.9
Seldom	51	21.4
Often	55	23.1
Most often	106	44.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and six respondent affirm they 'most often' code-switch with relatives in the domain of academic issues, 10.9% 'never' code-switch in this domain of discourse, while 44.5% of students say they 'seldom' or 'often' code-switch in this domain.

Table 4.3.7: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching in Supermarkets

	Frequency	Percent
Never	55	23.1
Seldom	10	4.2
Often	118	49.6
Most often	55	23.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and Eighteen (118) respondents representing 46.9% attest that they code-switch at supermarkets, while 23.1% says they "never" of 'often' code-switch.

Table 4.3.8: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching on Issues of Culture with Relatives

	Frequency	Percent
Never	55	23.1
Seldom	51	21.4
Often	77	32.4
Most often	55	23.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This data is basically to reflect if code-switching occurs as a result of those who acquired English language as their L_1, and if they did, they code-switch from Nigerian languages to

English language. The table indicates that 76.9% of the total respondents agree they code-switch in this domain of culture with relatives.

Table 4.3.9: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching when Seeking Religious Advice

	Frequency	Percent
Never	51	21.4
Seldom	55	23.1
Often	126	52.9
Most often	6	2.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Formal language is used in most religious gathering, however, when an individual is outside the place of worship and is seeking advice; tendency is that, the conversation becomes informal. But is it necessary or is it done as a result of deficiency in the use of Standard English language for expression of meaning? 52.9% of students stated that, they often code-switch in this domain, meanwhile 21.4% of the respondents admit that they 'never' code-switch in the discourse of this domain.

Table 4.3.10: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Health Matters with Personnel at Clinic

	Frequency	Percent
Never	110	46.2
Often	77	32.4
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

It is assumed that most Nigerian speakers would probably be informal while discussing medical issues with personnel or at the clinic, 53.8% of the total respondents agreed they code-switch in this domain, and 46.2% said they never switch to other codes while discussing medical issues.

Table 4.3.11: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Academic Issues in Classroom

	Frequency	Percent
Never	118	49.6
Seldom	18	7.6
Often	51	21.4
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table above indicates that One hundred and Eighteen respondents representing 49.6% 'never' code-switch in this domain, clearly indicates the influence of code-switching on standard usage of English language for meaning-making, this 50.4% who either seldom', often' or most often' code-switch totally affirms the hypothesis of the review; that there is influence of the use Nigerian languages on Standard English language when discussing academic issues in the classroom.

Table 4.3.12: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Academic Issues with Course mates in Classroom

	Frequency	Percent
Never	98	41.2
Seldom	8	3.4
Often	77	32.4
Most often	55	23.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The above table clearly shows that a total 58.9% of the respondents either 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' code-switch in this domain of discourse, even though the context might be informal, but the domain indicates it's an academic discussion. 41.2% of the respondents state that they do not code-switch in this domain of discourse.

Table 4.3.13: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Academic Discussion with Administrators

	Frequency	Percent
Never	110	46.2
Seldom	52	21.5
Often	26	10.9
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table above shows that 53.8% of the total respondents either 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' code-switch in this domain, while 46.2% of the respondents say they 'never' code-switch in this domain of academic discourse.

Table 4.3.14: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Health Matters with Personnel at the Hospital

	Frequency	Percent
Never	113	47.5
Seldom	13	5.5
Often	10	4.2
Most often	102	42.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and two or 42.9% percent of the respondents said they 'most often code-switch while having medical conversation with personnel, and 9.7% state that they 'seldom' or 'often' code-switch, that is to say, most students still prefer Nigerian languages in a formal setting to express themselves over the standard English usage in the context, 47.5% of the total respondents state they do not code-switch in this domain of discuss.

Table 4.3.15: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Academic Debates in School

	Frequency	Percent
Never	71	29.8
Seldom	10	4.2
Often	106	44.5
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This table indicates the influence of Nigerian languages in this domain of discourse, a total of 70.1% of the respondents said they either 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' code-switch in this domain of discourse of academic debates; a formal setting that requires all students to be able to interact using the Standard English language.

Table 4.3.16: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Academic Developments with Counsellors

	Frequency	Percent
Never	94	39.5
Seldom	16	6.7
Often	77	32.4
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Response from students clearly indicate that code-switching has become the best choice for meaning-making, no matter the violation of usage, when we sum up the total of those who 'often' 32.4% or 'most often' 21.4% code-switch in an academic environment. It indicates that, there is a high influence of Nigerian bilinguals who are probably not competent in the L_2 (English Language).

Table 4.3.17: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Academic Growth with Advisors

	Frequency	Percent
Never	119	50.0
Seldom	51	21.4
Often	51	21.4
Most often	17	7.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Admission by students clearly showed that code-switching has been accepted as the best choice for meaning-making, even when rules are violated during usage, given the summed up total of those who 'seldom' 21.4%, 'often' 21.4% or 'most often' 7.1% code-switch in this domain. 50.0% of the respondents declared that they 'never' code-switch. It indicates that

there is a high influence of Nigerian languages in speakers' repertoire, who are probably not competent in the L_2 (English Language).

Table 4.3.18: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching of Divination with Clergy Men

	Frequency	Percent
Never	98	41.2
Seldom	8	3.4
Often	81	34.0
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This table indicates that a total of 58.8% students code-switch in this domain, while 41.2% of the total respondents do not code-switch in this discourse of divination with clergy men. In the Nigerian context, one would agree that this is permissible; however, if it becomes a norm, the appreciation of English language use in formal setting diminishes.

Table 4.3.19: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching when Seeking Librarians Assistance

	Frequency	Percent
Never	137	57.6
Seldom	77	32.4
Often	12	5.0
Most often	12	5.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This result shows that those who do not code-switch while seeking library assistance is higher, with a percentage of 57.6% compared to 42.4% of the total respondents who seldom', often', or most often' code-switch in this domain of discourse.

Table 4.3.20: Domain of Discourse Code-switching when Giving Directions to Strangers in School.

	Frequency	Percent
Never	99	41.6
Seldom	26	10.9
Often	106	44.5
Most often	7	2.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

When one encounters strangers, it is advisable to be formal especially within the school environment, but in the Nigerian context with so many languages in users' repertoires, it is difficult for students not to code-switch. 58.3% of the respondents said they 'seldom', often' or 'most often' code-switch, while 41.6% said they do not code-switch in this domain of discourse.

The section presented data that indicate discourse on code-switching influence on the "language use" of speakers for effective meaning-making as well as the influence on the Standard English language usage for meaning-making in either the informal or formal settings. It is established in section B according to the questionnaire (Appendix 2), questions 1-11 are based on the informal settings of students' language use and questions 1-10 is for the formal settings. And the results shows that, one hundred and Eighteen respondents representing 49.6% 'never' code-switch in this domain, clearly indicating the influence of code-switching on standard usage of English language for meaning-making, this 50.4% who either seldom', often' or most often' code-switch totally affirms the hypothesis of the review; that there is influence of the use Nigerian languages on Standard English language when discussing academic issues in the classroom. Results also shows that 53.8% of the total respondents either 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' code-switch in this domain, while 46.2% of the respondents say they 'never' code-switch in domain of academic discourse. Another analysis indicates the influence of Nigerian languages in this domain, a total of 70.1% of the respondents said they either 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' code-switch in domain of discourse of academic debates; a formal setting that requires all students to be able to interact using the Standard English language (lingua franca). Therefore, we would agree that code-switching has become the better/best means for conveying meaning in this region, given

students have shown with all indication that it is seen as a norm even among the elite to code-switch.

4.4 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching

Domain of Pragmatics on code-switching basically deals with the standpoint of "language use" and "context of usage". We use language to interact and create human bonds through the use of words and sentences to acquire meaning in context; placing emphasis on the power of context and text to create meaning through numerous relations among the constituents of sentences, and among utterances themselves, arranged in discourse following reasonable argument.

This section focuses on the pragmatics of 'inter-languages' (English usage and other Nigerian ethnic languages) and the context to which BSU and UAM students relate, a focus which is justified by the growing importance of English as a global lingua franca among the large communities, and the Nigerian English Language and her ethnic languages trying to make headway into the global lingua franca, given that, cross-cultural contexts of English and other languages' usage are now predominantly used by students wrongly rather than as native speakers. Table 4.4.1 to Table 4.4.15- are responses based on the informal and formal "context" of "language use" on code-switching (Refer to Appendix 2).

Table 4.4.1 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Family Issues with Parents

	Frequency	**Percent**
Never	51	21.4
Seldom	17	7.1
Often	119	50.0
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and eighty seven (187) respondents code-switch in this domain of context or situation (home, family issues), with a percentage of 78.5%, while 21.4 said they do not code-switch even at home or with parents.

Table 4.4.2 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Leisure Conversation with Friends

	Frequency	Percent
Never	26	10.9
Seldom	16	6.7
Often	90	37.8
Most often	106	44.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The domain of students' leisure "language use" clearly indicates that 6.7% seldom code-switch, 37.8% 'often', while 44.5% 'most often' code-switch while with friends; 10.9% representing (26) respondents actually prefer using a single language in their conversations with friends.

Table 4.4.3 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Storytelling with Relatives

	Frequency	Percent
Never	10	4.2
Seldom	51	21.4
Often	77	32.4
Most often	100	42.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table clearly indicates that, since story-telling is an informal setting, tendency is that code-switching would be obvious, thus 21.4% 'seldom', 32.4% 'often' and 42.0% 'most often' switch to other language(s) in this domain of context.

Table 4.4.4 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Ex-communication with one who is not an L_1 or L_2 Speaker

	Frequency	Percent
Never	15	6.3
Seldom	4	1.7
Often	79	33.2
Most often	140	58.8
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table show that, respondents code-switch when speaking to an individual outside a conversation, probably as a result of their intrusion in the group's conversation with a question or a request. 83.7% of the respondents agreed that they switch codes in order to speak to such person. In other words, the respondents agree they code-switch in other to excommunicate someone who doesn't understand their language at social gatherings.

Table 4.4.5 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching in order to be Accurate with Relatives

	Frequency	Percent
Seldom	29	12.2
Often	158	66.4
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Some bilingual Nigerians could code-switch in order to make emphases, be exact/precise, better still, to be accurate in conversations with relations at home, the table shows that 100% of the respondents code-switch in this domain of context.

Table 4.4.6 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching for Language Harmonization at Social Gatherings

	Frequency	Percent
Never	68	28.6
Seldom	19	8.0
Often	106	44.5
Most often	45	18.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Sixty eight respondents representing 28.6% admit that they do not code-switch in order to harmonize with speakers of the same ethnic group, 8.0% 'seldom', 44.5% 'often' and 18.9% 'most often' code-switch in this domain of harmonization of language.

Table 4.4.7 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching with Classmates during Sports

	Frequency	Percent
Never	76	31.9
Seldom	24	10.1
Often	45	18.9
Most often	93	39.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Games are seen as informal situations, nevertheless, when it involves classmates, students would prefer to communicate in the language allowed in school, thus 31.9% or 76 respondents say they never code-switch, while 68.1% of the total respondents 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' code-switch in order to interact with classmates at games.

Table 4.4.8 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Conversation with Games Master

	Frequency	Percent
Never	26	10.9
Seldom	14	5.9
Often	178	74.8
Most often	20	8.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

A total of one hundred and seventy eight respondents or 74.8 % said they often code-switch with their games masters, while 10.9% do not switch to other codes while speaking with their coaches.

Table 4.4.9 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching when Planning Parties with Relatives

	Frequency	Percent
Never	26	10.9
Seldom	8	3.4
Often	98	41.2
Most often	106	44.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The domain anticipates that most Nigerians would code-switch in this context or situation and a total of 88.1% of the respondents say they 'seldom', 'often' and 'most often' use more than one language in their course of conversation with relatives.

Table 4.4.10 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Academic Discussion at home with Relatives

	Frequency	Percent
Never	51	21.4
Seldom	18	7.6
Often	114	47.9
Most often	55	23.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

It is expected that when students are in the domain of academic discussion, no matter the context, they are expected to be formal with their language use, but in the table above 78.6% of the total respondents disagree with this notion, stating they 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' switch codes in this context of their conversations, while 21.4% claim they do not code-switch.

Table 4.4.11 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching at Supermarkets

	Frequency	Percent
Never	26	10.9
Seldom	10	4.2
Often	96	40.3
Most often	106	44.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The domain of pragmatics clearly indicates that 44.5% most often, 40.3% often and 4.2% seldom switch languages or dialects while buying and selling at the markets.

Table 4.4.12 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Cultural Conversation at Social Gatherings with Relatives

	Frequency	Percent
Never	26	10.9
Seldom	29	12.2
Often	148	62.2
Most often	35	14.7
Total	**238**	**100.0**

During conversations on cultural issues with relations at social gatherings 62.2% 'often', 14.7% 'most often', 12.2% 'seldom' code-switch, while 10.9% 'never' switch to other languages during this domain of discourse.

Table 4.4.13 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Religious Advice from Clergymen

	Frequency	Percent
Never	118	49.6
Seldom	51	21.4
Often	55	23.1
Most often	14	5.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

In this domain, a total of 50.4% respondents affirm that, they often code-switch in this domain, while 49.6% of the total respondents state that they 'never' code-switch in this pragmatic domain when seeking for religious counsel from a Priest/Pastor/Imam outside the place worship.

Table 4.4.14 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Health Matters with Personnel at Clinics

	Frequency	Percent
Never	145	60.9
Seldom	12	5.0
Often	55	23.1
Most often	26	10.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Most Nigerian speakers would probably be informal while discussing medical issues with personnel outside or at the clinic, and 39.1% of the total respondents agreed they code-switch in this domain, 60.9% said they 'never' switch to other languages while discussing health issues with the College Doctor/Nurse outside the clinic.

Table 4.4.15 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Academic Classroom Discussion with Teachers

	Frequency	Percent
Never	126	52.9
Seldom	21	8.8
Often	32	13.4
Most often	59	24.8
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The fact that a total of 47.1% of the respondents switch to other language in this domain of academic discussion in a formal settings, clearly shows that university students are comfortable with the usage of Nigerian languages thereby having deficiency in the use of the Standard English language when discussing academic issues with teachers in the classroom. However, 52.9% of the total respondents declare they 'never' switch to other languages.

Table 4.4.16 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Academic Issues with Classmates in Classroom

	Frequency	Percent
Never	10	4.2
Seldom	12	5.0
Often	159	66.8
Most often	57	23.9
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table shows that a total 95.8% of the respondents either "seldom", "often" or "most often" code-switch in this domain of pragmatics, since the context is formal and the domain indicates it's an academic discussion, only 4.2% of the respondents state that they do not switch to other languages in this domain of discourse when talking about academic issues with course mates in the classroom.

Table 4.4.17 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Academic Issues with School Administrators

	Frequency	Percent
Never	124	52.1
Seldom	12	5.0
Often	51	21.4
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

When a large number of students' code-switch in this domain of pragmatics on academic issues, it clearly reveals the extent of influence of Nigeria language(s) on the student who is expected to speak the Standard English language in these contexts or domains. The table shows that 47.8% of the total respondents 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' switch in this domain, indicating that, this usage has become the better means for students to convey meaning. 52.1% of the total respondents 'never' code-switch in this domain when discussing academic issues in the school with the school administrators.

Table 4.4.18 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Health Issues with Personnel

	Frequency	Percent
Never	120	50.4
Seldom	16	6.7
Often	51	21.4
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and two respondents representing 42.8% said they 'often' and 'most often" switch Nigerian languages while having medical conversation with personnel, and 6.7% state that they 'seldom' code-switch. That is to say, most students still prefer Nigerian languages in a formal setting for self expression. However, 50.4% respondents claim that, they do not switch to other languages in this domain of context when discussing health matters with the College Doctor/Nurse in the clinic.

Table 4.4.19 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Students Academic Debates in School

	Frequency	Percent
Never	34	14.3
Seldom	32	13.4
Often	71	29.8
Most often	101	42.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This table indicates that there is significant intrusion of Nigerian languages in this domain of discourse, given a total of 85.6% of the respondents who aver that they 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' code-switch in this domain on pragmatics of academic debates. It should be noted that, this is a formal setting, which requires all students to interact using the Standard English language accepted in schools, but, the table shows that, those who "never" code-switch during academic debates with fellow students in the school are 14.3% of the total sampled population.

Table 4.4.20 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Academic Development with Counsellors

	Frequency	Percent
Never	125	52.5
Seldom	38	16.0
Often	24	10.1
Most often	51	21.4
Total	238	100.0

Response from respondents clearly indicate that code-switching has become the best choice for conveying meaning, given the frequent usage of this intrusion, when we sum up the total of those who "seldom" 16.0 "often" 10.1% or "most often" 21.4% code-switch in a formal pragmatic domain such as academic development in the context to which the discussion takes place (counsellors' offices). It indicates that, there is a high influence of Nigerian bilingual speakers who are probably not competent in the L_2 (English Language) accepted for the context, although the tables shows that 52.5% "never" switch languages when discussing academic development with Guidance Counsellors in school.

Table 4.4.21 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Academic Growth with Advisers

	Frequency	**Percent**
Never	116	48.7
Seldom	10	4.2
Often	102	42.9
Most often	10	4.2
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Response from students clearly shows that code-switching has been accepted as the best choice for conveying meaning, given the rate of usage and that it is proficiency driven, even when rules are violated during usage. 'Seldom' 4.2%, 'often' 42.9% or 'most often' 4.2% switch languages in the course of discussion on academic growth in a formal context (academic advisors), and those who "never" switch languages with a total percentage of 48.7%, it indicates that, there is a high influence of Nigerian language usage by the speakers,

who are probably not competent in their L_2 (English Language) when discussing academic growth with academic advisers at school.

Table 4.4.22 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Divination with Clergymen outside Place of Worship

	Frequency	Percent
Never	161	67.6
Seldom	18	7.6
Often	8	3.4
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This table indicates that a total of 32.4% students code-switch in this domain, while 67.6% of the total respondents do not code-switch in this pragmatic domain of divination with clergy men. In the Nigerian context, this situation should be the other way round, and it shows that university students do not notice the best context of language use. This rate of usage indicates the amount of usage and appreciation of English language use when discussing issues on divination with Priest/Pastor/Imam outside the place of worship.

Table 4.4.23 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of when Seeking Librarians' Assistance

	Frequency	Percent
Never	145	60.9
Seldom	20	8.4
Often	51	21.4
Most often	22	9.2
Total	**238**	**100.0**

39.1% of the total respondents said they 'seldom', 'often' or 'most often' code-switch, while 60.9% of this total said they 'never' switch in this domain on pragmatics when seeking for assistance from circulation officers in the library.

Table 4.4.24 Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching when giving Directions to Strangers in School

	Frequency	Percent
Never	44	18.5
Seldom	19	8.0
Often	124	52.1
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The tabular representation shows that, 81.5% of the total respondents said they "seldom", "often" or "most often" switch languages, while 18.5% of this total said they "never" switch languages in this domain of pragmatics when giving strangers directions within their school.

4.5 Domains of "Language use" on Code-switching

Domains of "language use" was first proposed by Schmidt- Rohr in 1932, and later developed by Fishman; based on Fishman (1972:20) as cited in Marjohan (1988), "domain is a socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationship between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institution of a society and the area of activity of speech community in such a way that individual behaviour and social patterns can be distinguished from each other and yet related to each other". Therefore, the languages used by people are influenced by many factors. Fishman (1972) states that, the factors which influence the concept of domain are topics, role relation, and locale, and that topics can be a regulator of language use in multilingual settings; someone switches his or her language to the interlocutor's language when discussing certain topics. Marjohan (1988) also opined that, role relation means that languages an individual uses are determined by the interlocutors one speaks with; father speaks to mother, child speaks to mother, and mother speaks to child. He further states that, locale means that the places where the conversations take place influence the languages use. This section's presentation is based on data collected

on the questionnaire and are basically open-ended questions, which require the respondents' opinions (refer to Appendix 2 Section 1D-3D).

Table 4.5.1: Number of Nigerian Languages Spoken by Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Two	157	66.0
Three	81	34.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table indicates that 66.0% of the total respondents speak two Nigerian languages, while 34.0% speak three Nigerian languages, in other words, students in these institutions are either bilingual or multilingual speakers of some Nigerian languages.

