

Code switching between Agglutinative and Non-agglutinative Languages: A case of Kiswahili and English Verb during English Language Lesson

Beth Njeri

Murang'a University of Technology, Kenya

***Corresponding author**

Beth Njeri

Article History

Received: 06.11.2017

Accepted: 13.11.2017

Published: 30.11.2017

DOI:

10.36347/sjahss.2017.v05i11.008



Abstract: Research shows that code switching plays a critical role in not only language development but also content delivery. The current study has addressed the issue of code switching in an agglutinative and non-agglutinative language classroom. Linguists agree that code switching is a rule-governed process. In addition, the rules applied are language specific; hence, languages involved are the determinants. Despite the teachers using code switching as a discourse strategy, guidance on which rules should guide them has not been offered. Consequently, teachers have continued to use code switching without following rules of the languages involved. This may have resulted to poor command of L2 as evidenced in English language in Kenya that has in turn contributed to poor performance in national examinations. For this reason, there is need to establish rules that guide teachers during code switching in order to enhance second language learning. To achieve this, the study was guided by three objectives: Finding out features of English and Kiswahili verb; establishing grammatical constraints that may result in an English/Kiswahili code switching and finally, establishing the grammatical consequences of using Kiswahili verb during an English lesson. Purposive sampling techniques were used to select schools where learners used Kiswahili as a medium of instruction. Data collection was through audio recording during English language lessons and interviews. The study established that Kiswahili and English have both similar and dissimilar features. Further, it was evident that syntactic constraints result when there are dissimilarities between the syntactic rules of the two languages involved in code switching. Grammatical dissimilarities led to syntactic constraints. Finally, use of Kiswahili verb during English lesson disadvantaged its learning due to the syntactic differences. In conclusion, code switching should be applied with caution by ensuring that rules of the target language are followed. However, where there is a possible syntactic constraint then code switching should be avoided. The study recommended that teachers and learners be sensitized on observing syntactic rules of second languages during code switching in an English lesson. This enhances its development as a second language.

Keywords: Agglutinative, non-agglutinative, verb phrase, code-switching, syntactic rules.

INTRODUCTION

Researchers and theorists give varying accounts on how second language learning may be facilitated. In particular, there is no agreement as to whether use of L1 influences or interferes with the L2 learning. Chomsky's Universal Grammar theory [1] demonstrates that L1 and L2 acquisition follow similar development patterns in grammar, phonological and orthographic. In the theory, Chomsky proposes that learning of L2 is achievable if informed by L1 acquisition phenomenon. In contrast, Selinker's Theory [2] on Error analysis focuses on establishing possible errors resulting from dissimilarities between L1 and L2. This is because of interference that may arise due to grammatical

difference. For Behaviourist Theory [3], however, there is a total disregard of the first language and the emphasis is laid upon learning structures of target language through drilling and repetition. These diverse views on second language acquisition reflect the intricacy of the whole process.

However, there is now a worldwide acceptance that L1 is used during target language lessons and when teaching other subjects during the classroom lessons. In such learning situations, code switching is used as a teaching strategy. For instance, Trudgill [4] and Nthiga [5] identified code switching as one of the strategies of introducing second language learning in lower primary.

Results from past studies and theories on code switching have had valuable implication for the language teachers especially in their teaching processes and classroom activities. The valuable role of code switching as a second language teaching strategy creates a need to understand the process for the results to be realised. This study reviews English to Kiswahili code switching during an English lesson.

Code switching

Language contact may result to a number of effects including code switching, language shift, and language borrowing among others. Field [6] suggests that in any discussion on bilingual mixes, borrowing must be included. For this reason and since the current study focused on code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing phenomenon were also discussed in an effort to establish whether there are major differences. The different views of what each phenomenon, starting with code-mixing then borrowing, as suggested by scholars are presented before drawing a conclusion of what the study considered to be code-switching.

Code mixing

Linguists have given different accounts of code-mixing bringing out different conditions and features involved in the process. For example, Sridhar and Sridhar [7] refer to code mixing as transfer of linguistic units like words, phrases and clauses from one language into another; within a single utterance in the same speech. The two argue that code mixing must occur within a sentence. Similarly, Bokamba [8] defines code mixing as the insertion of various linguistic units such as affixes, bound morphemes, words, phrases and clauses within a sentence. Although Bokamba agrees with Sridhar and Sridhar in his definition in terms of code-switching occurring within an utterance, he deviates slightly. In his explanation, Bokamba points out that during code switching there may be a morphological integration, which the duo had not included. Therefore, inclusion of any word that had undergone some affixation was to be referred to as code mixing as illustrated below.