Table 4.5.2: The Languages Spoken by the Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Hausa, Igbo & Yoruba	34	14.3
Ibibio, Hausa & Yoruba	81	34.0
Igala and Yoruba	55	23.1
Tiv	17	7.1
Idoma and English	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba are spoken by 14.3%, Ibibio, Hausa and Yoruba by 34.0%, Igala and Yoruba by 23.1%, Idoma and English by 21.4, while Tiv is spoken by 7.1% of the total respondents. That is to say respondents acquired or learnt the second language in school and learnt English language because they had to go to school. This also indicates that, they are mostly bilinguals and multilingual speakers of Nigerian languages.

Table 4.5.3: Respondents' Proficiency on the Spoken Nigerian Languages

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	171	71.8
No	57	23.9
No response	10	4.2
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and seventy one (171) representing 71.8% of the total respondents agreed that they are competent speakers of the languages they have in their repertoire, while 23.9% indicated 'no' and 4.2% did not respond to this question.

Table 4.5.4: Level of Proficiency on the Nigerian Languages Spoken

	Frequency	**Percent**
Native speaker/Mother tongue (L_1)	151	63.4
Second Language (L_2)	26	10.9
Proficient in both Languages	61	25.6
Total	**238**	**100.0**

A total of 63.4% of the respondents indicated that they are L_1 speakers of these Nigerian languages they speak, 10.9% indicated same as their second languages; while 25.6% agreed they speak both languages. This result clearly indicates that respondents are proficient speakers of the languages presented in the table.

Table 4.5.5: Languages often spoken by Respondents

	Frequency	**Percent**
Ibibio	31	13.0
Igala	64	26.9
Tiv	41	17.2
Idoma	51	21.4
English	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Despite the fact that the dominant language in this study area is Tiv, only 17.2% of the total respondents speak this language often, Ibibio 13.0%, Igala 26.9%, Idoma 21.4% and 21.4% speak English often. In other words, one can deduce that the languages student often speak are their native/Mother tongue (L_1).

Table 4.5.6 Language First Acquired (Native language)

	Frequency	Percent
Ibibio	41	17.2
Igala	43	18.1
Tiv	77	32.4
Idoma	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table clearly indicates that no respondent is native speakers of English, Tiv and Idoma language enjoy prominence with 32.4% each while Ibibio and Igala have 17.2% and 18.1% respectively.

Table 4.5.7: Languages used by Students in the Study Area during Lectures

	Frequency	Percent
English	238	100.0
Total	**238**	**100**

All the respondents agreed that English language is the language used during lectures.

Table 4.5.8: Languages used for Thoughts both in School, Home or Social Gatherings

	Frequency	Percent
Tiv and English	55	23.1
Igala and English	26	10.9
Pidgin English and English	51	21.4
English	94	39.5
Idoma and English	12	5.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

60.4% of the total respondents chose a Nigerian language before English as their languages of thoughts in school, social gatherings and at home. 39.5% indicated English language as their only code for thoughts in whatever context.

Table 4.5.9: Language of Communication with Classmates

	Frequency	Percent
Tiv and English	12	5.0
Idoma and English	16	6.7
Igala and English	8	3.4
Pidgin English and English	41	17.2
English	161	67.6
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The language of communication among the students in the study area shows that Nigerian languages are the first option, and 32.3% of the total respondents indicate Tiv, Idoma, Igala, and Pidgin with English as their language of communication with classmates, while 67.6% indicated they use English language for communicating with classmates.

Table 4.5.10: Language of Communication with Immediate Family

	Frequency	Percent
Idoma and English	51	21.4
Igala and English	55	23.1
Pidgin English and English	81	34.0
Tiv	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table indicates that students in this area prefer Nigerian languages for immediate family conversation over the Standard English language, 65.9% of the total prefer their native languages, while 34.0% of the total use Pidgin English and English language to communicate with immediate families.

Table 4.5.11: Language of Communication with Distant Relatives

	Frequency	Percent
English	132	55.5
Hausa and English	55	23.1
Tiv	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table shows that 55.5% of the total respondents prefer English over Nigerian languages while interacting with members of the extended family, while 44.5% prefer Hausa-Tiv and English for interactions.

Table 4.5.12: Language use for Conversation with Friends and Colleagues Outside Schools

	Frequency	Percent
Tiv and English	24	10.1
Idoma and English	32	13.4
Igala and English	12	5.0
Pidgin English and English	57	23.9
English	113	47.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Language use for interacting here indicates that 52.4% of the total respondents first use Nigerian languages before switching to English language while interacting with friends and colleagues outside school, 47.5% interact with English.

Table 4.5.13: Language use within Academic Environment

	Frequency	Percent
Tiv and English	20	8.4
Idoma and English	55	23.1
Igala and English	26	10.9
Pidgin English and English	6	2.5
English	131	55.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Language use within academic environment is expected to be the Standard English language, nevertheless, when the domain of language use involves two parties that are bilinguals, with domain of use (relationship, friendship, sports), tendency is that parties would switch codes in their repertoires in order to interact within school environment, and the table indicates that 44.9% of the total respondents use Nigerian language and English language, while 55.0% said the choice of code is English language.

Table 4.5.14: Language use to Non-familiar Person at Workplace

	Frequency	Percent
English	238	100.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table indicates that all respondents speak English when they meet unfamiliar faces at workplaces.

Table 4.5.15: Language use with Unfamiliar Persons at Home

	Frequency	Percent
Tiv and English	14	5.9
Idoma and English	8	3.4
Igala and English	47	19.7
Hausa and English	4	1.7
Ibira and English	4	1.7
Yourba and English	6	2.5
Pidgin English and English	14	5.9
English	94	39.5
Tiv	47	19.7
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Language spoken to unfamiliar persons at home in this domain of language use indicates that 5.9% Tiv, Idoma 3.4%, Igala 19.7%, Hausa 1.7%, Ibira 1.7%, Yoruba 2.5% Pidgin English 5.9% of the total respondents combine these languages with English language when speaking with unfamiliar faces at home, while, 39.5% and 19.7% speak either English or Tiv languages.

Table 4.5.16: Language of Communication with Unfamiliar Persons at Informal Settings

	Frequency	Percent
English	161	67.6
Ibibio	26	10.9
No response	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and sixty one (161) respondents representing 67.6% chose English language for this domain of their language use, 10.9% prefer Ibibio and 21.4% refused to respond.

Table 4.5.17: Speakers Duration of Spoken Nigerian Languages

	Frequency	Percent
1 hour	51	21.4
6 hours	55	23.1
24 hours, 7 days a week	55	23.1
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table indicates that fifty one respondents (51) representing 21.4% code-switch for an hour daily, while 23.1% for six hours daily and 23.1% indicate they code-switch twenty four hours, seven days of the week (in other words, all days of their lives). Therefore, long term code-switching influences the speaker or the user of Nigerian languages against their use of English language.

4.6 Domain of Meaning-making of Students' Language use

Semantics is a term that refers to how meaning is assigned in language while a domain is essentially a specific place or territory, in accordance to Labovian model and Gumperz's framework, a semantic domain is a specific place that shares a set of meanings, or a language that holds its meaning, within the given context of the place. Harriet Ottenheimer (2006), a specialist in Linguistic Anthropology, defines a semantic domain as a "specific area of cultural emphasis" (Ottenheimer, 2006).

Table 4.6.1 Students' Knowledge/Awareness of the Term Semantics

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	149	62.6
No	12	5.0
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Table indicates that very few students have an understanding of the term "semantics" and how it is made in conversation, until the term was explained to them, thus 32.4% of the total

respondents did not answer this question (appendix 1), and 5.0% said they don't know the term, while 62.6% agreed they know what it means.

Table 4.6.2: Context of Students' Awareness of the Term Semantics

	Frequency	Percent
School	106	44.5
Friends	55	23.1
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and Six respondents or 44.5% said they learnt about "semantics" in school, 23.1% said from friends, while 32.4% did not respond.

Table 4.6.3: Students' Understanding of Meaning in a Conversation

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	143	60.1
No	18	7.6
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

A total of one hundred and forty three (143) respondents agreed they understand the message in a conversation, 7.6% said they don't while 32.4% did not respond.

Table 4.6.4: Students' use of Nigerian Languages for Meaningful Conversation (Code-Switching)

	Frequency	Percent
Feature more specific words	55	23.1
Fluid relationship with words	106	44.5
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

67.6% of the total respondents agreed they use Nigerian languages to convey meaning, while 44.5% said it is because of their level of proficiency, 23.1% also said using Nigerian languages gives them more lexical items of their proficient language in their repertoire.

Table 4.6.5: Reasons for Nigerian Language(s) Choice over English Language

	Frequency	Percent
Ease of Understanding	42	17.6
Ease of Explanation	63	26.5
Ease of definition	21	8.8
Ease of interpretation among the people	25	10.5
Better choice of words than the English language	16	6.7
No response	71	29.8
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This tables presents data based on previous tables and with focus on the preference given to Nigerian languages over English language in order to make-meaning in a conversation, and 70.2% of the total respondents said they prefer Nigerian languages to make sense because it is "easily understood", 17.6% said "explanation is easy", "26.5% admit "lexical items are defined easily", "10.5% maintained "interpretation is done among people at effortlessness", "6.7% said "there are better choice of diction than English language words", 29.8% did not respond to this question.

Table 4.6.6: Setting and with whom these Languages are used to express meaningful conversation

	Frequency	Percent
Social gathering with friends	30	12.6
Home with parents	39	16.4
Classroom during lectures	56	23.5
Academic environment with lectures	36	15.1
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Likely places where and persons whom the languages are used in conversation: 12.6% Social gatherings with friends, 16.4% at home with parents, 23.5% classroom during lectures, 15.1% academic environment with lecturers, while 32.4% of the total respondents did not answer this question.

Table 4.6.7: Meaningful Conversation with the use of Nigerian Languages over Standard English Language

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	155	65.1
No	14	5.9
No response	69	29.0
Total	238	100.0

When asked if they believe that understanding is better when using the Nigerian languages over Standard English language, 65.1% of the total respondents said "Yes", while 5.9% said "No", 29.0% did not respond.

Table 4.6.8: Reasons for the Acceptance of Nigerian Languages over English Language to make Meaningful Conversation

	Frequency	**Percent**
Ease of Understanding	53	22.3
Ease of Explanation	22	9.2
Ease of definition	14	5.9
Ease of interpretation among the people	36	15.1
Better choice of words than the English language	72	30.3
No response	41	17.2
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Fifty three respondents (53) representing 22.3% "said it is easy to understand", 9.2% "explanation of domains are easily done", 5.9% "language lexical items are defined easily", 15.1% "language use interpretation among people is done easily"; 30.3% said there are better choice of words than in English language, while, 17.2% did not respond.

Table 4.6.9: Difficulties Encountered with the use of Standard English Language in Making Meaningful Conversation

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	51	21.4
No	110	46.2
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

When asked if there are difficulties encountered with the use of Standard English language in making meaningful conversation; 21.4% said "Yes", 46.2% said "No", while 32.4% of the total respondents did not respond.

Table 4.6.10: Listeners' understanding the Conversation with Speakers' choice of Language used

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	51	21.4
No	55	23.1
No response	132	55.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

When asked if the public understood the conversation with the choice of language used, 21.4% said "Yes", 23.1% said "No" while one hundred and thirty two of the total respondents did not respond to this question.

Table 4.6.11: Students' Meaningful Nigerian Language use Understandable by Listeners

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	106	44.5
No	55	23.1
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table is to understand if speakers believe they make sense with what they say to every listener when code-switching from English language to Nigerian languages or dialects, 44.5% said they "Yes" and 23.1% said "No", while 32.4% did not respond.

Table 4.6.12: How Students' make Meaningful Conversation with Nigerian Languages

	Frequency	Percent
By speaking in languages they understand	41	17.2
By relating and appealing to their local dialects and expression	72	30.3
Through the use of terms that are readily associated with the people	72	30.3
No response	53	22.3
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table above is an extension of the previous table and it seeks to show how speakers make-meaning to every listener when code-switching from English language to Nigerian languages

or dialects, and 17.2% said "by speaking in languages they understand", 30.3% state that, "by relating and appealing to their local dialects and expression", 30.3% said, "through the use of terms that are readily associated with the people", while 22.3% did not respond.

4.7 Students' Nature of Code-switching (Language Alternation) in Nigerian Universities

Language alternation describes the alternating use of two recognizable grammatical systems; two "languages" in some sense of that word. Where language alternation concerns linguistic form, code-switching concerns the contextualization of communication. Code-switching is seen as the use of language alternation or of code choice (that is, deciding to speak one language rather than another) in order to contextualize an utterance.

Table 4.7.1: Number of Times Students Code-switch

	Frequency	Percent
Never	59	24.8
Seldom	20	8.4
Often	28	11.8
Most often	131	55.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and thirty one students of the total respondents state they "most often" code-switch to Nigerian languages, 11.8% "often", 8.4% "seldom" switch to L_1 to make meaningful conversation, while 24.8% of the total respondents said they "never" code-switch at all.

Table 4.7.2: Context and Persons Code-switching is used (formal)

	Frequency	Percent
Friends	86	36.1
Colleagues	24	10.1
Course mates	26	10.9
Family members	29	12.2
Business associate	18	7.6
Cleric	8	3.4
No response	47	19.7
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Respondents' reactions were; 36.1% with friends, 10.1% with colleagues, 10.9% with course mates, 12.2% with family members, 7.6% with business associates, 3.4% clerics while 19.7% did not respond.

Table 4.7.3: Context and Persons Code-switching is used (informal)

	Frequency	**Percent**
Friends	96	40.3
Colleagues	41	17.2
Course mate	28	11.8
Family members	20	8.4
Business associate	8	3.4
Cleric	39	16.4
No response	6	2.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

For this category of people code-switching occurs while in an informal setting, and the respondents' reactions were; 40.3% with friends, 17.2% with colleagues, 11.8% with course mates, 8.4% with family members, 3.4% with business associates, 16.4% clerics while 2.5% did not respond. In order words, students prefer to switch to Nigerian languages in other to explain meaningfully in an informal setting.

Table 4.7.4: Avoidance of Code-switching

	Frequency	**Percent**
Yes	55	23.1
No	106	44.5
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table indicates that 44.5% of the total respondents admit they do not avoid code-switching, 23.1% agreed they avoid the use, while 32.4% did not respond.

Table 4.7.5: Daily Amount of Time Spent Code-switching

	Frequency	Percent
Never	64	26.9
Seldom	14	5.9
Often	92	38.7
Most often	68	28.6
Total	**238**	**100.0**

On the number of times in a day that respondents alternate between two or more languages, 26.9% said "never", 5.9% "seldom", 38.7% "often", 28.6% "most often" switch codes daily, in other words, we have more Nigerian students who spend more time code-switching between languages daily.

Table 4.7.6: Number of Times Students Notice when Code-switching

	Frequency	Percent
Never	71	29.8
Seldom	8	3.4
Often	108	45.4
Most often	51	21.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table shows that, 45.4% "often", 21.4% "most often", 3.4% seldom notice their code-switching, while 29.8% said they "never" notice when they code-switch.

Table 4.7.7: Number of Times Speakers Notice when others Code-switch

	Frequency	Percent
Never	24	10.1
Seldom	28	11.8
Often	118	49.6
Most often	68	28.6
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table indicates that, 49.6% "often", 28.6% "most often", 11.8% seldom notice others' code-switching, while, 10.1% said they "never" notice others' code-switching.

Table 4.7.8: Students' Ability to Notice and understand others Code-switching

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	155	65.1
No	21	8.8
No response	62	26.1
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and fifty five respondents (155) representing 65.1% said "Yes", 8.8% said "no", while 26.1% did not respond.

Table 4.7.9: Students Reason for Code-switching

	Frequency	Percent
Ease of Understanding	47	19.7
Ease of Explanation	67	28.2
Ease of definition	24	10.1
Ease of interpretation among the people	40	16.8
Better choice of words than the English language	41	17.2
No response	19	8.0
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This table was duplicated in order to hear students' opinion and the reasons why they code-switch, 19.7% said it is "easy to understand", 28.2% stated "explanation is easily done", 10.1% "easy definition of language lexemes", 16.8% agreed that Nigerian languages are "easy interpret among the people", and 17.2% said that, Nigerian languages have better choice of words than the English language for expressing meaning.

Table 4.7.10: Students usage of Nigerian Languages and English Language when Writing

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	110	46.2
No	51	21.4
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The data collected showed that 46.2% of the total respondents said "Yes", 21.4% said "No", while 32.4% of the total respondents did not respond. Undoubtedly, there is influence of

Nigerian language usage on the Standard English language in whatever context of usage as well as in students' writing.

Table 4.7.11: Views on the Effects of Code-switching on English Language Standard Expression by Linguistics Students

	Frequency	Percent
Very Negative	139	58.4
Negative	53	22.3
No response	46	19.3
Total	**238**	**100.0**

An open end question, requesting students' opinion/views on the effect of code-switching on English language and Linguistics students of Nigerian Universities, 58.4% said it is has a "Very Negative", and 22.3% said the usage has a "Negative" effect on university learners of English language.

Table 4.7.12: Effects of Language Alternation on effective Meaning-making in Speech and Writing of English Language Students

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	55	23.1
No	106	44.5
No response	77	32.4
Total	**238**	**100.0**

This shows that respondents' language alternation affects English language students meaningful conversation and their writing; 23.1% responded "Yes" and 44.5% said "No", while 32.4% did not answer.

Table 4.7.13: Effects of language Alternation on Students' Meaningful Conversation and Writing

	Frequency	Percent
It affects the original form of the mother tongue	106	44.5
It affects the standard nature of English language	132	55.5
Total	**238**	**100.0**

One hundred and Six respondents representing 44.5% said, "it affects the native language (L_1)", 55.5% stated that, the usage has "affected the standard nature of English language".

Table 4.7.14: Code-switching has affected Students Effective Communication with non-users

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	137	57.6
No	74	31.1
No response	27	11.3
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Student usage of code-switching has affected effective communication between users and non-users of code-switching, 57.6% of the total respondents said this usage has affected effective communication amongst users and non-users, 31.1% think otherwise, while 11.3% did not respond.

Table 4.7.15: Effects of Code-switching on Successful Communication with Non-Users

	Frequency	Percent
First language speakers find it difficult to be fluent and proficient	89	37.4
Second language speakers find it difficult to speak their mother tongues fluently and proficiently	89	37.4
Conflict choice on the use of semantics and the environment in which it would be spoken	56	23.5
No response	4	1.7
Total	**238**	**100.0**

The table presents students' responses on reasons why the use of code-switching has affected effective communication with non-users, and 37.4% said "first language speakers find it difficult to be fluent and proficient", 37.4% stated that, "second language speakers find it difficult to speak their mother tongues fluently and proficiently", 23.5% said, "there is conflict of choice on the use of semantics and the environment in which it would be spoken".

Table 4.7.16: Suggestions for Effective Meaningful Conversation between Users and Non-users

	Frequency	Percent
Other native languages should be standardized to make them formal	46	19.3
Native languages and Pidgin English should have comprehensive dictionaries for ease of consultation and interpretation	90	37.8
Code-switching should be restricted to informal settings	58	24.4
Strict adherence to standard English language learning in our schools and formal settings	40	16.8
No response	4	1.7
Total	**238**	**100.0**

Forty six (46) respondents representing 19.3% suggested that, "other native languages should be standardized to make them formal", 37.8% also recommended that, "native languages and Pidgin English should have comprehensive dictionaries for ease of consultation and interpretation", 24.4% said, "code-switching should be restricted to informal settings", and 16.8% suggested "strict adherence to standard English language learning in our schools and formal settings.

4.8 Motive-Determination Interview

This interview is a follow-up to the observations from the spontaneous verbal conversations. The interview is carried out much later after the initial conversation (observational) to determine from the respondents whether the meanings and switches in their utterances were done as a result of bilingual proficiency or deficiency, and below is a presentation of data collected on fifty (50) respondents:

Table 4.8.1: Motive-Determination Interviews with Fifty Students

Sn	Questions	Responses	F	%
1	What do you know about code-switching and semantics"? **Respondents said:**	• They have no idea of what the term "Code-switching means, likewise the term "semantics. • "Code-switching is when you are speaking in English and change to another tribe or language, while semantics means 'definition'". • "Switching another language when speaking English and then coming back to it, semantics means interpretation or definition or giving meaning to something". • "Speaking English and diverting to another language and coming back to English, semantics can be said or mean "definition" of something". • "One is in a conversation and speaks different languages, not really sure of semantics". • "For instance speaking to me in English and translates to another language or dialect the listener doesn't know that someone else understands".	33 2 4 1 5 5	66.0% 0.04% 0.08% 0.02% 10.0% 10.0%
2	Which word(s) or expression(s) do you use from your language and it the usage deliberate? **Respondents said:**	responses were basically exclamations: fear, surprise/shock, cry for help etc, although, when they don't want a third or more party to hear their conversation, a specific code (tag switching) is chosen in order to carry on the conversation: • "No" • "Yes"	20 30	40.0% 60.0%
3	What language(s) do you often speak? **Respondents said:**	• Yoruba-English and Tiv • Idoma-Pidgin English-English • Igbo-Pidgin English-English • Tiv-Pidgin English-English • Hausa-English • Pidgin English-Idoma-Tiv • Ufia-English	5 15 5 14 5 5 1	10.0% 30.0% 10.0% 28.0% 10.0% 10.0% 0.02%
4	What language did you first learn to speak before school age? **Respondents said:**	• Tiv • Idoma, • Igbo, • Hausa • English • Ufia.	22 8 4 4 1 1	44.0% 16.0% 0.08% 0.08% 0.02% 0.02%
5	What language(s) are used in lectures in school? **Respondents said:**	All these respondents agreed that English language is the only language used during lectures.	50	100%
6	What language did you eventually learn at the secondary school? **Respondents said:**	• Yoruba • Igbo • Tiv • Didn't learn any language • French	10 12 15 12 1	20.0%
7	Can you only speak English or only Nigerian languages, pidgin and is it easy or difficult?	• "they speak both because they are easy", • some said "English is kind of easy than the Nigerian language, because it's not my language" • "speak Igbo and English, although Igbo is easier"	22 3 4	44.0% 06.0% 08.0%

	Respondents said:	• "Hausa and English, but Hausa is easier than English", • "some also said both but then surprisingly very difficult" • "Pidgin (common), • French (quite difficult) • Nigerian language(s) (very often because of the nature of the environment), and maintained that "English is quite difficult to use because of the dominant languages in the context they find ourselves".	4 3 10 1 3	08.0% 06.0% 20.0% 0.02% 06.0%
8	Do you think switching languages is wrong? **Respondents said:**	• "Yes" Agreeing it is wrong to switch languages, • "No", because it is difficult to avoid the switching, • "Depends on the person in the conversation and the situation".	22 23 5	44.0% 46.0% 10.0%
9	Do you think code-switching is a sign of proficiency or deficiency in one or both languages? **Respondents said:**	• Students also think it is as a result of deficiency in English language that makes them switch to Nigerian languages, • It is the level of proficiency/ability in the language or dialects that makes speakers switch, • It all depends on the context/situation of usage.	33 15 2	66.0% 30.0% 04.0%
10	Which personality traits, if any, do you associate with switching languages? (Examples: witty, fun, outgoing, funny, friendly, creative, cool, not so intelligent, reserved, serious)	• "They have no idea", • "It is for friendliness and while being funny"	22 28	44.0% 56.0%
11	Do you feel including English in conversation signals that you are not Nigerian?	and all students said they do not agree that including English in conversation indicates that they are not Nigerian,	50	100%
12	How does code-switching relate to your identity as a Nigerian?	• "disagree that code-switching relates an individual to their Nigerian identity, • "it rather "helps in giving them a sense of belonging to other dialects/ethnic groups".	39 11	78.0% 22.0%
13	Does code-switching define you in any way?	Contradictorily, twenty two students disagreed that, code-switching define them in any way although sometimes in some places, while twenty eight students agreed this usage define their ethnicity or person.	22 28	44.0% 56.0%
14	In order for someone to consider himself Nigerian, does he or she need to speak The Nigerian languages, dialects, Nigerian English or pidgin?	"No" "Yes".	20 30	40.0% 60.0%
15	Do you feel code-switching can be associated with belonging to an "elite"?	• "Yes" • "No"	35 15	70.0% 30.0%
16	Do you see code-switching as something positive or negative about yourself?	• Students think code-switching sometimes has negative effects • Few think it doesn't.	45 5	90.0% 10.0%
17	Do you prefer Nigerian languages over Standard English to make sense in a conversation?	But then, thirty three students do prefer Nigerian languages over Standard English to make sense in a conversation, ten think otherwise, while a few thinks it depends on the environment one finds themselves.	33 10 7	66.0% 20.0% 14.0%
18	Do you think listeners understand your intended meaning when you code-switch?	• "They don't think so", • "Yes", • "Not always" and "it depends on who you are speaking with".	20 12 18	40.0% 24.0% 36.0%

19	How do you think monolingual Nigerian feel about people who code-switch?	• "they feel bad mostly when they don't understand the speaker", • "they don't know" • "the feel awkward especially when they can't understand" • "they feel the speakers' deficiency", (very few students had an idea of what "monolingual" means)	30 8 10 2	60.0% 16.0% 20.0% 04.0%
20	Do the languages you know have something to do with your socioeconomic position in society?	• "Yes" it does, in other words, if one is in a particular community and there is a dominant language, they are considered or accepted by the society, groups or associations with all privileges rendered if they are proficient speakers • "No" • Feel it occurs but sometimes.	30 15 5	60.0% 30.0% 10.0%
21	Do you consider yourself bicultural because of your use of English?	• "No", • "Yes".	39 11	78.0% 22.0%

4.9 General Discussion

The major findings of this study with reference to the ***Research Questions*** and the ***Objectives*** outlined in Chapter 1 are summarized as follows: The sample taken from the population was 250 students, but data collected was from 238 respondents (95 Respondents from *Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi* and 143 Respondents from *Benue State University*). The skew in the representation of the population according to all classes, questions on the questionnaire not answered, and the shortage of total distributed questionnaires were as a result of the difficulties faced in the field. This work examined the socio-semantic features of Nigerian university students' code-switching both in formal and informal context.

Now, with Nigeria being a multilingual society with diverse cultures and languages, despite the dominance of English as the language of wider communication nationally and globally, it is classified as disrespectful in some quarters for a young person to communicate in English with an elderly person; this notion encourages the constant usage of speakers' mother tongue, given that, speaking the mother tongue serves as a polite register, which however decreases the users' ability or competency of the country's official lingua franca. This tallies with Oseghale (2012) that, "...scholars of semantics are of the opinion that since English is spoken

in Nigeria as a second language; socio-cultural variables are bound to influence the variety of English spoken by Nigerians". In circumstances like this, a larger percentage of the Nigerian populace would prefer using their mother tongue in order to communicate meaningfully. Furthermore, the connotation is that there is greater predisposition to code-switch in the urban areas than in the rural settings; the rural competency influences the standard and official language in the urban areas.

Analysis of data on the psycho-physical variables shows that *gender, age and level of education* has no significant influence on code-switchers among students in the institutions, although the random distribution and response on questionnaire shows that, male respondents are more than the female. Meanwhile results on age differ from McClure's (1977) assertion, that age is an essential variable that influences language alternation. However, results on level of education corroborates Hoffman's (1991) opinion that, switching is a by-product of education, in other words, one's level of education does not influence code-switching, although to a degree, bilingual speakers would influence the switch. In this case, it was not as a result of the speakers' competency of both the Nigerian languages and English language, but that; some Nigerian students are incompetent users of English language, likewise level of education does not limit individuals' code-switching. On the other hand, location has a significant influence on switching between Nigerian languages and English language at the university communities. This affirms Romaine's (2000) opinion that, because there is a convergence of different ethnic groups in the urban areas, there is the tendency for code-switching to be used frequently and functionally.

The *domains of discourse* (registers employed in a conversation, codes for a topic, language choice) and *pragmatics* (language use and context of usage), *language use* (languages in users' repertoire, topics and relationships between communicators) and *meaning-making* (meaning assigned on a code for a specific territory of usage) has a significant impact on the Nigerian university students in the study areas. This indicates that, topics, situations, settings/location, context of usage does not necessarily limit students from choosing their competent or proficient code for interactions, and in this case, Nigeria's official lingua franca is not the first choice of code in their repertoire to interact. This finding agrees with the observation of Alfonzetti (2002) that speakers switch to the code they consider more appropriate for a given topic and/context; showing an extensive level of switching both in formal and informal setting while *'discussing academic issues with teachers'* and *'academic issues with course mates in classroom', 'academic issues with school administrators', 'during academic debates with fellow students'*, family discussion, friends and social gatherings conversations etc.

The analysis revealed according to the results, students agreeing that they find it difficult to make meaningful conversation in English language, with a 67.6% of the respondents agreed they use their Nigerian languages to express themselves better, and when asked why?, 44.5% said it is because of their level of *"proficiency in Nigerian languages than that of English language"* (in other word lower than that of their vernaculars), while 23.1% stating that, *"they have more lexical items of their proficient language in their repertoire"*. The long term code-switching user has high influence on the speaker or the user of Nigerian languages; all indications shows that, the duration respondents spent speaking and thinking in any of the

Nigerian languages in their repertoire is high with 67.6% of the respondents affirming *"they use languages or dialects to speak or think at least 1hour, 6hours or 24hours 7days a week"*.

In accordance to the data collected at the institution, students affirmed that they prefer Nigerian languages over English language in order to make-meaning in a conversation, and 70.2% of the respondents said they prefer Nigerian languages, stating clearly that, it is *"easily understood"*, 17.6% *"explanation is easy"*, 26.5% *"Nigerian language lexical items are defined easily"*, 10.5% *"language interpretation is done among people at ease"*, and many respondents arguing that, *"there are better choice of diction than English language words"*. The analysis further reveals the implication of usage of the Nigerian language and Standard English language when writing in whatever context, no matter the requirement, 46.2% of the total respondents agreeing it has a negative effect on their usage of English language, while 32.4% did not respond. Respondent further indicated that the switch between Nigerian languages and Standard English Language has a significant influence on them as students of English language, 58.4% said it is has a *"Very Negative effect"*, while 22.3% said the usage has *"Negative"* effect on university learners of "English language".

Further analysis on the nature of students' code-switching among Nigerian university students, particularly students of English Language indicated that 75.2% of the total respondents state they *"most often", "often" and "seldom"* code-switch to Nigerian languages to make meaningful conversation. The case study reveals that students encountered difficulties with the use of Standard English Language while interacting (both at formal and informal settings) and that listeners do not understand when they use the wrong choices of codes in a certain context. This reveals that, any meaningful conversation in Nigerian

languages is based on the context of the groups or association networks, that relate and appeals to their local languages or dialects with the use of terms readily associated.

4.10 Findings

The following findings of the study were further highlighted:

1. In regards to the frequency and rate of code-switching among students in Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi, code-switching is exceedingly prevalent in the area of study, thereby making formal code-switching inevitable. Indicating a decline in the use of Standard English language and students' incompetency of Standard English language and their inability to keep the languages apart in their conversations. In spite of the stipulations of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004) that the nation's Lingua Franca (BrEng) be the medium of instruction in media and education, there is an extensive use of Nigerian languages and English language in formal settings.

2. The analysis revealed that code-switching is prominent among students in this area as result of first the number of Nigerian languages in the students' repertoire, secondly the convergence of different ethnic groups in one academic environment who are also not L1 or L2 speakers of English. The other aspect according to the data presented, there is a high percentage of bilinguals or multilingual speakers of Nigerian language before learning or acquiring English language. Thereby making code-switching in informal context a life style and as result it becomes unavoidable in the formal situations. This implies that, the frequent usage of vernaculars, the multilingual nature of students and their inability to keep the languages apart, affects their better acquisition or learning of the required Standard English language.

3. In accordance to the extent of code-switching among students in this area of study, whether it is proficiency-driven or deficiency-driven; the analysis revealed that, code-switching is proficiency-driven (with Nigerian languages), in other words, the drive is as result of their competency in their Nigerian languages than English language and deficiency-driven (with the use of the Nation's official Standard language).

4. Influence of domains of discourse on code-switching in order to make sense is affirmed by the views of Maynard (1980), Holmes (1992) and Alfonzetti (2002) that, there are domains of language use that induce language choice. In essence, a change in speech situation brings about a change in language use. Students in these institutions affirmed that they most often and exceedingly switch to Nigerian languages in a verbal communication at certain domains and topics of discourse and pragmatics, language use, meaning made in whatever the setting, in this case, it is also high in formal situations.

5. The study also revealed that there is the influence of code-switching on the users of English language; alternating to Nigerian languages has become the better means to make meaningful expression among students, who do not minding if rules are violated. It is also pertinent to note that, according to the data, some students in these institutions find it almost difficult to make meaningful conversation with the use of Standard English language, 44.5% said it is *"because of their level of proficiency in the Nigerian languages than that of English language"*, while 23.1% stating *"they have more lexical items of their proficient language in their repertoire"*. Similarly, *"Nigerian languages features more specific words"*, and *"speakers have fluid relationship with these words*".

6. The preference given to Nigerian languages is higher than Standard English language in order to be expressively understood, 70.2% of the respondents clearly stating that, it is "*easily understood*", 17.6% affirmed that the *"explanation is easy"*, 26.5% stated that, "Nigerian language lexical items are defined easily", while 10.5% said *"language interpretation is done among people at ease"*, many respondents argue that, *"there are better choice of diction than English language words"*. 65.1% of the respondents further stated that, understanding is better when using the Nigerian languages against the Standard English language no matter the context.

7. The analysis reveals that most students are either bilingual or multilingual speakers of 'Nigerian Languages' in these institutions, which of course their L_1 and L_2 is neither English language.

8. There is a growing influence of code-switching on the society; since it would be okay to say that the urban area is a society, the university campus is a society (civilization, humanity, culture etc) of people with diverse ethnic groups all coming together to build up another community. This brings about choice of communication or relations, and the adoption of a particular language is necessarily accepted, but then, the Nigerian context approved an official (English language). Therefore, when about five hundred other ethnic groups converge in the same area with little or no ability to speak the conventional language required of speaker/users, people tend to use their competent languages in their repertoire, thereby bringing effects on the rules of language use around the academic environment.

9. The study also reveals that, there are no native speakers of English language (BrEng, the nation's official language) or as their L_2 language. In other words, they are rare native speakers of English language; meanwhile, students use these languages not only to make conversations but also to reason/think.

10. The data collected presents multiple effects abound code-switching Standard English language expression of English language students. The data collected presented the students' frequent switch to Nigerian languages from Standard English language, and showed that it affects their writing in whatever context; 46.2% of the respondents agreed they are affected, while 21.4% think otherwise. Respondents further expressed their views on the effects of code-switching on English language users, particularly English language students of Nigerian Universities; 58.4% affirming it has *"Very Negative effect (usage for meaningful conversation)"*, while 22.3% said the usage has *"Negative"* effect on university learners of English language.

11. This study also observed that there is a 'high-duration' code-switching in these institutions; with the duration spent by respondent to speak and think in any of the Nigerian languages in their repertoire; 67.6% of the respondents clearly affirming that, they use these languages or dialects for about 1 hour, 6 hours or 24 hours 7 days a week. This influence of language use of code-switching has a demeaning value on the approved language of media, education and formal situation of the Nigerian academic environment.

12. The concept of socio-semantics asserts a combination of social networks of people, culture, groups and association at all levels of the society, who develop and institute a code for expression of meaning in context, but when it becomes a dominant code in their

repertoire, they in-turn tend to use these codes in and around the academic environment. In other words, the social language use (code-switching) has effects on the academic society/environment; the behaviour of users also affects the language use within the society. The assertion that, social usage of language by bilinguals and multilingual speakers of Nigerian languages has effect on users and students of English language with a clear indication in the data collected in the study area.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Preamble

The primary objective of this study is to analyse the socio-semantics of code-switching among students and to find out the influences and effects of code-switching on making-meaning by presenting intervening variables of age, gender, education, location and domains of discourse, Pragmatics, language (meaning and alternation) on code-switching among students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria. This chapter presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

5.1 Summary

This research is an enquiry into the socio-semantics of code-switching features of Nigerian university students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State. The number of languages spoken in Nigeria is still not clear. For instance, (Osaji l979, Bamgbose 1971; Brann 1990) put the number at about 400 (Adegbija. 1991, 1989). The most recent speculation puts the number between 450 and 500 (Omodiagbe, 1992 and Adegbite 2010 cited in Ayeomoni, M. O., 2011). Undoubtedly, there are many languages in Nigeria both indigenous and foreign that exist side by side. These languages are assigned different roles or functions depending on the domains and occasions of usage, consequently, language use situation in Nigeria is different from what obtains in other monolingual, bilingual and multilingual countries where language is used for all activities.

The central aim investigated how a network of elite, students in universities, well-read bilinguals/multilingual and most of all, students of English Language in Nigerian universities alternate from English to vernaculars, NPE, NE, in everyday formal/casual conversations, and how their choice of language relates to their social identification and expression of a meaningful conversation with the major focus being the classification of the linguistic, social functions and influences of the variable users on the standard expression of English Language. It also examined whether students' of the selected area of study place more emphasis on code-switching to make meaning while in a social or formal situation, and if these codes are usually the only options during a conversation or it is the societal agreement to code-switch.

The study also looked at journals, articles, thesis and dissertations, books etc, in order to support and relate works to the study and enhance the presentation of data collected at the study area. The progressive growth of this social trend for communication/interaction by code-switching towards enhancing semantic expression provides an informal representation of knowledge, based on the standard conventional meaning of a language chosen for the context's expression. Scholarly works unveiled concepts that propose an approach for knowledge representation of language usage meaning in social context, similar to semantic presentation that builds semantic relations, cognitive sociolinguistics and language concepts, through a direct or indirect arrangement consisting of language varieties for conversation even as bilinguals and multilingual. For the purpose of this study, several interdisciplinary theoretical frameworks were employed in order to discuss 'socio-semantics of code-switching'; a mixture of Fishman's (1972) "Domain and Topics" analysis, Labov's (2006) "Quantitative Paradigm" analysis as well as the Semantic Model of Conversational Code-

switching by Gumperz further modified by Auer (1984). The section also presented written of works related to this study, and such aspects that are covered in the chapter are; *Socio-Semantics, Sociolinguistics of Semantics, Registers and Diglossia, Code-switching/Code-Mixing, Semantics and Social Semantics, Language and Semantics, Domains of language use, Semantic Network, Pragmatics and the Semantics of Code-Switching, Discourse and Semantics of Code-Switching, Code-Switching, Code, Code-Switching in Nigeria Context, Reasons for Code-switching, Code-Switching and its Tenets, Code-Switching in Nigerian Universities, Theoretical Framework.*

The research design combines aspects of qualitative and quantitative analysis descriptively statistical tools such as frequency distribution, tables and percentages. The components of design allows the researcher to rely on codes, varieties, languages and dialects used in code-switching with English Language alongside by students of Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi and Benue State University in relation to their expression of meaning as related to the study of 'socio-semantics in code-switching (sociolinguistics).

From the analysis of the data, several deductions were made in concluding the properties socio-semantics of code-switching of Nigerian university students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi. That said, the analysis showed that, the frequency of code-switching among Nigerian university students and students of English Language in particular indicated that 75.2% of the total respondents affirming they “most often”, “often” or “seldom” code-switch to Nigerian languages in order to make meaningful conversation, while 24.8% of the respondents “never” code-switch at all. This frequency indicates that, the nature of code-switching among students in this area would diminish the

daily usage of Standard English language for meaningful interactions even at the formal settings.

The case study also revealed that students encountered difficulties with the use of Standard English Language in making meaningful conversation, and that listeners do not understand when they use codes in their repertoire. This indicates that, the nature of the confidence Nigerian language(s) native speakers have, with the ability to freely use these languages as a result of the preference over the Standard English Language and the context of usage is alarming most especially for English Language students. In other words they are proficiently driven speakers of their Mother tongue (L_1) or even Second language; most Nigerian languages in this case (L_2). The analysis also show that, students make meaningful conversation better with Nigerian languages by speaking in languages they all understand, and relating and appealing to their local dialects and expression, through the use of terms that are readily associated with a people. Speakers also prefer to switch to Nigerian languages in other to explain meaningfully in a formal and informal setting. Therefore, affirming the notion that social language usage has effect on the user of the Standard usage of English language as a result of the frequent usage of the ethnic languages in their repertoire.