Example 1

I *chezad* yesterday.
I played yesterday.

In example 1, there is code mixing because the verb '*cheza*' has been inserted in the sentence. Further, the verb 'play' has undergone a morphological process by being added a suffix '-d' to show tense in English. Wardhaugh [9] states that code switching occurs when the speakers use both languages to the extent that they change from one language to another in the course of a single utterance. In his definition, Wardhaugh lays emphasis on code-mixing occurring in the same sentence.

Borrowing

Field [10] defines borrowing as a form of copying a form of language system from one language into another with or without all associated meanings or concepts expressed in its source language. According to Field, borrowing may occur through copying structures of morphemes and word(s). Sridhar and Sridhar [11] have identified 5 ways of distinguishing code-mixing from borrowing.

- i) In code-mixing elements do not fill the lexical gap of the host language;
- ii) The code-mixed elements are often sequentially longer than single words;
- iii) The code-mixed elements are not restricted to a more or less limited set accepted by the speech community of the host language because the entire language system is at the disposal of code-mixer;
- iv) The code-mixed elements are not necessarily assimilated into the host language through phonological and morphological processes
- v) Lastly, in terms of individual speaker's competence, borrowing occurs in monolingual speech while code mixing is necessarily a product of bilingual competence.

Grojean [12] notes that there has been a lot of debate on whether, during borrowing, there is phonological integration but less debate on morphological adaptation. The implication is that most scholars agree that in borrowing the word may undergo a morphological adaptation as observed in example 1 above. The word '*cheza*' undergoes a morphological integration by adding the morpheme '-d' to be included in the English utterance.

Code Switching

There are many descriptions of code switching. For instance, Valdes-Fallis [13] describes code switching as the use of two languages simultaneously or interchangeably while Poplack [14] says that it as an alteration of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituents. Similarly, Bokamba [15] defines code switching as use of words, phrases and sentences from two distinct grammatical systems across sentences within the same speech. Further, Macaro [16] and Malmakaejar [17] add that switching between two languages occurs in a naturalistic discourse when the interlocutors have some degree of competence in the language they use. It is from the different definitions that one major difference between code mixing and code switching is brought out. The fact that code switching is not limited to a single utterance in a sentence because switching is allowed between words, phrase, clauses and sentences in a conversation.

Since, the study limited itself to the switches within a sentence or an utterance; code mixing and code switching were used to refer to the same phenomenon.

Further, the study adopted Sridhar and Sridhar's [18] approach to identify code-switched constituents in the data provided.

Code switching in Bilingual Classes

Code switching may be used to develop both second language grammar and vocabulary. Krashen [19] found that code switching was used a lot in grammar instruction in classroom. The high use of code switching during grammar instruction in lower primary is an indication that use of L1 helps in L2 learning. For instance, Cook [20] noted that when teachers code-switched, learners were able to draw knowledge from their L1 grammar. Further, Celik [21] argues that code switching benefits the L2 learner because it allows the learner to identify the similarities and differences between L1 and L2. She also notes that when a learner is aware of the differences that exist in L1 and L2 grammar, then errors resulting from interference are likely to reduce.

Similarly, Macaro [22] examined the use of L1 grammar during L2 vocabulary learning lessons. The results revealed that use of code switching by teachers improved pupils' vocabulary. Lin [23] concurs by noting that code switching is useful in vocabulary learning because it increases learner's cognitive processing of words as it allows a learner to get both an explanation of a word and a translation.

In conclusion, the above studies and others revealed that the use of code switching during English lessons by both teachers and learners had a significant impact on classroom discourse and grammar development. These include the need to clarify and emphasize, especially to explain instructions, which are in a language that pupils do not understand. Secondly, to explain a vocabulary that is new to the learners. Thirdly, code switching is used to enhance communication, especially when the listeners have not achieved proficiency in all languages. Fourthly, pupils' code-switch to maintain a relationship with their interlocutors since it is not right for them to be quiet. Finally, pupils were observed to use words from the L1 to fill in gaps for words that they either had forgotten or never knew especially when using target language in their discourse [24, 25, 26]. Therefore, the positive impact of code switching in English language learning situations explains why teachers in Kenya and beyond practise it until pupils have acquired some level of proficiency in the language.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Contrastive Analysis

Lado proposed contrastive analysis (CA) in 1957. Lado argued that a teacher may predict possible errors by studying the similarities and differences in L1 and L2. He further notes that the similarities in L1 and

L2 enhance language learning, while the differences could cause some difficulties and errors, which are likely to be observed. The theory proposes that teachers should compare L1 and L2 in order to identify the differences. In their teaching, teachers are expected to focus on areas that have some dissimilarity. Ellis [27] has identified four main stages in the process of contrasting two languages, which are based on CA.