5.2 Conclusion

The issues addressed in this study elaborated on the concepts of "socio-semantics" and "code-switching", the Nigerian students' language use based on users' proficiency or deficiency, the effects of switching on the conventional language user and the global lingua franca (English language), the influences of psycho-social variables of age, gender, education, location, domains and topics of discourse, pragmatics, semantics, language use on the code-switching

among students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture. It is therefore, agreed that the social language use affects the user of Standard British English, particularly bilingual or multilingual Nigerian languages speakers who are students of English language.

The rate of code-switching is relatively high among the respondents. The high occurrence of code-switching meant that the respondents were unable to keep both languages apart in their utterances. The percentages of proficiency-driven code-switching are by far higher than the percentages of the deficiency-driven switches. Even though this result was not derived from the observable participatory conversations, the ability of the respondents to give a Nigerian language equivalent of switched items in the motive determination interview triggered this apparent deficiency. On the other hand, age, gender, level of education, location of students significantly influences code-switching, with the urban respondents switching more frequently than their rural counterparts. Likewise, the domains of discourse, pragmatics, language use (semantics and code-switching) significantly influenced the students usage of standard English language, while higher rates of switching occurred at formal settings, an unimaginable occurrence of code-switching occurred at informal settings, these frequency has affected the proper usage of English language for effective meaningful expressions in whatever context is required of speakers.

The high rate and frequency of code-switching has become the better/best means for conveying meaning, in fact, it has become a norm even among the elite to code-switch in all types of situation/context. Tied to this is the fact that, rate of code-switching among students in BSU and UAM is extensively high, and that code-switching among students in the selected

case study is proficiency-driven (with Nigerian languages) and deficiency-driven (with Standard English language).

The domains of topics on the language use indicates the effects of social usage on the students' use of Standard English language in formal setting as result of the frequent code-switching; thereby making the act prevalent among the elite. It is concluded that code-switching is prominent among Nigerian students due to the diverse convergence of Multilanguage groups in one institutions and students' competency of more than one language. The influence of domains and topics of discourse on code-switching by students in the classrooms clearly shows language preference (based on their competency of the languages in their repertoire) over English language. It is also concluded that, socio-semantic (social, societal) implies social language code-switching affects the users' ability to use the conventional language in formal settings; indicated that, the societal or conventional language lexical items and rules of grammar of English language are not competently/appropriately acquired or learnt and frequently used by students, thereby losing the authority of the Standard English language in their repertoire for a meaning conversation. Lastly, not all individuals understand speakers when they code-switch, and some seem to respond awkwardly because they have no idea of the language or dialect spoken or that a listener is not a competent speaker of the conversation language base.

5.3 Contribution to Knowledge

This study has added a considerable value to the field of linguistics, sociolinguistics and semantics and the nature of language use in Nigeria with particular emphasis on the language use of Nigerian university students and meaning making. This work highlighted the features

and linguistics performance of Nigerian University students of Benue State University and Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State, and a clear indication that Nigerian university students' code-switch inappropriately in order to express themselves meaningful at formal settings or domains and topics that required Standard English language usage. Amid this, findings revealed that the nature of code-switching, frequency of code-switching by students both at the formal/informal context shows that, English language in Nigeria has little or no native speakers of Standard English Language (Br.Eng).

Also, the aim for communication, conversations are violated, when speakers find it impossible to make meaning with the use of Nigeria's approved standard language for formal settings, as well as making it impossible for listeners to understand the language expression. Therefore, this study contributes to the contemporary studies in the field of sociolinguistics and semantics, indicating that scholars, teachers, well-read bilinguals, linguists and professors of English language in Nigeria code-switch with students within the academic environment (particularly English language Students), thereby given room to learners' frequent switch of codes both in formal and informal context, which of course has made scholars, sociolinguists, psycholinguists to view most bilinguals or multilingual speakers who code-switch as an ability and not as a result of their inabilities/incompetency of the Standard English Language when they fluctuate from English to vernaculars, NPE, NE etc., in order to express themselves meaningfully and better.

5.4 Recommendations

Consequent upon the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are made to English learners, language teachers, language researchers and associations in order to address

the problems arising from social and conventional language use as result of code-switching by Nigerian university students.

- Code-switching should be restricted to informal settings.
- Strict adherence to Standard English Language learning in our schools and formal settings.
- The study recognized that there are competent bilinguals and multilingual speakers of Nigerian languages and incompetent English language Students among the respondents, it is expected that the findings of this study could be a wake-up call for those who cannot make sense with the use of English words/sentences.
- English Language learners could be inspired to use code-switching as a communicative alternative for specific functional ends.
- It has been noted that language constitutes impediment to success in knowledge acquisition. The findings of this study should encourage all subject teachers to functionally use Standard English language to teach and discuss outside the classrooms in order to boost students' confidence of the standard usage of the language even as a subject.
- In spite of the stipulations by Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004) that English Language be the medium of instruction in media and education etc, there is an extensive use Nigerian languages and English languages in formal settings combined with the rate of usage in an informal context, which leads to a switch input in the memory of the students, thereby making it a norm. Therefore, a restriction should be stipulated and enforced, most especially for English language students, when they

have acquired the knowledge and have the ability to use the standard language for its purpose, the restrictions can be removed.

- Nigerian parents and teachers who are parents should endeavour to ensure that, children are bilinguals, and English language is the child's L_1, thereby creating another generation of native speakers of English language as well as bilinguals of Nigerian languages.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Study

From the findings and limitations of this study, the following suggestions are made for further study:

i. A linguistic analysis on the socio-semantic effects of code-switching in Nigerian universities.

ii. Study on the manipulation of social variables on English language users among speakers of other Nigerian languages and their acquisition of English language.

iii. Examination of the type of code-switching and why it is mostly used by categories of students based on the psycho-social variables of age, gender, location and institutions or level of education.

iv. Although, as Nigerians we harbour so much pride in our languages and dialects as well as cultures, Standard English language is a language that empowers a majority; therefore, studies should be carried out to establish how English language can empower Nigerian language bilinguals.

v. Further study should be carried out to figure out why it is almost impossible to have near native or native speakers of English language in Nigeria.

vi. Meaning-making is the aim of language use, if students or users of language don't have proficiency in English Language, whose fault is it? Therefore, studies should be carried out on university teachers of English language, to understand why they prefer to code-switch when interacting with students outside classrooms.

APPENDIX I

Corpus recorded Conversations of Students both in Domains and Topics, Situation and Context, Formal and Informal settings in the Institutions of this study and around it: RANDOMLY RECORDED CONVERSATIONS ARE PRESENTED BELOW

Conversation One

A: Kate, I don dey go lecture ***imesiakwaa imechie uzo*** (Kate, am off for lectures, when you are through, close the door)

B: Nne, ***chogodorum some money before you go dey go na*** (Nne give me some money before you leave)

A: ***Abeg, you too de beg money. walu***. (You are always begging for money. Take)

B: Thanks. ***Onya ka m ji ekwu maka gi, we get lecture fa***. (Thanks. That is why I always talk about you. We have lectures right now)

Conversation Two

A2: ***Or ne, e er ne na?*** (O boy/Guy how far?), Dude, what's up?

B2: You have exams this afternoon?

A2: ***Dey pray for me o*** (Be praying for me o), it's Grammar

B2: ***You dey fear?*** (Are you scared?)

A2: ***kai, ka moo wan u aondo?*** (Eh! Is it I the child of God?), ***I dey pass in Jesus name*** (I would do well in just name)

Conversation Three between an Admin Staff and a Student

A3: Show me your school fees slip

B3: ***Or tamen***, sorry sir, ***m hugu shin ya***, (senior man, sorry sir, I forgot it at home), M ***zambe,*** sign ***moo kwagh shon, kpegh tsa meh va mi*** (Please, sign the thing for me, tomorrow I would bring it)

A3: You this girl, leave my office, ***du wegh ke woon yor!*** (Go outside)

B3: Sir, ***m zambe wegh ga*** (Sir, I am pleading)

Conversation Four between Students in their Classroom

A4: I did not submit my assignment and ***m soo yongu e kwase la ga fa!*** (I did not submit my assignment and I do not want that woman's trouble)

B4: ***You go lose ur mark fa*** ((NP) You will lose your mark), go and beg her. You fit get luck, ***she go accept am*** (You may be lucky, she may accept it)

A4: Toh, make I come dey go, just de pray for me, Aondo a wasem! (Let me go, just be praying for me, God help me).

Conversation Five between Classmates

A5: ***Person no see you for class yesterday*** (NP). ***Kwagh er lu ga gah?*** (Nobody saw you in class yesterday. Is it well?)

B5: ***I no know weda na Ebola sef***, throughout yesterday I was so feverish, ***I bin no even fit eat*** (I do not know if it's Ebola, throughout yesterday I was so feverish, I couldn't eat)

A5: ***Lu kela weh tswen, de van kyuwa moo ga, before I get am from you*** (NP), ***but serious you don go see doctor*** (NP). (Please don't come near before I get it from you. But have you gone to see the doctor).

B5: ***You dey craze, na from medical centre I just dey come for this yeye class*** (NP) (I am just coming from the Medical centre for rubbish lecture)

A5: Sorry, Aondo a wase o, meanwhile, tu ma nya, or inglishi u ka lamen se ugwan ga ne va ver (Sorry, God help you, meanwhile, sit down, this English man, who speaks and we can't hear has just entered)

Conversation Six between Students Playing Basketball

A6-1: Guy, ***na we game be this o!***

B6-1: Guys, lets give them the D (defence) they have never seen)

A6-2: ***Abeg, comot from road***, I don't need it….

A6-3: ***Orne, naam ball, degh liam joor*** (This man, give me ball, stop talk joor (Yoruba exclamation))

B6-2: Hehehehehe, they are already fighting themselves

B6-1: Stop laughing; let's make it more difficult for them

A6-3: *(shoots the ball, and scores)* ***ser ba ser fa liam ga yor*** (we that don't know how to talk), we just keep scoring

Conversation Seven between Students during a Lecture

A7: ***or ne, u ugwa bute*** lecturer a lu orlun jeh? (This man/Guy, you heard the English this lecturer is speaking at all?)

B7: ***Wetin him bin dey talk that time? (NPE)*** (What was he saying at that time?)

A7: ***shen a ahir kwagh u*** Politics ***la….*** (when he started about politics)

B7: wait, ***pine un ga, moom soo ugwan*** lectures ***ne***, ***make I listen na***, later (Wait, ask him, I want to listen to the lectures eh, later)

LEC: Stop disturbing my class ***weh wan kwase ne***

B7-1: Sorry sir… excuse me sir, you said something about semantics… ***em em em, m zua kwagh u lu orlun gah*** (em em em, I didn't get what you was saying)

LEC: Of course, why would you? Besides, ***u lu elen liam gah?*** (were you not making a noise?)

B7-1: No sir, I was asking my ***friend to tell me (NE)***

LEC: what?

B7-1: ***m lu pinen boki wan megh a wasem pesan!*** (I was asking my friend to help me explain)

Conversation Eight between a Student and a Physician

Doc: (On phone speaking in Yoruba language)….*hung up the call and turns to the patient*

A8: Ekaro o sir

Doc: What is your name?

A8: Tolu

Doc: From which hostel?

A8: Block B

Doc: What is wrong with you?

A8: ***Oga, good morning ko!***

Doc: Good morning

A8: ***Mo ri iranlọwọ te fun roommate mi*** (I saw the help you have given my roommate).

Doc: Okay.

A8: Thank you. ***My body been don dey pain me since*** and I feel dizzy.

Doc: Okay.

A8: ***I shiver***
Doc: What about nausea?
A8: Sir, I don't understand, ***my body just dey shiver*** and when I walk, I feel dizzy, like I will fall.
Doc: Anything else?
A8: Lack of sleep.
Doc: We like to hear from the patients', so we will know the right thing to do. May God heal you!
A8: Amen
Doc: Okay, what I can see now is that your blood pressure has risen a bit. Do you know you are hypertensive?
A8: I know
Doc: How old are you? Because, the problem with hypertension is that it is not something that just heals once and for all. No, it does not heal completely. You can only take drugs to manage it. Anyone who is hypertensive needs to come to the hospital regularly so that the B.P can be checked and monitored. So that whenever it rises, then drugs will be given. Plus, you have to sit with a counsellor, because, you look too young to be having this issue.
A8: *(Silent)* 24 years old doctor
Doc: Do you understand?
A8: Yes.
Doc: What about sleep?
A8: I don't sleep. That is why I brought the drug you gave my roommate, yesterday, I was really disturbed me, so I took her medicine, ***no be the drug dey cause the trouble ko***?
Doc: (*Shocked)* you took her drug!!!
A8: Wait, let me show you
Doc: So without a doctor prescribing the drug, you just took it?
A8: It is the one that the she too brought
Doc: But it is not yours and you took it!
A8: That is why she told me to come with it so that you will see. ***If you say make continue take am, then I go…. and if you say make I stop, I go stop***.
Doc: Okay. Now I am saying you should stop taking it because it is not yours and it can cause additional problems. Please, stop taking drugs that are not meant for you.
A8: Okay. Wait, ***my body dey always dey weak both day and night***
Doc: We will do a blood test now. After then, we will know what is wrong.
A8: Truthfully ***doc, the way dis body dey shake, e dey fear me***.
Doc: Don't worry about that. By God's grace, you will be healed
A8: Amen. But doctor, ***I fit collect ur number,*** call you even when ***you no dey work, make I fit see or*** tell you what is happening?
Doc: NO!

Conversation Nine between a Student and a Physician

Doc: You are welcome
A9: ***Aondo a lu awe didoo*** (May God be with you well)
Doc: ***weh kpaa!*** (And you too), ***Lam zua butei?***
A9: Toh, weh soo ya

Doc: You can sit down. You are Terwase Jennifer right?
A9: Yes
Doc: So, what is your problem?
A9: I don't feel well, ***mgu fan tyio u yan kwagh ga*** (I am finding it difficult to eat something)
Doc: Okay, English please, are you not a student?
A9: Yes, I am, okay. Since last week, I usually feel cold in the evenings
Doc: Okay, you feel cold?
A9: Yes, I usually feel very cold and feverish with headaches.
Doc: Okay, do you vomit?
A9: Last night, I vomited many times, ***but since I never chop, I never vomit and***... (NPE; but since I have not eaten, I have not vomited and….)
Doc: so when do you feel feverish?
A9: In the evening
Doc: Okay, do your body get very hot?
A9: Yes
Doc: What about your stomach, does it ache?
A9: Yes, it aches
Doc: Does the stomach feel swollen?
A9: No, it doesn't
Doc: Do you purge?
A9: I no dey shit, but ka gba suwan je….
Doc: (interrupts again) is urination painful?
A9: No
Doc: Your body, is there weakness?
A9: I don't feel well, I feel weak
Doc: So have you taken anything?
A9: Medicine?
Doc: Yes
A9: Yesterday, I did not take any medicine and I...
Doc: *(Interrupts)* What about the day before?
A9: The day before yesterday, yange mma chi kin hol (took some cold drugs), kpaa (but), there was no change
Doc: Okay. I will just write some drugs for you but you also need to do some tests to be sure.
A9: Okay, thank you
Doc: Thank God *(calls out to nurse, while speaking Yoruba)* Jọwọ, rii daju o gba yi oloro, yi ọmọ ti bar gbogbo eniyan mo wọn ede (Please, ensure she collects this drugs, this children that thinks everyone understands their language)

Conversation Ten between Students Playing Card Game

A10: Uhh hu! ((Breathy sound stimulating the game)) "Come on!"
F10: **Ṣe Diamond ni? ("Is it diamond?")**
G10: "Yes!"
I10: **"It's the only diamond that I…"**
B10: "Well, my apprentice…"
F10: "Yes, ohun ni ... (yes, **that is**…)
A10: oh! "**No**, I'll get him!"

I10: **"**It's serious because there is (.), there is (.). No, don't bother."
G10: "No, there are two left. If there was one ( ) and the party is over."
TR: Oh! "Oh, excuse me!"
I10: Eh, Dogo? (Name given to the researcher by his friends)….
TR: "Ah, how are you?"
F10: O tojo meta ("**Long time no see**!")
G10: "**How are you doing?"**
TR: "**Very well, *I just dey entre town few days ago*** (I just go to town few days ago)."

(*Starting another game)*

F10: "Spade!"
G10: **"Pass!"**
B10: "If it were not for bastardy, how dare he say it?"
F10: "Why shouldn't I say **spade**?"
B10: "When it's your turn, say, we'll make fun of him."
E10: "What did he say?"
G10: **"Play spade!"**
E10: "Bastard!"
C10: **"**Barry**, did** you **win?"**
B10: Wai! "Yes!"
C10: "Have you got much?"
B10: "**Well**! Yes, we have!"
F10: Ẹ ki á ka! Ẹ ki á ka! "make we count am! Let's count it!"
D10: "I've just **played!**"
G10: "He has just … **It's his first game."**
D10: "**It's not our first game."**
B10: Hey… "Hey, stop talking! Stop! **Thirty one, thirty five, forty, fifty, sixty, sixty two**…"
G10: "James … you sat to replace Bolaji!"

(*Starting another game)*

G10: "Ah, go on!"
B10: "I'll knock you down at once!"
G10: 4 One of the Cards games
I10: "If he says '**tout'**, slap in the face."
I10: "Did you say '**tout'**?"
B10: "He said it."
I10: **"**If he says '**tout',** slap him face (slap his face), you **kick** him, and then you **knee** him."
B10: "O. K., I'll **knee** him!"
E10: "Ukwa, play, hey!"
G10: "Yo, dogo (Tall), the day before yesterday (**ti a fe lọ sodo rẹ**) **we wanted to go to your place**; we called you and you said that (**o wà ni ibi igbeyawo**) **you were at a wedding."** (Addressing the researcher)
TR: ehn ehn! "Yes, yes!"
G10: "Club!"
I10: "Isn't it a **club** you have just **played?**"
B10: "You played **a jibiti kaadi** (a trick card.")
G10: "You also played **a trick card,** dog!**"**

C10: **"**It's the **diamond."**

B10: **rara, Ola, o ni Oga ti Diamond, ni ko si amfani ni ("No, Ola, you haven't got the ace of diamond, there is no point in)**

E10: **"**There is only one **club** in the **game."**

B10: "If only I had one **diamond**, and he played this way, I would drop this **diamond [...]**"

E10: **Ah, mo sobe (Ah, me, I also said it)**

I10: **e ma da le bi ni gbangba ọna** (Don't, Don't accuse him in the most ordinary way)

F10: "Tell me! Mo Iyanu (**I wonder)** how someone could get into your house and take your "foonu" (**phone)** under your head."

B10: "That moment he was crawling down like a lizard. (h) He was too busy that moment." "All the "olopaa" (**policemen)** that did the "iroyin" (**report)** in which they said. What did you **stick**? What did you **stick**?"

F10: Mo fe fẹhinti! mo gba fun! ("I have to retire! I give up!")

B10: Mo ti fi ọwọ mi sinu rẹ ("I put my hand into your insides!")

D10: "Really!"

B10: "You have never "di" (**stuck)** something and managed to pull yourself through it."

(*Starting another game)*

B10: te si waju! (Go on!)

G10: "It's alright! It's alright!"

D10: "It's alright!" Heh heh

D10: O da be! ("It's alright!")

F10: O da be, abi be ko? ("It's alright, isn't it?")

D10: O da be! ("It's alright!")

F10: O da be, abi be ko? "It's alright, isn't it?"

D10: bẹẹni! "Yes!"

B10: **A nta 'kaadi' ("We're playing 'Cent')** which card should you play?" One of the card games

B10: Taye? "Taye?"

D10: Haa! "Yes!"

B10: **Gbogbo awọn olopa alabojuwo ati awọn awakọ ṣe iwadi** ("All the police inspectors and the drivers did that investigation). They said that when the "foonu tin dun" (**phone was ringing)** your uncle was not sleeping. They said that he was not asleep at all! '**pe**' (so)

B10: Surely, Ask Taye, he is the one who knows, because, I think he asked his aunt (.) Taye asked his aunt about the issue; " *anti re si fun ni gbogbo iroyin itan naa*" (**so** his aunt actually told him the **report** of the whole story)

B10: "Someone is knocked out. Didn't I tell you since then?"

E10: "Play **club** so that they ***dashi wa lo ...*** (**dash** us **off** ...) Hehehehehe

B10: "God damn you, ***Diamond ni, agbaya, Diamond ni*** (it's **a diamond**, big idiot**, a diamond**!)

E10: "Ọmọ ale"! (Bastard!) Hehehehe

G10: "It's for Ola."

B10: ***Mo ní nkankan lati sọ*** ("I had nothing to say)

B10: **"**What ***ki lon ta?*** (what **are you playing?")**

G10: "We play **'cent**'."

B10: **"**Abdul**,** I respect you. There is a person here that I am going to slap if you don't talk to him, ***ohun ti o ni lati se ni ye. Nje o gba mi bayi?*** (**That's what you had to do. Do you get me now?)**

C10: ***"Bẹẹ ni, oto lo so."*** **("Yes, you're right.")**

I10: ***him no want make we win the game***, na (he doesn't want us to win the game, egoistically)

B10: ***"....as soon as he won, o si gba gemu re je! Abdul o se dada ti oko lati fun ni mewa yen". O ti...*** **("He spoiled his game. Abdul, you are not right in refusing to give him the ten. He has already....** As soon as he won**, he dropped the ace of diamonds.")**

D10: **"No, e no mata (no, it doesn't matter)."**

B10: ***" bayi, ni owo re,*** *in your hand*.... **(So now**, in your hand …")

C10: "***bẹẹni*** (Yes!")

B10: "You had only clubs left."

C10: "***bẹẹni*** (Yes!")

B10: **"*ki lo fe se,* wetin him go do? Wetin him go do?** (So, now, what should he do? What should he do?")

C10: "I could get him nowhere."

B10: ***ki lo ma se ni sin yi? Kio da diamond naa pada lẹsẹkẹsẹ ...*** ("What should he do? He should immediately return the diamond…")

G10: ***Awọn kaadi naa temi ni*** ("The cards are mine.")

B10: ***"... ka pa awọn diamond to ku ati Oga ọkàn kaadi mo [...]"*** **(**"…that's to save the remaining diamonds with the ace of hearts […]")

(*Starting another game)*

D10: "Eh, president, ***na u turn to play*** (it's your **turn** to play.")

A10: "OK, fine! So, let's go on to this game!"

G10: "oya na (common, it's your **go.**"

A10: "me dey play? (Is it my **go**?")

G10: "na you choose the diamond! (It's you who chose the diamond**.")**

A10: I ask for am, ("I asked for (the **diamond))**, and it's my **go**, **so**, I am going to **play** this. It's my **diamond**."

A10: "Ah, tell us **the results!"**

F10: ***" mefa le logun si meji le logoji."*** **(**"Twenty six to forty two")

A10: "Come on, let's go on!"

A10: "He said spade. He said spade before you."

C10: **"No, no!"** ***na lie joor*** (it's not true)

A10: **"He said spade before you."**

C10: "It's the spade you have **stuck**."

I10: Hey, hey! "Hey, hey!"

C10: "it's the spade you have **stuck**'."

I10: "**Well**, hey, **the referee has to settle it."**

A10: "He really said spade."

G10: **"No, I said club."**

C10: "**He said spade, he said** '**coincé'."**

D10: "He first said **spade**, then he said '**coincé'."**
F10: Hey, Yoruba **simple!** Yoruba **simple!** Hey, play **simple spade! Simple spade!**
B10: "OK, fine! So, **let's play!"**
A10: **"He really said spade."**
B10: "Come on! (.) **Say something now.** What did he say**?"**
A10: **"He said simple spade. (.) Pass**!"
D10: **"**He said that it's **simple spade, you know."**
B10: **"So he said that you can no more say anything."**
D10: **simple! "He said that it's simple spade, so, he can say something."**
G10: "He said '**pass'**."
C10: **"He said 'pass'**
D10: **"So**, we forget it." (0.10)
B10: "Hey, calm down!"
F10: "What are we playing? Spade?
I10: **"That's the kind of cards that I don't check them."**
F10: Yoruba **"Ah, so …"**
B10: **"You have all the time to do so**."
I10: "**No, I was waiting, you know.** If my **co-player** won't say anything, I will **stick the game**, **you know. So, he had been"**
B10: **"That it is!"**
A10: **"**Your **co-player** said **pique."**
B10: **"But, he thought you would say 'pass."**
G10: "Yes!"
B10: "Now, he expected you to say '**pass**."
A10: "Actually, if he says '**pass'**, I will say exactly what I have."
B10: **"He really said it. He really said it."**
A10: "If he says '**pass'**, I will say exactly what I have."
G10: **"That's no problem."**
E10: "You tried to deceive these men, didn't you?"
G10: "Let's go on!"
B10: "He tried to lie. (.) Abdul also knows that he is a thief, that's why Abdul didn't accept."
C10: "I didn't say that."
A10: "Look!"
I10: **"No, it doesn't matter!"**
A10: "You **have already played**, that's why he has played the **heart**, **because ( ). Otherwise** he wouldn't play **the heart**, because for him you would beat."
G10: "I wouldn't, of course!"
B10: "Abdul really knows that he is a thief."
A10: "How much?"
C10: **"Thirty nine to forty five."**

(*Starting another game)*
B10: "He said diamond."
E10: **"He has already said diamond!"**
I10: "Who?"
A10: "Abdul said diamond."

C10: "**It's not good**, I am sure!"

B10: "Hey, don't waste your time, Abdul. **Only you and I got all the spades.** You have nothing to do but **plunge the ten of diamonds. That's all!** If he is interested in it, he will pick it up. If he is not interested, he will leave it for you. You should return it to him again. That's what I was telling you. **In case he needs it. If he doesn't need it, he leaves it. But you return the diamond again."**

E10: "Hey, you two have all the spades. **You play the spade for him instead of playing the heart.** That's what I said**."**

I10: **"It's very good."**

A10: "**Spades**, only we two got them."

I10: **"He said diamond, but is it certain that he has got all the diamonds?"**

A10: "So, so, so, you have begun, haven't you?"

F10: Yoruba**!** "Yes, my friend, **play!"**

B10: "Abel said that the **phone** was taken out of the pocket of his pants. That moment, the pants were as far as under his knees. He said that he was completely barelegged the moment when the **phone** was taken out of his pocket."

F10: Yoruba?] "Was it taken from the underpants?"

A10: "He said that his **phone** had been stolen."

F10: Yoruba? "Was it taken from the underpants or the trousers?"

B10: **"**Ask Abel. He is the one who knows, because **he is the one who got the information."**

F10: Yoruba …. (h) "His pants … (h)"

A10: "Please!"

B10: "As far as his nephew told me, when the **phone** was taken he had his pants on."

H10: Haah?

B10: "His nephew told me also at that moment he really had the pants beneath his knees [...]"

B10: "He said that he got this information from his aunt."

F10: Yoruba. "You know, it was found out in the street after."

F10: Yoruba. "The pants were then found out in the street."

A10: "So, they found the pants in the end."

F10: Yoruba! "Yes!"

H10: "That's where they found the pants?"

F10: Yoruba. "That's where they found the pants. And that's the very moment when they realised that someone had got into the house."

D10: "Hey, let's keep on **playing**, and stop bothering us."

F10: Yoruba. "Hey, you know, your uncle, your uncle is a bastard."

H10: Yoruba **"Diamond!"**

B10: "What did you say?"

H10: "I said diamnond."

F10: Yoruba**. "No, I prefer the heart, I play heart."**

B10: (phone rings, and he picks up the call): "Allo… peace upon you. **How are you? She is very well**, thank God!"

F10: **"**Ah, really, **it was too funny, honestly!"**

F10: Yoruba "They found you in bed, and took your **pants.** Moreover**, pants, anyway**, if you hang them, you better put them above your head."

D10: "Actually, I cannot understand that he is sitting here doing nothing but smiling. He must say something.

E10: **"**What you don't know, everybody is saying something, but he doesn't say anything. You really didn't understand. He has to **justify** himself."

Conversation Eleven by 2 Student Friends talking about a Author's book: Two College Students.

A11: Hey Jackie, how are you doing today?

B11: I am good! I just got out of my psychology lecture. It was so boring! I am glad I am done for the day. How are you doing? Did you just get out of class too?

A11: No, I have been out of class since early this afternoon, and I have been reading this new book I just bought. Have you ever heard of the author John Grisham?

B11: Yeah! John Grisham is a lawyer who has written a lot of books based on his knowledge and experience with the legal system like *The Client*. His books are very easy to read, and they give a lot of information on how the legal system works.

A11: Yeah, *The Client* is one of my favourite books! I love Mark Sway and Reggie Love, the two main characters of the novel. For an eleven-year-old kid, Mark is old beyond his years and so streetwise. John Grisham's special sense of humour has made his characters very entertaining and the book much more interesting to read. Have you read *The Chamber*?

B11: *The Chamber* is a pretty good book too. The story about a grandson who tried to save the grandfather he has never really known gave me an insight on how the legal system works in the case of capital punishment. This story was somber, and it was written in a more serious tone.

A11: John Grisham really knows how to adapt his writing style to each situation. That is probably one of the reasons for his success.

B11: John Grisham's success is an example of the importance of education. Even though his parents were poor and did not have a decent education, his mother put a lot of emphasis on his education and pushed him to go to college.

A11: I have to agree with you on that. Education is one of the best tools to achieve success in life. That is the reason why we are still in school, right?

B11: Right. But, why the sudden interest in John Grisham, Lisa?

A11: Well, I read his first book, and I found it very interesting. So, I kept on reading his books. I already have a collection of all his work.

B11: He has written at least twenty books. Did you read all of them? Did you have that much free time?

A11: No, I only read his legal fiction books. I have not touched any of his non-legal fiction or his non-fiction books.

B11: I see that you are very interested in learning about the legal system.

A11: Yes, very much. I find it fascinating. However, it's not enough to change my major from psychology to law yet.

B11: Maybe you should follow John Grisham's example. He is a lawyer, and he writes novels about the legal system. You can finish your studies in psychology, and then write novels based on your expertise in psychology.

A11: That is a good idea. However, do you think I am creative enough to be able to weave all sorts of stories like John Grisham? That would require a lot of talent, and I do not know whether I have it in me.

B11: You never know unless you try. Anyways, people say, "where there is a will, there is a way," right?

A11: And, there is also writer's block. Those moments when you sit in front of the computer, ready to put your story in writing, and yet, your mind is completely blank. You keep on trying and trying, and nothing comes. I mean, absolutely nothing.

B11: Still, you never know unless you try, Lisa. Oh, it is almost 3 o'clock! I need to run, or I will miss the bus. See you later, Lisa!

A11: Bye, Jackie! Talk to you later!

The Conversation Twelve between a Doctor, Patient, Record Officer and Nurse

A12: Good morning, I suppose see doctor this morning.

B12: Make I check if you fit see doctor now, please write your name and sign, then sitdon.

C12: Avese Tyoor.

A12: ***Na me o*** (that's me).

C12: ***Va ser yem*** (come lets go), ***U soo negen a*** doctor, ***ka nyi kwagh e elu***? (you want to see the doctor, what is wrong with you?)

A12: I have been feeling tired, and ***tyoo ka ki nanedem kpishi, ma shi ka myian ambi kpishi*** (I have had really bad headaches and an upset stomach). On top of that, ***I dey cough every time*** for two weeks now (I have had this persistent cough for the last two weeks).

C12: When did you start having these symptoms?

A12: ***e bin don start for the past two months sef (***I started about two months ago) a little bit after that the headaches….

C12: Are you taking any medications?

A12: ***na just vitamins o*** (Only my vitamins).

C12: What vitamins are you taking?

A12: multi-vitamin tablet….

C12: OK, let me take your vitals

A12: **Take my what?**

C12: **Don't worry, the doctor would check you instead….** Anyway, everything would be good, Please wait here for me.

A12: Thank you.

Doc: Good morning,

A12: morning Doctor.

Doc: I see here that you started feeling tired two months ago, and then you started having bad headaches. You also have had an upset stomach and a persistent cough. ***Did you have fever too?***

A12: No

Doc: Let me do a quick check up; please take a deep breath, hold your breath, and exhale, do it again please, have you changed what you often eat recently?

A12: ***I dey chop the same food I like morning and night*** I eat the same food I like, everyday.

Doc: Did you suffer from insomnia?

A12: **wetin be that?** (what is that?)

Doc: Do you sleep at night or you stay awake often?

A12: Oh, that is insomnia? Okay, ***e dey take time before I sleep for night sha*** (Okay, it takes lot of time before I fall asleep at night and ***I dey wake up plenty times for night*** (I also woke up many times during the night).

Doc: Do you drink and smoke?

A12: No.

Doc: It looks like you have pneumonia. Other than that, I do not see any problems. You are probably under stress from changes at work, and the stress causes headaches, upset stomach, and sleeplessness. For now, try to relax and exercise, it just may solve the problems. Come back to see me again if the symptoms persist, and I will do further tests. I am going to give you a prescription for your pneumonia. Are you allergic to any medications?

A12: Not to my knowledge.

Doc: OK, take this medication three times a day after you eat, while your blood is being tested

A12: ***I dey anxious*** (I am anxious) to know my sugar level. ***When I go get the result?*** (When will I get the results of the blood test?)

Doc: ***Result go dey ready in Two weeks*** (The results will be available in two weeks). Don't stress yourself. I think everything will be OK.

A12: Thank you, doc

Doc: Cheers!

Conversation Thirteen between 3 Students, Being Funny about Formal Speaking

A13: Girl, May I borrow your cell phone to call my mother after we finish lunch?

B13: Yes, of course, Jane. And please, do not forget to ask your mother whether you may go to the movies with us afterwards.

C13: could you pass the salt, please?

A13: Sure, here you are.

C13: And the pepper too, please. Thank you.

A13: You are welcome.

B13: Would both of you mind if I stop by Marcus bookstore on our way to the movie?

A13: No, not at all.

C13: I would love to look at our library new books selection. So, I would like to stop there also.

A13: Would both of you like to go the club tonight? Its weekend

B13: Maybe some other time. I need to be home by 5:00 o'clock.

C13: I can go with you if you want.

A13: That would be great. I need to pick up a gift for my brother. His birthday is on Sunday next week. What would you recommend, Mary?

C13: Just a moment please. Let me think. Maybe a fishing pole since he loves fishing?

A13: What a clever suggestion! My brother will thank me for the lovely gift. I hope there is a fishing store in the mall.

B13: I ordered too many French fries. Would anybody care for some?

A13: Yes, I would like some.

B13: How about you, Mary?

C13: No, thank you. I have enough food already.

A13: Babe, would you like some of my fried rice?

B13: Yes, please. Just a little bit.
A13: Here you go.
B13: Oh, that is enough! No more, please.
A13: did you remember to bring my Half of a Yellow Sun?
C13: Oh, I am sorry. I completely forgot about it. Could you call to remind me again tonight?
A13: Certainly.
B13: If you do not mind, may I borrow the book after you are done with it?
A13: I promised to let John borrow it after I get it back from Mary. You are welcome to have it once John is finished. John is a fast reader; he will finish it in no time.
B13: I, on the other hand, am a pretty slow reader. How long do you think I may keep it?
A13: I already read it. So, you may keep it as long as you want. Give it back to me at your earliest convenience.
B13: Thank you, Jane. That will save me some money.
C13: Are we all done? We should leave now to catch the next show; otherwise, we will be late.
B13: I am ready anytime you are.
A13: So am I. Shall we go?

Conversation Fourteen between a Student and Stranger

A14: Hi
B14: Afternoon
A14: You eat here often? Is their food nice?
B14: yes, maybe, I don't know, ***try am na***
A14: madam, food, rice and beans. ***Shey, na good option ko?***
B14: **yes, na wetin I dey chop na**
A14: What do you do for living?
B14: I don't understand the question.
A14: *which job u dey do or you na student too?* (What is your occupation or you are a student like me?)
B14: ***I be mechanic; I dey work for the garage just before you enter school, you get motor?*** **(**I'm a mechanic; I work in a garage just before the entrance of the school, you have a car?)
A14: A mechanic? You must do a lot of work and get very dirty, and earning good money.
B14: ***Yes, work dey plenty, everyday na work I dey also clean myself after work for long time. (***Yes, I do lots of work. Every day I fix cars and it takes a long time to get clean after work.)
A14: ***Ohmo, that na good thing o. How cars do you think you fix in a day?*** **(**That is really interesting. How many cars do you think you fix in a day?
B14: ***(****an aside****, which kain inglish or ne a luu lamen a moo ne?*** what kind of grammar is this man speaking to me?). ***Ok, na like seven cars I dey fix han ma yange*** **(**On average I probably fix about seven cars everyday).
B14: ***You sef, wetin you dey do or you na teacher for here?*** (You, what sort of job do you do or you are a teacher here?
A14: ***I no get job now yet o,*** (I don't have a job at the moment).
B14: why?
A14: I'm a student here learning English literature.

B14: ***wanda, ka kwagh e er ver u va lamen butee amoo je ne, thank you for the chat, me sef na student, but this your zua bute, I don taya. M gu or tiv, zua la ka u wam ga. Thank you for gbogbo liam, I have to go back work now, I have class later*** (No wonder that is why you came here speaking all that grammar for to me, I am also a student, but this your mouth English, I am tired. Thanks for the chat I have to get back to work now, I have class later

A14: ***Okay, but me no be tiv guy o, thank you….*** (Okay, but am not a Tiv guy, thank you….)

Conversation Fifteen between a Student and the Researcher

TR: Hey, hi, what are you doing here this early?

A15: Hi, King, ***me been just taya for caf*** (I got tired of sitting in the cafeteria), that's all. I have an hour break before this class, and I usually, spend it there... but it's so noisy today! Why are you here early as well?

TR: Oh, I always come in about now; it's ***kinda*** (slang: kind of) quiet now, I just try to go over my notes before class.

A15: ***Gee, no be you be the grand linguist!*** (Gee, aren't you the linguist!)

TR: I just find it's a good way to review and at the same time try to keep up with where this course is going. This literature class is too difficult for me. Why's the cafeteria so noisy? There shouldn't be many people there at three in the afternoon.

A15: There's a rally going on for the one demonstration. Wait, ***you been start with us for year one?*** (Wait, you started with us in year one), ***m hungu jii e moo meeti u la*** (I have forgotten where I met you).

TR: Not saying more than you already know, I don't know much about you either, by the way, demonstration?

A15: Yeah, Friday.

TR: Really? Against who or what? What's it about?

A15: Wait again, ***you be student for this school?*** (NPE: are you not a student of this school?), anyway, it's about tuition. It's about the tuition increase.

TR: Oh, yeah, the tuition increase is ***kinda*** (slang: kind of) high. They're holding a demonstration?

A15: ***wanda, or ne, shi u gu pine moo?*** (exclamation, this man/guy, you are still asking me?) or you don't even go around campus often? ***See posters dem posters for everywhere na*** **(**They've got posters plastered up all over the place.)

TR: No, I guess I don't. I just come in for this class and for….um… never mind. I didn't think this fee rise was such a big thing, though. It seems to occur for many years or so, in fact, regularly

A15: Well, I guess this one would just be the last time

TR: Why's that?

A15: Because, our economy is so bad. Students don't have any money; their parents don't have any money. ***Dem no fit de pay more fees for school now na*** (They just can't afford to pay any more for school right now).

TR: Let's hope that's so. We all are managing for years….

A15: You're working?

TR: Yeah, not really, but some little to keep me up, that's why I'm taking fewer classes and reasons you don't see me often

A15: ***Where be that?*** (where is that?)