- i) Description of the two languages. In the current study, transcribed data from the classroom discourse during English lesson and views from other linguist were used to describe English and Kiswahili languages.
- ii) Selection of the items or areas to be compared. In the study, the item of focus was on the verb phrase in English and Kiswahili.
- iii) A comparison where the researcher compares the two language systems or sub-systems by highlighting the differences and similarities. In the current study the focus was on the syntactic rules in verb phrase.
- iv) Lastly, prediction where the researcher is able to anticipate some possible outcomes. Croft [28] notes that studies on language structure have shown that although languages may have similarities, they could also differ from each other in many unpredictable ways. In view of the existence of both similarities and differences in languages, there is need to study the language structures of different languages especially in the bilingual world. The comparison is necessary in bilingual education where the role of L1 in target language learning has been identified.

In the current study, the similarities between the word order of the matrix language (English) were used to predict a possible switch of the two elements on one hand. On the other hand, the differences between the word order of the verb was used to predict possible syntactic constraints.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a descriptive design and a qualitative approach describes English to Kiswahili code switching. Wimmer and Joseph [29] note that the design attempts to describe a current condition in any given area of study. The current study was carried out in Kasaraani sub location of Nairobi County]

In Kasarani Sub County, there are 25 public primary schools. The public schools were classified into 3 groups depending on the area that they are located. The schools are spread across different environments with some located in slums, others in areas dominated by middle class while others were in areas resided by the middle-upper class. Stratified sampling was used to select one school from each of the three categories. Milroy and Gordon [30] points out that social context

plays a prominent role in language use and should not be ignored. Taking such factors relating to setting into consideration was important to the study since it influenced language use as enshrined in the language policy. Kenya's language policy states that the language of the catchment area should be used as medium of instruction with exceptional use of Kiswahili in multi-ethnic areas.

One school from each category was randomly picked for the purpose of the study. The 3 schools were more than 10 percent of the number of public schools. Gay [31] argues that 10 percent of an accessible population is enough for a sample in a descriptive study. In each school, further sampling of 3 classes was done to arrive at a sample of nine classes. Random sampling was used to select standard one, two and three in two schools which had more than one streams.

Audio recording was the main data collection method. Each of the English lessons covers 35 minutes. It was observed that approximately the first 20 minutes could provide the data required for the study. The 20 minutes recording in each class translated to a total of 180 minutes of recording in the whole study. The researcher observed that out of the 9 classes that data was collected from only 4 classes had relevant data to the study. The data was considered enough to be used in the study. Milroy [32] argues that the big sample for linguistic study may not be necessary, as they tend to be redundant, increasing problems with little analytical returns. The researcher observed that even a bigger sample would have provided similar information provided by the 4 classes.

FINDINGS

English Verb Phrase

English is an example of a non-agglutinative language. The verb phrase in English can be formed by only a main verb or an auxiliary verb + the main verb. Leech *et al.*, [33] argue that auxiliary verbs are optional since a main verb in a sentence can convey the information to do with tense, number and person. However, when a main verb is used with the auxiliary verb the auxiliary verb relays the information on person, number and tense. Tense relates to the event or states being described by the verb to a time in the past, present or future. In English only two tenses are identified as guided by the morphological marking '-s' for present tense and '-ed' for the past tense. Number in grammar refers to whether verb(s) and noun(s) are singular or plural. In English, the subject and the verb must agree in terms of number. As a result, a singular noun goes with a singular verb. Likewise, a plural noun goes with a plural verb [34, 35].

In English, auxiliary verbs are of two types: primary and modal. Primary auxiliaries are three: 'BE',

'HAVE' and 'DO'. Each of the three types takes different forms. For instance 'BE' takes six forms that include 'is', 'was', 'are', 'were', 'being' or 'been' while 'HAVE' takes only three forms, 'has', 'have' and 'had' just like 'DO' which takes the form 'do', 'does' and 'did'. As indicated earlier, primary auxiliaries are the linguistic categories that carry tense when used with a main verb. However, auxiliary verbs unlike the main verb are said to have irregular tense because they do not add the affixes '-s' or '-ed'. Further, primary auxiliaries are used in the formation of negative sentences and polar questions as in Example 2(i) and (ii) respectively.

Example 2

- i) The lady *was not* going to attend the party.
- ii) *Was* the lady going to attend the party?