TR: You need not worry about that!
A15: ***you no get problem na***, (you don't have a problem), since you have a little fees to pay, given, you're just taking those fewer classes!
TR: Ouch! I could protest for all of us, I guess. Are you going?
A15: To where, the demonstration? ***I dunno*** (I don't know). I've been thinking about it, ***but me not be person wey really fit carry*** placards with this my popular face….
TR: its turning into that is it; business of the show off?
A15: Seems like it, there are lot of people in the cafeteria, and they are kind of enthusiastic about ***the tin sef*** (the thing).
TR: Don't you think this might be just a student politics thing? Students are getting angered up, just for a few to get popularity and be angered up even the more?
A15: Oh, no doubt, no doubt, ***you sure sey you no dey enter this school often?*** (Are you sure you don't come to this school often?). Since ***you even get the idea of s***tudent government ideology ***sef***?
TR: But… it's hard times, we all get it, but how do we influence our economy?
A15: Oh, I'm OK! Oh yeah! ***Money dey come from terlem*** (My money comes from my father)
TR: ***Una get bah be that na!*** (NPE: You must be rich!)
A15: (laughs) I wish, for the first time, ***you talk like naija person*** (NPE: you spoke like a true Nigerian person). No oo!
TR: Amen! Good for you!
A15: Yeah, I'm lucky and I've got enough to graduate, no problem. But a lot of others, they're not so lucky. Some of them are sure not going to be able to finish school!
TR: What time is that protest?
A15: I think it starts at four, why? Thinking of going?
TR: (sighs) Yeah, I am, actually. I'd like to get a few more details first, because I have got some assignments hanging. Do you know where?
A15: Flyers and posters dey inside that cafeteria and over at the Student Union, and at some other places on campus, I guess. You could pick one....
TR: Yes, I think I would pass through the caf, but after this class.
A15: I'll go with you, if you decide to participate Friday, ***and after, you and me dey go club!***
TR: Club? Naah! But we could meet somewhere else first.
A15: And make out or what? (laughs)
TR: (Laughs) Maybe! Wow, the sarcasm huh? Anyway, it would be easier than to find you in the crowd, we could plan our escape if it gets too rough.
A15: ***Geez, you think sey e fit reach that level?***
TR: Oh, probably or maybe. But it's better to be safe than sorry.
A15: Yeah, I suppose so. Oh, here comes ***zua bute*** (English mouth)
TR: And I haven't reviewed my work. Talk to you after class.

Conversation Sixteen between Two Students in the Bus Stop

A16: In which class are you studying?
B16: I am in eighth standard, what about you?
A16: I am in ninth standard.
B16: Do you come to school by bus?
A16: Yes, I am travelling by bus. I have to catch Route No.24 bus.
B16: It has passed on just 15 minutes before.

A16: There is another bus at 4.45p.m.
B16: Who is he learning on the iron pole?
A16: He is a beggar. He is a trouble to the passengers.
B16: He seems to be blind.
A16: We must help the blind people.

Conversation Seventeen between a Patient and a Doctor at the Medical Centre

A17: Good afternoon
Doc: Hello, how are you?
A17: Fine sir.
Doc: Okay…. *(A nurse walks in and speaks in Tiv to the doctor)* **ahirde, kpaa e zuagh shuu la ga fa** (he is back, but they didn't find that fish). ….sorry o, just a minute *(Interruption)*
Doc: Sorry please, let me just get this done.
A17: Okay sir.
Doc: *(After some minutes)* Okay, yea, ***ehen***, how are you?
A17: Fine sir.
Doc: What is the problem?
A17: **v*angeh gu yoon moo***, for some days now.
Doc: Okay, which side exactly?
A17: *(Touching the area)* here
Doc: Noooooo… Nurse! *(calls out to nurse)* ***doctor u kwase gu around a***? (any female document is around?) Nurse: ***ehyi*** (No), Okay, ***assist moo hen*** (help me here). (To the patient) ***Ehen,*** but that is not your chest now, it's your breast. Your chest is kind of at the same place with your chest. Please show the nurse, let her feel it and tell me.
A17: But...
Doc: *(Interrupts)* madam, ***no remove your breast in front of me*** just like that, is it not there? *(Points to the area)* Madam that is not just your chest, that's your breast (speaks to the nurse, please what can you feel, **nurse**; nothing doc)
(Someone walks in)
Doc: *(To the patient,)* please just a moment
(The person leaves)
A17: ***Ehen***, please, I have another complaint, is it because [unclear] my stomach dey grow big?
Doc: *(Laughs)*, it's because you're eating too much or because you might be pregnant. You should go on a proper test and diet; eat at the right time and don't leave your stomach empty for too long.
A17: Eh? (Shouts) doctor, wetin you dey talk, pregnant? Okay, make we go check nurse
Doc: Yea

Conversation Eighteen between Students of an Organisation

B18: "u kibi wegh moom" for "or ne", u kibi wegh mom" for Musa, then u kibi the rest for mo". "You pay one month for this man, you pay one month for Musa, and the rest is for me."
F18: "As for you, ka kenken u kibi wegh u taa". "As for you, you must pay for three months."
B18: "Saa a duegh mi, u ashi la ka u wam" "It is to be taken out too, the rest is for me."

H18: You give a donation, ma u gu seghn mor. Wegh wagh kwagh shon hin wegh wam, and I handle it." "You give a donation, and then you laugh at me. You have to put it in my hand, and I handle it to him."

B18: Hey, u turdu share na from the cash ma na or ne, we will stick it after. "Hey, you cut his share from the banknote and give it to him, we will **stick** it after."

A18: Toh!, Ku mor gah? "Toh! Is it okay?"

B18: Tille, ver turndu share wo, ser si va nau kwagh shon. "Wait, they will cut your share, we'll give it to you."

A18: Ka mimi, alue weghn nau kwagh shon yo, it's finished", "**It's true**! If he has already given it to you, **it's finished."**

H18: eghi ngu a begh gah deh! He must put it into my hand, ka chivi jela. Egh n aver u soor u disgracing muu? "It's not **finished** leave it! He must put it into my hand, that's respect! Why do you put shame on me?"

A18: "degh liam, m zam begh" "Stop talking, please!"

H18: egh, egh, m soo ga, I don't like it! "**No, no**, I don't like it! I don't like it!"

F18: ver wan bastard ne from muu "Keep this bustard away from me."

H18: aho eh ka how much eh? How much did he say? Na unn change. aho eh ka how much wegh u du ke sha? "How much did he say? How much did he say? Give the change. How much did he say to take out of it?"

F18: ka shaa wegh moom "For one month."

H18: mbum ter! Naam change wam (swearword meaning: By God!) Give me my change."

C18: **Alright! "Alright!"**

B18: ser na ver gah! "We don't give it!"

H18: Egh na ver u soor naan mu kwagh shon? "Why don't you give it to me?"

B18: ser na ver gah. Why should we give it? "We don't give it. Why should we give it?"

H18: wegh, kaa nagh? "You, who?"

B18: ser, mzough. "We, the association."

H18: tyogh e faan kwagh woo ne yem memyoo? "Have you taken leave of your senses?"

F18: ehn! "Yes!"

H18: du egh kwagh waam… this thing, and give me the change. "Take out my ... this thing, and give me the change."

A18: Tyoohemba? Tyoohemba? an gbain u vesen, he is one of the sponsors hegn "Tyoohemba? Tyoohemba? Your uncle, **he is one of the sponsors, here."**

B18: ka mimi! "That's true!"

G18: ka nyi sponsor la? "What **sponsor** is that?"

H18: ka mimi! "That's true!"

A18: ka a na ser dubu u haa for many times, here. "He used to donate us two thousands for many times, here."

H18: **kwagh u m hor yoo… kwagh u m hor yoo, I only said that actually!** "**What I said is… What I said is**, I only said that actually!

F18: Eh, Tyoohemba? **Presiden**t, ka nyi kwagh u hor? "Eh, Tyoohemba? **President**, what did you say?"

B18: du dubu moom for when, dubu u taa u ashi la, put it in the funds. "Take **one thousand** for him, the remaining **three thousands**, you put it in the **fund.**"

F18: **Ah, toh! "Ah, OK!"**

J18: ka for anna u kagh wegh I duu dubu moom**?** "For whom did you say to take one **thousand?"**

H18: ka nyi e lu plobrem wogh? Musa and I, ka deri moom u na un gah? Three hundred is mine! "What's your problem? Moussa and I. (.) Isn't it one hundred that you give him? Three hundred is mine."

G18: eghi, share u Musa ka derri u haa. "No, Musa's share is two hundred."

H18: Musa hor kwagh gah… "Musa didn't say anything…"

G18: share u Musa ka derri u hua. "Musa's share is two hundreds."

H18: Musa hor kwagh gah, Musa hor kwagh gah, but I claimed. "Musa didn't say anything. Musa didn't say anything, but I **claimed."**

F18: Terwase? Terwase? U ka wegh e hi de e nau derri utan la gah u a remaining, shin ka nahan gah? Terwase? Terwase? You said to give you back the remaining **five hundred naira**, didn't you?"

H18: Naam wan tusand naira waam; (some money is coming back again), Naun! "Give me my **thousand francs**; some money is coming back again. Give it! Give it!"

E18: heh, wegh u kibi adashi ne gah? Haa ma or naan kibi, and you refuse to pay. "Hey, don't you pay your contribution? Everybody has paid, and you refuse to pay."

H18: Naam tuu tusand naira waam. Kuna sou ku e mu iskanci… "Give me my two thousand naira. You all want to play me (in Hausa)

2B15: Naun tsa u nege mo? "Dare you give it to him?"

B18: **ser fa tyor… ser fa tyor u yemen ehn? "Can we… can we leave?"**

C18: ser fa tyor u yemen gah "**We can't leave** yet!"

2B12: May?… May se n'o noo? "Whom? Whom are you giving my money?"

J18: ya che a bada wana dubu daya… "He said to give this man **thousand naira**…"

F18: heh, a hor ye, m na or ne naira dubu moom, m naa or geh negh la kpagh dubu moom, and put the remaining three thousands for him. "He told me to give this man **thousand naira**, to give that man a **thousand naira,** and to put the remaining **three thousands** for him."

H18: yari ki dubu utaa ki shi la, naam, mo meh da naaun (The remaining **three thousands,** give it to me, I will pass it to him.)

F18: Haah? heh**, heh!** "What? **No, no!"**

A18: between you and him**, or moom naan fa tyoo u wan zua gah, kpa, alue wen gu henya,,** he is the president of all**. "**Between you and him, **nobody can interfere; but, when he is here,** he is the president of all."

The Conversation Nineteen is between 3 People at a University having a Brief Conversation about a Friend wanting to Apply to the University.

A19: Good afternoon sir, how are you today?

LEC: Good afternoon, I am doing well and you?

A19: I'm great, thank you. This is my best friend Jane. She wants to apply to come to this university. She would like to ask you a few questions. Would you mind taking the time and telling her what process she would have to do, please?

LEC: Hello, Jane! It's a nice to meet you. I am very busy today, as I am going to class now for the next 3 hours. Can you come to my office for 9am tomorrow morning?

B19: Yes that will be no problem. Thank you for making time for me and speaking to me today.

LEC: Hopefully we will be seeing you at this university soon. See you tomorrow at 9.

Conversation Twenty between Students

A20: ***Dude, wetin dey na?*** (Pal, what

B20: ***Zaaki, e er ne na***? (Chief, how are you doing?)

A20: ***me fine o…*** (NPE: I am fine) ***you don finish*** (have you finished) that literature assignment?

B20: ***which assignment again na***? (which of the assignment again?) ***Orne, mo kwagh prose la, m fa un gah, so, m na or na wasem er len*** (this man, that prose thing, I don't know it, so, I gave someone to help me do it)

A20: ***Toh, moom yem vegh***, (Okay, I gone) you can't help me ***na*** (exclamation), ***make I dey go dey go help myself*** (Let me go and help myself)

B20: where you ***wan dey go so***? (NPE: where are you going to?)

A20: ***aaah, you don*** (ah, you have) forget ***sey we dey submit am for today class abi***!? (NPE: that we are submitting it in today's class!?)

APPENDIX II

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES

FACULTY OF ARTS

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY

QUESTIONNAIRE

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PREVAILING DEVIATION OF THE STANDARD LEXICAL, PHRASES AND SENTENCE MEANINGFUL EXPRESSION IN CONVERSATION WHILE CODE-SWITCHING BY NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS OF BSU & UAM.

INTRODUCTION

This questionnaire is to help in the completion of my academic research in partial fulfilment of the award of a Master of Arts (M.A) in English Language. This research questionnaire is to collect and analyze data on the semantic deviation and the ineffective communication meaningless expression when code-switching from Standard English language lexemes, phrases and sentences to Nigerian ethnic groups' languages by university students of BSU and UAM of Benue State while interacting and associations in whatever context.

Kindly respond honestly to the items in this questionnaire. Your honest response could guide today's learners of English language, linguists, language educators and curriculum planners about language use and educational interference/remediation for the Idomas, Tivs, Igedes, Itollu, Yorubas, Igbos, Hausas and English bilingual students in Benue State, Nigeria. Please respondents, kindly answer these questions with your discretion, as your information will also be treated with confidence. Thank you

INSTRUCTIONS

Please ticks (√) appropriately in the parenthesis provided and also please fill in the blanks where necessary.

SECTION A: Preliminary information on the psycho-social variables of age, gender, education, and location

1. Sex a) Male ( ) b) Female ( )
2. Age a) 18-24 ( ) b) 25-30 ( ) c) 31-35 ( ) d) 35-40 ( )
2. Faculty……Department……
3. Level of Education
   a) 100 ( ) b) 200 ( ) c) 300 ( ) d) 400 and above ( ) e) Masters ( )
5. Location:
   a. Name of Institution……
   b. Town where the Institution is located……
   c. Local Government Area where the Institution is located……
   d. Senatorial Zone where the institution is located a. North b. East c. West
   e. Are you a campus resident student? a) Yes ( ) b) No ( ) If No, where? ……

SECTION B: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching

Code-switching is the use of several languages or dialects in the same conversation or sentence by a bilingual person. It involves the use of lexical items or words in the languages; code-switching is a situation where the speaker deliberately changes a code being used, by switching from one to another. It involves the movement, whether psychologically or sociologically motivated, from one discrete code (language or dialect) to another within a communicative event.

	I switch Tiv, Igede, Idoma, Ittolu, Igala, Jukun, Igbo, Yoruba, NGE, NPE, Broken English, Hausa etc and English in my verbal communication at these informal settings	Most often	Often	Seldom	Never
1	When discussing family issues with my parents at home.				
2	During my leisure times with friends at social gatherings				
3	When telling stories to nephews/nieces at home.				
4	During games at school with course mates.				
5	When discussing with sports coaches during games at school.				

6	When planning birthday parties with families at home.				
7	When discussing academic issues at home with brothers and sisters.				
8	When I go to the supermarkets to buy things.				
9	When discussing issues on culture with relations at home.				
10	When I go to seek religious advice from a Priest/Pastor/Imam outside the place of worship.				
11	When discussing health matters with the college doctor/nurse in the clinic.				
	I switch Tiv, Igede, Idoma, Ittolu, Igala, Jukun, Igbo, Yoruba, NGE, NPE, Broken English, Hausa etc and English in my verbal communication at these formal settings	**Most often**	**Often**	**Seldom**	**Never**
1	When discussing academic issues with teachers in the class room.				
2	When talking about academic issues with course mates in the classroom.				
3	When discussing academic issues in the school with school administrators.				
4	When discussing health matters with the college doctor/nurse in the clinic.				
5	During academic debates with fellow students in the school.				
6	When discussing academic development with guidance counsellors at school.				
7	When discussing academic growth with the academic advisers at school				
8	When discussing issues on divination with Priest/Pastor/Imam in the church/mosque.				
9	When seeking for assistance from circulation officers in the library.				
10	When giving direction to strangers/guests at school.				

SECTION C: Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Students

Code-switching is the bringing-in sentences, phrases or clauses of languages A and B or more while holding a conversation in language A.

	I switch Tiv, Igede, Idoma, Ittolu, Igala, Jukun, Igbo, Yoruba, NGE, NPE, Broken English, Hausa etc and English in my verbal communication at these informal settings	**Most often**	**Often**	**Seldom**	**Never**
1	When I converse with my parents at home on family issues				
2	During my leisure times with my friends at home at social gatherings				
3	When telling stories to my nephews/nieces at home.				
4	When I want to ex-communicate someone who does not understand Igbo at social gatherings.				
5	When I want to be very precise in my conversations with relation at home.				
6	When I want to harmonize with someone who understands Nigerian Languages at social gatherings.				
7	During games with my classmates at school				
8	When conversing with my games master during games at school.				
9	When planning birthday parties with my cousins at home.				
10	When discussing academic issues at home with my brothers and sisters				
11	When I go to supermarkets to buy things				
12	When talking about cultural issues with my relations at social gatherings.				
13	When seeking for religious advice from my Priest/Pastor/Imam outside the Church/Mosque premises.				

14	When discussing my health issues with the college doctor/nurse outside the clinic.				
	I switch Tiv, Igede, Idoma, Ittolu, Igala, Jukun, Igbo, Yoruba, NGE, NPE, Broken English, Hausa etc and English in my verbal communication at these formal settings	**Most often**	**Often**	**Seldom**	**Never**
1	When discussing academic issues with my teacher in the classroom				
2	When talking about academic issues with my course mates in the classroom				
3	When discussing academic issues in the school with school administrators.				
4	When discussing my health matters with the college doctor/nurse in the college. Clinic				
5	During academic debates with my fellow students in the school.				
6	When discussing about my academic development with guidance counsellors at school				
7	During discussions on my academic growth at school with my academic adviser				
8	During discussions on religious issues with my Priest/Pastor/Imam at the church/mosque.				
9	When seeking for assistance on how to look for books in the library from the Liberians.				
10	When giving directions to strangers on how to locate certain places at school.				

SECTION 1D: Domain of Language use on Code-switching

1. How many Nigerian languages do you speak? a) One ( ) b) Two ( ) c) Three ( ) d) Four/More ( )
2. What are these languages? .....
3. Are you competent in all the languages? a) Yes ( ) b) No ( )
4. If yes, what is your level of proficiency? a) Native Speaker/Mother Tongue ( ) b) Second Language ( ) c) Proficient in both ( )
5. What language (s) do you often speak? .....
6. What language(s) did you first acquire/learn to speak before school age? .....
7. What language(s) is used during lectures? .....
8. What language(s) do you use for your thoughts, both in school (classroom), Social gathering and/or Home (Dreaming, Praying, Cursing etc)? .....
9. What language(s) do you normally use to communicate with your classmates? .....
10. In what language do you normally interact with other members of your immediate family (father, mother, brothers, and sisters)? ....
11. What do you use to interact with non-members of your close family (uncle, cousin, nephew, aunt)? .....
12. In what language do you interact with your colleagues (friends) outside your school? .....
13. What language(s) would you normally use if you are within the academic environment? .....
14. What language would you use in speaking to a non-colleague or a person not familiar with you, if you happen to come across such a person? (a) In his/her office or place of work? .....
    (b) In his/her Home? .....
    (c) In an informal setting (like a party, club house, restaurant, market, football field, etc.)? .....
15. How often do you speak or think in any of the Nigerian languages or dialects you speak?
    a) 1hr daily ( ) b) 6hrs daily ( ) c) 12hrs daily ( ) d) 24hrs daily ( ) e) 24hrs, 7days a week ( )

SECTION 2D: Semantics

1. Have you heard about Semantics?
2. Yes ( ) b) No ( ) If "yes", How/Where? ……
3. What do you understand about meaning in a conversation? ……
4. Have you used any of your above languages to make meaning in a conversation? a) Yes ( ) b) No ( )
5. If yes, why the choice of language? ……
6. Where and with whom do you use these languages? a) Social Gatherings with friends ( ) b) Home with parents ( ) c)Classroom during lectures ( ) d) Academic environment with lecturers ( )
7. Do you think you are understood better with the use of Nigerian languages over Standard English language to make meaning? a) Yes () b) No ( ) If yes, why? ……
8. Do you encounter difficulties in making sense a conversation with the use of Standard English Language? a) Yes ( ) b) No ( ) If yes, what difficulties? ……
9. Do you think people understand you in a conversation with your choice of language used? a) Yes ( ) b) No ( ) If yes, how would you know? ……
   ……
10. Do you think you make meaning to your every listener as you use Nigerian languages in every conversation or interactions? Yes ( ) b) No ( ) If "NO" in above, then why? If "yes" then how?……

SECTION 3D: Code-switching (Language Alternation)

1. Do you code-switch? a) Most often ( ) b) Often ( ) c) Seldom ( ) d) Never ( )
2. With whom and in what contexts? a) Informal ( )……b) Formal ( )…… (Please Specify)
3. Do you avoid code-switching? a) Yes ( ) b) No ( ) When and why? ……
4. During the course of one day, how often do you alternate the two or more languages? a) Most often ( ) b) Often ( ) c) Seldom ( ) d) Never ( )
5. Do you notice your own code-switches as you say them? a) Most often ( ) b) Often ( ) c) Seldom ( ) d) Never ( )
6. Do you notice when others do it and do they make sense to their listeners?
7. Why do you code-switch? ……
8. Do you use both languages when you write? a) Most often ( ) b) Often ( ) c) Seldom ( ) d) Never ( )
9. What would you say is the effect of code-switching on English language standard expression of meaning by linguistics students of Nigerian universities? ……
   ……
   ……
10. Has language alternation affected effective meaning-making in speech (utterance) and writing amongst students of English language?
11. Yes ( ) b) No ( ) If "yes", How? If "No" why do you think so? ……
    ……
12. Do you think often users of code-switching have affected student's effective communication when not using these languages or codes with non-users? Yes ( ) b) No ( ) If "yes" above, why? ……
    ……
13. How could this problem of effective meaning-making be resolved, if some students can only make sense or meaning when they code-switch with Nigerian languages, dialects, Nigerian English, Pidgin within the academic environment ……
    ……
    ……
    ……
    ……

APPENDIX III
Motive-Determination Interview Questions

This interview is a follow-up to the observations from the spontaneous recording of verbal conversations. The interview is carried out much later after the initial recording (observational) to determine from the respondents whether the meanings and switches in their utterances were done as a result of bilingual proficiency or deficiency

1. What do you know about code-switching and semantics?
2. Which word(s) or expression(s) do you of use from your language .....…….…… ……. in your speech.
   Was the usage deliberate? {Yes} {No} If {Yes}, please mention the English equivalent …….
3. What language(s) do you often speak?
4. What language did you first learn to speak before school age?
5. What language(s) are used in lectures in school?
6. What language did you eventually learn at the secondary school?
7. Can you only speak English or only Nigerian languages, pidgin? Is it easy? Difficult?
8. Do you think switching languages is wrong?
9. Do you think code-switching is a sign of proficiency or deficiency in one or both languages?
10. Which personality traits, if any, do you associate with switching languages? (Examples: witty, fun, outgoing, funny, friendly, creative, cool, not so intelligent, reserved, serious)
11. Do you feel including English in conversation signals that you are not Nigerian?
12. How does code-switching relate to your identity as a Nigerian?
13. Does code-switching define you in any way?
14. In order for someone to consider himself Nigerian, does he or she need to speak The Nigerian languages, dialects, Nigerian English or pidgin?
15. Do you feel code-switching can be associated with belonging to an "elite"?
16. Do you see code-switching as something positive or negative about yourself?
17. Do you prefer Nigerian languages over Standard English to make sense in a conversation?
18. Do you think listeners understand your intended meaning when you code-switch?
19. How do you think monolingual Nigerian feel about people who code-switch?
20. Do the languages you know have something to do with your socioeconomic position in society?
21. Do you consider yourself bicultural because of your use of English?

REFERENCES

Adegbija, E. E. (2004). *Multilingualism: A Nigerian case study*. Africa World Press.

Adegbija, E. E. (1991). *The context of language planning in Africa: An illustration with Nigeria*. Linguistic Agency University of Duisburg.

Adegbija, E. (1989) "Lexico-Semantic Variation in Nigerian English". *World Englishes* 8 (2) G. Britain: Pergamon press. Dada S.A. (2007): *Language Contact and Language Conflict: The Case of Yoruba-English Bilinguals.* Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 29 p. 85-113. URL: http://hdl.handle.net/1808/1789

Adegbite, A. B. (2010). English Language Usage, Uses and Misuses in a non-host second Language context, Nigeria. *Inaugural Lecture Series*, *231*.

Adetomokun, I. J. (2012). *A systemic functional linguistics (SFL) analysis of Yoruba students' narratives of identity at three Western Cape universities* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Western Cape).

Adzer, V. C. (2012). Factors militating against the development of indigenous languages: the Tiv language in perspective. *Journal of Igbo Language & Linguistics*, *5*(1), 76-79.

Agbedo, C.U. (2011). Problems of multilingual nations: the Nigerian perspective. Nsukka: ACE Resources Konsults in Emeka-Nwobia, N. U. (2014). A Pragmatic Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Former Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo (Doctoral dissertation).

Agbedo, C. U. (2000) *General Linguistics: An Introductory Reader*. Nsukka: ACE Resources Konsult.

Agber, T. (2015). *Assessment of Online Resources Usage By Agricultural Science Lecturers of Tertiary Institutions in Benue State Nigeria* (Doctoral dissertation).

Aikhenomian Queen Isimemen (2011) A Semantic Study of Inferencing Through the Identification of Linguistic Signals in some Selected Text. Being an Unpublished Dissertation Submitted in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Ajaero, Chris (2007-11-18). "A Brand New Image For Benué". *Newswatch magazine* (Newswatch Communications). Retrieved 2007-12-26.

Ajayi, K.O. (1989). Attitudes to codeswitching among Yoruba-English bilinguals: A case study of the University of Ilorin students. Department of Modern European Languages, Faculty of Arts, University of Ilorin.

Akande, A (2013). *Code-switching in Nigerian hip hop lyrics.* Language matters: studies in the language of Africa.

Akande, J. O. (1982). *The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1979: With Annotatons*. London: Street & Maxwell.

Akere, F. (1981). Sociolinguistic consequences of language contact: English versus Nigerian languages. *Language Sciences, 3*(2), 283-304.

Akere, F. (1980). 'Verbal strategies in communal meetings: Code –switching and status manipulation in a bi-dialectal Yoruba speech community,' *Language Sciences* 2 (1), 102-126.

Alfonzetti, G. (2002). The conversational dimension in codeswitching between Italian and dialect in Sicily *Codeswitching in Conversational Language Interaction and Identity* P. Auer (Ed). London: Routledge. p197

Alo, M. A. (2004). Context and Language Variations: The EL2 Example. *Language and Discourse in*.

Amuda, A. A. (1994) Yoruba/English Conversational Code-switching as a Conversational Strategy, *Journal of African Cultural Studies***,** 7 (2), 121-131.

Amuda, A.A. (1986). Yoruba-English Code-switching in Nigeria: Aspects of its Functions and Form. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Department of Linguistic Sciences, University of Reading, United Kingdom.

Annual report of the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture Author International Institute of Tropical Agriculture Publisher IITA, 1990 ISSN 0331-4340 http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=B3ZCcinut_sC&lpg=PA58&dq=University%20of%20Agriculture%2C%20Makurdi&pg=PA58

Anugerahwati, M. (2015). Pygmalion: a Study of Socio-semantics. *TEFLIN Journal*, *21*(2), 202-210.

Anyanwu, Ogechi Emmanuel (2011). The Politics of Access: University Education and Nation-Building in Nigeria, 1948-2000. University of Calgary Press via Questia (subscription required). p. 174-7.

Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (2006). *Language contact and bilingualism*. Amsterdam University Press.

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1989). *Language Contact and Bilingualism.* London: Edward Arnold.

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London; Baltimore: E. Arnold.

Ariffin, K., & Rafik-Galea, S. (2009). Code-switching as a communication device in conversation. *Language & Society*, *5*(9).

Auer, Peter (1999): "From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech". In: *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3, 309-332.

Auer, Peter (1998a): "Introduction: *Bilingual Conversation* revisited". In: Auer (ed.), 1-24.

Auer, Peter (ed.) (1998b): *Code-switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. London/New York: Routledge. • 1957 •

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.

Ayeomoni, M. O. (2012). The languages in Nigerian socio-political domains: Features and Functions. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(10), 12.

Ayeomoni, M. O. (2011). LANGUAGES AND DOMAINS: NIGERIAN SITUATIONS. *Advisory Editorial Board*, 141.

Ayeomoni, M. O. (2006). 'Code-switching and Code-mixing: Style of Language use in Childhood in Yoruba Speech Community.' *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 15(1), 90-99.

Babalola, E. T., & Taiwo, R. (2009). Code-switching in contemporary Nigerian Hip-hop music. Itupale, Online. *Journal of African Studies*, *1*, 2009.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays by mm bakhtin (m. holquist, ed.; c. emerson & m. holquist, trans.).

Bamgbose, A. (1971). The English Language in Nigeria. In J. Spencer (Ed.*) The English Language in West Africa* (pp. 35-48). London: Longman Press. In Onakunle, Olayemi Oluwatobi (2011) Pragmatic Features of Nigerian English: A Case Study of Selected Poems of Bayo Adebowale; A Bachelor of Arts Project Submitted the Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Banjo, A. (1983). Aspects of Yoruba/English language mixing. *Journal of Nigerian languages*, *1*(2), 17-26.

Banjo, A (1969) A Contrastive study of aspects of the syntactic and lexical rules of English and Yoruba, An unpublished P.h.D Thesis University of Ibadan

Bashir, Bilikisu (2014) Effects of Multilingualism on English Language: A case study of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria campus (a semantic approach). Being an unpublished project submitted to the department of English and literary studies, faculty of arts, ABU Zaria in partial fulfilment of the award of Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree

Bernstein, B. (1971). Class, codes and control: Vol. 1, Theoretical studies toward a sociology of education. *London: Paladin*.

Berruto, G. (1997). Code-switching and code-mixing. *The dialects of Italy*, 394-400. In Franceschini, R. (1999). Proposals for a dual focus model. *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, 51.

Biber, D. and Finegan, E. 1994. (eds.) Sociolinguistic perspectives on register. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J.J (1972). Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code Switching in Northern Norway. In: Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. (eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, 407-434. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1986). Social meaning in linguistic structures. Code-switching in Nor-way. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics. The ethnographic communication.* Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Blomquist, L. (2009). Language and identity: attitudes towards code-switching in the immigrant language classroom.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.

Bloomfield, L. (1984). *Language.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Originally published in 1933).

Boztepe, E. (2005). Issues in Code-switching: Competing Theories and Models. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, *3*(2). p11-16

Brann, C. M. B. (1990). The role and function of languages in government: Language policy issues in Nigeria. *Sociolinguistics, 1*, 1-19.

Brann, C. M. B. (1985). *Official and National Languages in Africa: Complement or Conflict*? Quebec: CIRAL.

"Brief profile of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi, Benue State". Commonwealth Ministers. Henley Media Group. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Agriculture,_Makurdi Retrieved 4 May 2013.

Britannica, E. (2012). Language. Encyclopaedia Britannica. *Millennium 11th Edition. Copyright, 2003*, 1994-2003.

Bryman, A. (2008): *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bullock, B., & Toribio, A. J. (2009) 'Themes in the study of code-switching', In B. Bullock and A. J. Toribio (eds.) *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic codeswitching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burge, T. (1979). Individualism and the Mental. *Midwest studies in philosophy*, *4*(1), 73-121.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1972) English Comparatives. Ph.D. Thesis, UCLA, cited in Simmons, R. F. (1972). *Semantic networks: their computation and use for understanding English sentences*. Department of Computer Sciences and Computer-Assisted Instruction Laboratory, University of Texas.

Chambers, J. K. (1995) *Sociolinguistic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chen, S.Y. (2007). Code-switching between English and Mandarin Chinese on postings in a college-affiliated bulletin board system in Taiwan: A functional approach. *Papers from LAEL PG*, 1. Retrieved from http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/pgconference/v01/Chen.pdf

Cheng, K. K. Y. (2003). Language shift and language maintenance in mixed marriages: A case study of a Malaysian-Chinese family. *Int'l. J, 165*(2516/03), 0161-0081.

Chieni, S.N. (2001). Language and Society: Kiswahili, a national language or a social class language in Kenya. *Kiswahili a Tool for Development the Multidisciplinary Approach.* Nairobi: Kimechapischwa na Downtown Printing Works Ltd. In Ene, Onyeanuna Innocent (2009). Influence of Psycho-social Variables on Codemixing and Codeswitching among Igbo-English Bilingual Students. In Enugu State, Nigeria: A PhD Thesis in English Language Education submitted to Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State.

Chomsky, Noam. (1995). Language and nature. *Mind* vol. 104, no. 13, pp. 51

Chomsky, N. (2000). *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Clyne, M.G. (2003). *Dynamics of language contact. English and immigrant languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, Michael G. (1991): *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge et al: CUP.

Clyne, Michael (1967): *Transference and Triggering.* The Hague: Nijhoff.

Collins, A. M., & Quillian, M. R. (1972). How to make a language user. In: E. Tulving, & W. Donaldson (Eds), *Organization of memory* (pp. 309–351). New York: Academic Press.

Cooper, D. E. (1973). Philosophy and the Nature of Language.

Coupland, N. (1985). 'Hark, hark the lark': social motivations for phonological styleshifting. Language and Communication 5. 153-171.

Coupland, N., & Jaworski, A. (1997). Relevance, accommodation and conversation: Modeling the social dimension of communication.

Creswell, John (2008). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage.

Crystal, D. (2008). Txtng: The Gr8 Db8. New York: Oxford University Press.

Davidson, Donald. (2005). *Truth, Language, and History.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. Pp.121

Di Pietro, R. (1977). Code-switching as a verbal strategy among bilinguals. *Current themes in linguistics: bilingualism, experimental linguistics and language typologies. Washington, DC: Hemisphere*, 3-13.

Dummett, Michael (1978) *Truth and Other Enigmas.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Emeka-Nwobia, N. U. (2014). A Pragmatic Analysis of Selected Political Speeches of Former Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo (Doctoral dissertation).

Ene, I. O. (1994). Influence of Levels of Education on Codemixing among Igbo-English speakers. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation submitted to the Department of Curriculum Studies and Education Technology (CSET), University of Ilorin, Ilorin.

Ene, Onyeanuna Innocent (2009). Influence of Psycho-social Variables on Codemixing and Codeswitching among Igbo-English Bilingual Students. In Enugu State, Nigeria: A PhD Thesis in English Language Education submitted to Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National Policy on Education.* Abuja: Nigeria Education Research and Development Council. Cited in Akande, J. O. (1982). The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1979: With Annotatons. London: Street & Maxwell.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *word, 15*(2), 325-340.

Fernández, F. M., & Moreno-Fernández, F. (2016). *A Framework for Cognitive Sociolinguistics*. Taylor & Francis.

Fillmore, C. J. (1968). The case for case. In: E. Bach, & R. T. Harms (Eds), *Universals in linguistic theory* (pp. 1–88). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Fillmore, C. J. (1976). Frame semantics and the nature of language. In: S. R. Harnad, H. D. Steklis, & J. Lancaster (Eds), *Origins and evolution of language and speech* (Vol. 280, pp. 20–32). Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Filmer, A. (2003). African-American Vernacular English: ethics, ideology, and pedagogy in the conflict between identity and power. *World Englishes 22* (3), 253-270.

Firth, J. R. (1957). Ethnographic analysis and language with reference to Malinowski's views. *Man and Culture: an evaluation of the work of Bronislaw Malinowski*, 93-118.

Fishman J (1972a). Language in socio-cultural change. In Fil A S (ed.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Fishman, J.A. (1972b). "The Sociology of Language" in Giglioli, P. P (ed), *Language and Social Context.* Harmondsworth: Penguin. Pp 45-58.

Fishman, J. A. (1969). National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 111-135.

Fishman, J. A. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of social issues, 23*(2), 29-38.

Franceschini, R. (1999). Proposals for a dual focus model. *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, 51.

Freeman, A. (1996). Andrew Freeman's Perspectives on Arabic diglossia. *Innerbrat. org*. Freeman, Andrew (9 December 1996). "Andrew Freeman's Perspectives on Arabic Diglossia". Andy Freeman's Homepage. Archived from the original on 27 May 2010. Retrieved 8 September 2010

Frege, G. (1892). "On Sense and Reference." Reprinted in D. Davidson and G. Harman, eds., *The Logic of Grammar.* Dickenson, Encino, CA.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. Academic Press.

Gardner-Chloros. P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. New York. In Coupland, N. and Jaworski, A. (1997). Research Methods in the Social Sciences. Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gazdar, G. (1980), "Pragmatics and Logical Form". *Journal of Pragmatics* Vol.4 No.1 Pp 1-13

Geeraerts, D., Kristiansen, G., & Peirsman, Y. (Eds.). (2010). *Advances in cognitive sociolinguistics* (Vol. 45). Walter de Gruyter.

Giglioli, P. P. (Ed.). (1972). *Language and social context: selected readings*. Penguin Books.

Giles, H., & Smith, P. M. (1979). Accommodation theory: Optimal levels of convergence. In H. Giles & R. N. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and Social Psychology* (pp. 45-65). Baltimore, MD: University Park

Goke-Pariola, A. (1983). 'Code-mixing among Yoruba-English bilinguals.' *Anthropological Linguistics,* 25, 39-46.

Grabe, W. (ed.). (2000). Applied linguistics as an emerging discipline. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 2

Grimes, J. E. (1972). The Thread of Discourse.

Grosjean, F. (1995) A psycholinguistic approach to code-switching: the recognition of guest words by bilinguals. in: Milroy, Lesley and Muysken, Pieter, (eds) *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, 259-275.

Gumperz, J. J (1982a). "The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching", in: *Papers on Language and Context (Working Paper* No 46, Berkeley); revised version as "Conversational code-switching" in *Discourse Strategies,* by. J. Gumperz (Cambridge), pp 59-99.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982b). *Conversational Code switching. In Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge, England. Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1976). Language, communication and public negotiation. *Anthropology and the public interest: Fieldwork and theory*, 327-340.

Gumperz, J. J & Hernandez Chavez. (1972b).”*Bilingualism, bidialectalism and classroom interaction”* in J. J. Gumperz (ed.), *Language in Social Groups.* Stanford, Stanford University Press. (Cited in Ayeomoni).

Gumperz, J. J., & Blom, J.P. (1972a). Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code-Switching in Norway. In John Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics* (1986th ed., pp. 407-434). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gumperz, J. J. (1970). Verbal Strategies in Multilingual Communication.

Gumperz, J. J., & Hernandez, E. (1969). *Cognitive aspects of bilingual communication* (No. 28). Institute of International Studies, University of California.

Gumperz, J. J., (1968). “The Speech Community”. *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*: 381-6. New York: Macmillan.

Halliday M A K (1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Halliday M A K (1978). Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). Learning How to Mean--Explorations in the Development of Language.

Halliday M A K, McIntosh A & Strevens P (1964a). The linguistic sciences and language teaching. London: Longman.

Hasan, R. (1985). Meaning, context and text: fifty years after Malinowski. *Systemic perspectives on discourse, 1*, 16-47.

Heller, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Code-switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Hilhorst, T., van Liere, M., Ode, A. V., & de Koning, K. (2006). Impact of AIDS on rural livelihoods in Benue State, Nigeria. *SAHARA-J: Journal of Social Aspects of HIV/AIDS*, *3*(1), 382-393.

Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1988) *Social Semiotics.* Cambridge: Polity.

Hoffmann, C. (1991). *An introduction to bilingualism*. New York: USA: Longman.

Holmes. J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York. Longman Publishers.

http://www.benuestate.gov.ng

http://www.bsum.edu.ng/dwnloads/BSU_Brief_History.pdf

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diglossia Retrieved 4 December 2017.

Hudson. R. A. (2007). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. University of Ghana http://ugspace.ug.edu.gh

Hudson, R. A. (2001). Sociolinguistics. Cambridge, UK: CUP. In Emeka-Nwobia, Ngozi U. (2014). *Code Switching in Igbo-English Bilingual Conversations*. *British Journal of English Linguistics* Vol.2, No.3, pp.1-6

Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.

Hudson, R. A. (1980) *Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1984d). Sociolinguistics: stability and consolidation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *1984*(45), 39-46.

Hymes, D. (1972b). "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life" *In*: Gumperz & Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication.* Blackwell: 35-71.

Hymes, D. (1972a). On communicative competence. *sociolinguistics*, *269293*, 269-293.

Hymes, D. (1972c). Toward ethnographies of communication: The analysis of communicative events. *Language and social context*, 21-44.

Hymes, Dell. (1964). Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. *American Anthropologist,* 6: 1–34. In Giglioli, P. P. 1972. *Language and Social Context*. England: Clays Ltd. pp283-307

Igboanusi, H. (1990). Sociolinguistic perspective on Igbo-English codemixing among educated Igbo. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation submitted to the Department of Linguistics, University of Ibadan.

Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics. In A.S. Thomas (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp.350-377). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Jendra, Made Iwan Indrawan. (2010). *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Societies' Languages*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Kajotoni, Elizabeth Titilayo (2000) A Sociolinguistic Study on Code-switching: A case study of Yoruba Students in Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. Being an unpublished project submitted to the department of English and literary studies, faculty of arts, ABU Zaria in partial fulfilment of the award of Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree

Kantiok Gad Batonn (2014) A sociolinguistic Study of Code Mixing among Undergraduates of Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, living off Campus; A Case Study of Danraka. Being an unpublished project submitted to the department of English and literary studies, faculty of arts, ABU Zaria in partial fulfilment of the award of Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree

Kassam, Hauwa Margaret (1991) Language Choice among Some Segments of the Ahmadu Bello University Community Being an Unpublished MA Dissertation Submitted in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Katz, J. (1972). *Semantic Theory.* Harper & Row, New York.

Katz, J. (1966). *The Philosophy of Language.* Harper & Row, New York.

Kloss, H. (1968). Notes concerning a language-nation typology. *Language problems of developing nations*, 69-85.

Kripke, Saul. (1980). *Naming and Necessity.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Labov, W. (2006). *The social stratification of English in New York City*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Labov, Williams (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns* (Vol. 1). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, William (1970). The Study of Language in its Social Context. *Studium Generale, 23*, 30-87.

Labov, Williams. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City.* Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Lakoff G & Turner M (1989). More than cool reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: what categories reveal about the mind.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lakoff, G. (1971). "On Generative Semantics." In Steinberg and Jakobovits 1971, 232 296.

Lakoff, G. (1970). *Irregularity in Syntax.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Lamidi, M. T. (2004). 'The Scopal Authority of Heads in Yoruba-English Code-switching'. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 13(1), 76–94.

Lewis, David. (1975) Languages and language. In Gunderson (ed.), *Language, Mind and Knowledge.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. P.6

Lyle, J., & Hoffman, H. R. (1971). *Children's use of television and other media*. Department of Journalism, University of California.

Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics.* Vols. 1 & 2. London: Cambridge University Press. Pp109

Lyons, J. (1995) *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mackey, W. (1957): "The Distribution of Bilingualism."*Journal of Canadian Linguistics Association* Vol. 7. No.51

Madaki, R.O. (1983): A linguistic and pragmatic analysis of Hausa-English codeswitching. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Maher, J. C. (2017). *Multilingualism: a Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Maiyanga, A. Abdullahi, (1998). A Semantico-Pragmatic Analysis of Proverbs: The Example of Igala Collection. A Ph.D Thesis Submitted to the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Kaduna.

Malik, L. (1994). *Socio-linguistics: A study of code-switching*. New Delhi, ND: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Malinowski B (1923). 'The problem of meaning in primitive languages.' In Ogden C K & Richards I A (eds.) The meaning of meaning. London: Kegan Paul. 451–510.

Marjohan, A. (1988). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. *Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*.

Matthews, J. J. R. (2006). *Codeswitching In African American College Students: Attitudes, Perceptions, and Practice* (Doctoral dissertation, Miami University).

Mazrui, A. A. (1975) The Political Sociology of the English Language: An African Perspective. The Hague: Mouton. In Tajudeen Yaqub Surakat, (2010). *Categorizing Varieties of Nigerian English: A Socio-psycholinguistic Perspective. Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association* (JNESA) 13:2 September, 2010

Maynard, S. K. (1993). *Discourse modality: Subjectivity, emotion and voice in the Japanese language* (Vol. 24). John Benjamins Publishing.

McCawley, J. D. (1968a). "Lexical Insertion in a Transformational Grammar without Deep Structure." In B. Darden, C.-J. N. Bailey, and A. Davison, eds., *Papers from the Fourth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.* Department of Linguistics, University of Chicago, Chicago.

McCawley, J. D. (1968b). "The Role of Semantics in a Grammar". In E. Bach and R. Harms, eds., *Universals in Linguistic*

McCawley, J. D. (1968c). "Concerning the Base Component of a Transformational Grammar." *Foundations of Language* 4,

McConvell, P. (1994). *Two-way exchange and language maintenance in Aboriginal schools*.

McClure, E. F. (1977). Aspects of code-switching in the discourse of bilingual Mexican-American children. *Center for the Study of Reading Technical Report; no. 044*.

Merriam-Webster's Dictionary (2009). Dictionary of Contemporary English Usage. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster. Merriam–Webster's Advanced Learner's English Dictionary (see

website http://www.merriam-webster.com). In Grabe, W. (ed.). (2000). Applied linguistics as an emerging discipline. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 2

Mey, Jacob L. (2009). (ed.). Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Elsevier.

Miller, G. A. (1995). WordNet: a lexical database for English. *Communications of the ACM*, *38*(11), 39-41.

Milroy, L. (1987a). *Language and Social Networks.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). Introduction: Code-switching and bilingualism research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 1-14). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Milroy, L., & Wei, L. (1995). A social network approach to code-switching: The example of a bilingual community in Britain. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker two* Issues in CS: Competing Theories and Models 25 *languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 136-157). New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Montague, Richard (1974) *Formal Philosophy*. Ed. by Richmond Thomason. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Montague, R. (1970). English as a formal language.

Montague, Richard, (1968). "Pragmatics," in R. Klibansky (ed.) *Contemporary Philosophy – La philosophie contemporaine, vol. 1*, Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, pp. 102–22. Reprinted in R. Thomason (ed.) 1974, *Formal Philosophy: Selected papers of Richard Montague*, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, pp. 95–118.

Morris, Charles (1938). *Foundations of the Theory of Signs. International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*, vol.1, no. 2 Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Morris, P. (Ed.). (2009). *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Morris, C. W. (1971). *Writings on the general theory of signs* (Vol. 16). Walter de Gruyter.

Muma, Ngwiniform Martha (1992) Bilingualism: A Case Study of Communication Difficulties among High School Students of Government Bilingual High School (G.B.H.S) Bamenda Cameroon. Being an Unpublished Dissertation Submitted in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Muysken, P. (1995). Code-switching and grammatical theory. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 177-198). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006a) Natural codeswitching knocks on the laboratory door. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition*, 9 (2), 203-212.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006b). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism.* London: Blackwell publishers.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (2002): *Contact Linguistics. Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press

Myers-Scotton, C. (1979). Codeswitching as a 'safe choice' in choosing a lingua franca. In William McCormack & S. Wurm (eds.), Language and Society, pp. 71-88. The Hauge: Mouton.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a) *Social Motivations for Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1992). Codeswitching as a mechanism of deep borrowing, language shift and language death. In M. Brenzinger (Ed.), *Language death factual and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa* (Vol. 64, pp. 31-58). Mouton de Gruyter.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (1989). "Codeswitching with English: types of switching, types of communities". World Englishes 8 (3): 333–346.

Myers-Scotton, C. and W. Ury (1977) Bilingual strategies: the social function of codeswitching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 13, 5-20. 243 269.

Nelson, D. L., McEvoy, C. L., & Schreiber, T. (1999). University of South Florida word association, rhyme and word fragment norms. Retrieved November 8, 2008.

Nerlich, B., & Clarke, D. D. (1988). A dynamic model of semantic change. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, *17*(2), 73-90.

Newmark, P., & Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation* (Vol. 1, p. 982). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Nexus Strategic Partnerships (2007). Commonwealth Education Partnerships, 2007. Commonwealth Secretariat. p. 155. ISBN 9780954962913.

Ngozi U. Emeka-Nwobia (2014) Code Switching in Igbo-English Bilingual Conversations. *British Journal of English Linguistics.* Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org) Vol.2, No.3, pp.1-6, December 2014 ISSN 2055-6063(Print), ISSN 2055-6071(Online)

Norrick, N. R. (2001). Discourse and semantics. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 76-99.

Nur, N. A. (2015). A Descriptive Analysis of English Indonesian Code switching Spoken by the Teacher in the First Grade of mtsn model makassar. *Eternal (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal), 2*(1), 82-95.

O'Mole, J. (1987) 'Code-Switching in Soyinka's "The Interpreters".' *Language and Style,* 20(4), 385-395.

O'Brien J. Richard (1973) On Linguistic Semantics and Linguistic Sub-disciplines: A Review Article Studies in Linguistic Semantics by Charles J. Fillmore; D. Terrence Langendoen; Linguistics: Developments of the Sixties: View-Points for the Seventies Review by: Joel Sherzer Language in Society, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Oct., 1973), pp.269-289, Cambridge University Press Stable, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166728 .Accessed: 04/02/2014 12:22

Ogden, C. K., and I. A. Richards. (1923). The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought. With an introduction by Umberto Eco. San Diego, New York, and London: Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich. A Harvest/HBJ book.

Okwu, O. J., Kuku, A. A., & Aba, J. I. (2007). An assessment of use of radio in agricultural information dissemination: a case study of radio Benue in Nigeria. *African Journal of Agricultural Research, 2*(1), 14-18.

Olaoye, A.A. (2002) Intern-sentential English-Yoruba code alternation: an ethnographic approach. Unpublished Department seminar, Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages, University of Ilorin, Ilorin. June 28.

Olaoye, Ayodele Anthony (1991) A Sociolinguistic Investigation into Yoruba-English Code-switching in Kano Metropolis. Being an Unpublished PhD Thesis Submitted in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Olu, M. (1995). A Functional Study of the Language of Medicine: A Case Study of Faculty of Medicine, A.B.U Zaria. A Project Submitted to the Department of English and Drama, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Omoniyi, T. (2006). 'Hip-Hop Through the World English Lens: A Response to Globalization'. *World Englishes*, 25(2), 195-208.

Onakunle, Olayemi Oluwatobi, (2011). Pragmatic Features of Nigerian English: A Case Study of Selected Poems of Bayo Adebowale; A Bachelor of Arts Project Submitted the Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Onyango, O. R. (2009). An Exploration of Extra Linguistic Factors of English–Kiswahili Code switching in FM Industry in Kenya. *Journal of Language, Technology & Entrepreneurship in Africa, 1*(2), 151-159. In Then, D. C. O., & Ting, S. H. (2011). Code-switching in English and science classrooms: more than translation. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 8*(4), 299-323.

Osaji, D. (1979) Language Survey in Nigeria; Quebec International Centre for Research in Bilingualism, Quebec: ICRBC. In Okpeh, O. O., 'Government in Stateless Societies: A case Study of Pre-colonial Idoma of central Nigeria', in Idrees, A. A. & Ochefu, Y. A. (2002).(eds.), Studies in Central Nigeria History, Lagos: CSS Books, pp. 145-166.

Oseghale, Esther Otekpen (2012), Lexico-Semantic Features of Nigerian English, Dissertation submitted in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Kaduna.

Ottenheimer, Harriet J. (2006). *The Anthropology of Language: an introduction to linguistic anthropology*. Belmont (Canada): Wadsworth. p. 18. ISBN 9780534594367.

Passmore, Ashley. "In the New German, English is a "lifestyle diglossia cited in Maher, J. C. (2017). *Multilingualism: a Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Pfaff, Carol (1979) Constraints on language mixing: intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English, in: *Language* 55 (2), 291-318.

Poplack, Shana (1980) Sometimes I´ll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching, in: *Linguistics* 18, 581-618.

Poplack, Shana, Marjorie Meechan (1995) Patterns of language mixture: nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse‖, in: *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, Milroy, Lesley/Muysken, Pieter, eds., 199-232.

Putnam, Hilary (1975). The meaning of 'meaning'. In *Minnesota Studies in Philosophy*, ed. by Keith Gunderson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Reprinted in *Mind, Language, and Reality: Philosophical Papers Vol.2* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1975: 215-71.

Putnam, Hilary. (1970). "Is Semantics Possible?" In Putnam (1975) The meaning of 'meaning'. In *Minnesota Studies in Philosophy*, ed. by Keith Gunderson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Reprinted in *Mind, Language, and Reality: Philosophical Papers Vol.2* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1975: 215-71.

Quillian, R. (1968). Semantic memory. In M. Minsky (ed.) *Semantic information processing*: 227–270. MIT Press.

Rafiu, K. A. (2011). Patterns of Language Loss: A Study of the Benue-Congo Languages in Niger State, Nigeria (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ilorin).

Rash, Felicity (1998). The German Language in Switzerland: Multilingualism, Diglossia and Variation. Berne: Peter Lang. ISBN 0-8204-3413-2.

Ricento, Thomas (2012). "Political economy and English as a 'global' language". *Critical Multilingualism Studies*. 1 (1): 31–56.

Riehl, C. M. (2005a). Code-switching in bilinguals: impacts of mental processes and language awareness. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Bilingualism* (pp. 1945-1960).

Riehl Claudia Maria (2005b). Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism, ed. James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad, and Jeff MacSwan, 1945-1959. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. ISB4

Roget, P. M. (1911). *Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases...* TY Crowell Company. Cited in Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H. J. (2013). *An introduction to cognitive linguistics*. Routledge.

Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics 2nd Edition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taiwo, R. (2010). The dynamics of language mixing in Nigerian Digital communication. *Handbook of Research on Discourse Behaviour and Digital Communication: Language Structures and Social Interaction, Hershey: IGI Global*, 180-190.

Rumelhart, D. E., Lindsay, P. H., & Norman, D. A. (1972). A process model for long-term memory. In: E. Tulving, & W. Donaldson (Eds), *Organization of memory* (pp. 197–246). New York: Academic Press.

Saeed, I. John (2003). Semantics. 2nd ed, UK, Blackwell Publishing: pp. 34-46, 266-76

Saeed, J. I. (1997) *Semantics*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Sangster, C. M. (2002). *Inter-and intra-speaker variation in Liverpool English* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oxford).

Sapir E (1949). Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture, and personality. (Mandelbaum D G ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Sapir, E. (1929). Male and female forms of speech in Yana. In St. W. J. Teeuwen (ed.), Donum natalicium schrijnen. Nijmegen - Utrecht: Dekker and Van de Vegt. 79-85.

Sapir E (1921). Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Saussure, F. D. (1916). 1983. *Course in general linguistics*.

Saxena, Mukul (2014) "Critical diglossia" and "lifestyle diglossia": development and the interaction between multilingualism, cultural diversityand English. International Journal of the Sociology of Language. Volume 2014, Issue 225, Pages 91–112, ISSN (Online) 1613–3668, ISSN (Print) 0165-2516

Schiffman, H. F. (1993). The balance of power in multiglossic languages: Implications for language shift. *International journal of the sociology of language*, *103*(1), 115-148. *Schiffman, Harold. "Classical and extended diglossia". Retrieved 2010-09-10.*

Seymour, H.N., & Seymour, C.M. (1979) The symbolism of Ebonics: I'd rather switch than fight. *Journal of Black Studies (9)* 4, 397-410.

Shin, S.Y. (2010). The functions of code-switching in a Korean Sunday school. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7 (1), 91-116. Retrieved from http://www.international.ucla.edu/media/files/vol7-1-S-Y-Shin.pdf

Shuy, R. W., & Fasold, R. (1971). Contemporary emphases in sociolinguistics. *Linguistics: developments of the sixties viewpoints for the seventies*, 185-97. Cited in Shuy, R. (ms.) Sociolinguistics and Medical History. Presented at 3rd International Conference of Applied Linguistics (Copenhagen).

Simmons, R. F. (1972). *Semantic networks: their computation and use for understanding English sentences*. Department of Computer Sciences and Computer-Assisted Instruction Laboratory, University of Texas.

Singh, S. K. S. (2012). Code-switching Among Military Cadet Officers during Group Interaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 66*, 64-75.

Smitherman, G. (2000). *Talkin that talk: language, culture, and education in African America*. New York: Routledge.

Sneddon, J. N. (2003). The Indonesian language: Its history and role in modern society. Sydney: UNSW Press.

Stockwell, P. & Trask, R. L. (2007) (ed) *Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts.* New York: Routledge

Surakat, Tajudeen Yaqub (2010). *Categorizing Varieties of Nigerian English: A Socio-psycholinguistic Perspective. Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association* (JNESA) 13:2 September, 2010

Surakat, Tajudeen Yaqub (2001) Code-mixing in the Language Development of a Bilingual Nigerian Child. Being an Unpublished PhD Thesis Submitted in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Taylor, O. (1999). Ebonics and educational policy: some issues for the next millennium. *Journal of Negro Education* 67 (1), 35-41. *Theory,* 125 170. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

Terna-Abah, Martha Nguemo (2014) A Sociolinguistic Study of the Patterns of Nonstandard English Words usage in Formal Contexts: A Case Study of Students of Higher Institutions in Kaduna State. Being an Unpublished Dissertation Submitted in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Terna-Abah, M. N. (2016). The Patterns of Nonstandard English Words Used in the Written Communication of Selected Students of Higher Institutions in Kaduna State. *Nile Journal of English Studies, 1*(1), 78-86.

Then, D. C. O., & Ting, S. H. (2011). Code-switching in English and science classrooms: more than translation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *8*(4), 299-323.

Thibault, P.J. (1991) Social Semiotics as Praxis: *Text, Social Meaning Making, and Nabokov's Ada.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Toribio, A.J. (2004) 'Convergence as an optimization strategy in bilingual speech: evidence from code-switching', *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 5: 165-73.

Trudgill, P., & Chambers, J. K. (2017). *Dialects of English: Studies in grammatical variation*. Routledge.

Trudgill, P. (1983). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society,* England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics; An Introduction to Language and Society*. Penguin Group. pp18, 44-45, 102.

van Leeuwen, Theo (1996) „The Representation of Social Actors." In: Caldas-Coulthard, C. R., Coulthard, M. (eds) *Texts and Practices*. London and New York: Routledge. 32-70.

van Leeuwen, Theo (2005) *Introducing Social Semiotics.* USA and Canada: Routledge.

Van Usselt, H. R. (1991). Code-switching and discourse structure in a first English lesson. Paper Presented at the Symposium on code-switching in Bilingual Studies. Theory Significance and Perspective Barcelona. Pp 577-585

Verschik, Anna (2004) Aspects of Russian-Estonian codeswitching: Research perspectives. – *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 8/4, 427–448.

Wallwork, J.F. (1969). *Language and Linguistics*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Wardbough, A. (1980). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, (3rd ed.). London: Blackwell Publishing.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. (1986) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics second Edition.* Cambridge USA: Blackwell.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. New York. The Hauge: Mouton.

Weinreich, Uriel (1959) Is a structural dialectology possible? *Word* 10, 388-400.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee (1956a) Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf, ed. by J.B. Carroll, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press In Mey, Jacob L. (2009). (ed.). Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Elsevier.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee ([1941] 1956b). 'The relation of habitual thought and behaviour to language.' In Carroll J (ed.) Language, thought, and reality: selected writings of

Benjamin Lee Whorf. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. In Mey, Jacob L. (2009). (ed.). Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Elsevier.

Wilkinson (1971).*The Foundation of Language*. London: Oxford University Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations.* Basil Blackwell, Oxford. Cited in Newmark, Peter (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. London, Pergamon Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1965). Philosophical Investigations. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Wolfram, W. and Schilling-Estes, N. (1998). American English: dialects and variation. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wong, K. (2000). *Cultural functions of code switching among bilingual speakers from different communities.* [Online] Retrieved March 20, 2011, from http://www.sfn.ca/~intlclub/Articles/codeswitching.doc

Yule, G. (1996b). *The Study of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, George (1996a) Pragmatics, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yun, J. H. (2017). Ethnic Identity and Language: Can Languages be "Culture-Bearing Units" for Ethnic Identification? Through the Study of the Northern Thailand's Hmong Case. *BOOK OF FULL PAPERS BESSH-2017*, 10.