Primary auxiliary verbs are used as copular verbs in a sentence. A copular verb plays a linking role in a sentence as illustrated in example 3.

Example 3

- i) The girl *was* right.

Modal auxiliaries like the primary auxiliaries are used to help the main verb in a sentence. Their main function in a sentence is to express action or state in terms of ability, permission and obligation. Modals will express possibility, prediction and necessity as illustrated in example 4 sentence (i)-(iii).

Example 4

- i) The examiners *may/might/can/could* leave anytime. (Possibility)
- ii) The graduation date *shall* be announced next month. (Prediction)
- iii) Students *must* work to pass their exams. (Necessity).

Similar to the primary auxiliaries, modal auxiliaries can be used in the formation of negative sentences, polar and questions as shown in example 5.

Example 5

- i) The man *should not* be condemned for slaughtering a stolen goat. (Negative).
- ii) *Should* the man be condemned for slaughtering a stolen goat? (polar)
- iii) The man *should* be condemned, *shouldn't* he? (Tag)

Syntactic Constraints in English to Kiswahili Code-switching

Bunyi [36] refers to syntactic constraints as a situation where two elements cannot collocate during code switching because it would lead to ungrammatical construction. Verb phrase in English and Kiswahili is

used to discuss syntactic constraints resulting from code switching of the two languages. Since it is only the grammar of the languages involved that result to syntactic constraints in code switching as MacSwan [37] points out; rules that guide element combinations in each language are discussed. In each area identified, where there are similarities code switching is allowed. However, where the rules of the two languages are dissimilar possible constraints are identified.

A verb in English takes the same position like that of Kiswahili in a sentence. It would then be expected that switching between the two languages is allowed. On the contrary, switching between the verbs of the two languages may result to constraints in sentences. Constraints in a verb phrase are explained using the word formation and the word order of the verb phrase

The constituents of a Kiswahili verb phrase are similar to those of the English verb in terms of the different types. However, verb phrase in English and Kiswahili are dissimilar morphologically and in some cases in usage as discussed in the study. Like an English verb phrase a Kiswahili verb phrase constitutes a main verb and an auxiliary verb. In both English and Kiswahili the helping verb may grouped into two groups: primary auxiliary '*vishirikishi vipunguvu*' and modal auxiliaries (*vishirikishi kamilifu*).

a) Main Verb

Kiswahili main verb unlike the English one is complex [38; 39 & 40]. The main differences of the verb systems are attributed to Kiswahili being an agglutinative language and its verb can function as a complete sentence whereas English cannot.

Table 1: A Summary of Person in Kiswahili and English

Person	Singular	Plural
First	<i>Ni-</i> (I)	<i>Tu-</i> (we)
Second	<i>U-</i> (you)	<i>M-</i> (you)
Third	<i>a-</i> (he/she)	<i>Wa-</i> (they)

As observed in table 1, Kiswahili like English can use first, second and third person to show the subject in a sentence as the table shows. However, in English for persons used as subject in a sentence are free morphemes unlike Kiswahili whose persons are bound to the root verb. Person in English like in Kiswahili is able to express number as illustrated in example 7.

Example 7

- i) T: People along the field, *wanaoshangilia*.
'People along the field, they who cheer others'
- ii) Respect *vile uneambiwa* you respect your mother

Example 6

- i) *KIS: Hatutamchokoza.*
- ii) *ENG: We shall not harass him/her.*

In example 6 (i), the verb '*Hatutamchokoza*' is complete sentences having a subject, verb, and object as given by the translation in example 6 (ii). The ability of a verb in Kiswahili to function as a sentence is attributed to several affixes (prefix, infixes and suffixes) attached to the verb, representing different grammatical aspects that serve specific functions as summarized below.

Pre-Prefix (PP) + Subject Prefix (SP) + Tense Marker (T) + Object infix (O) + ROOT (V) + R. Derivational (D) + Suffix (S) +Post Suffix (Ps)

In the sentence '*hatutamchokoza*' the affixes include 'ha-' (PP) that expresses negation, '-tu-' (Sp), '-ta-'(T), '-m-'(O), '-chokoz-'(V) and '-a' (D).

Polome [41] notes that in case of a negation in Kiswahili, the affix should be placed before the subject. As observed, unlike English negation that occurs after the verb, the Kiswahili negation is placed before the verb. According to Omondi [42] the verb is able to function as part of a sentence after numerous affixes are attached to it depending on the condition expressed. Consequently, the whole representation of the verb system may not appear in all sentences. Aboum and Bastiaanse [43] identify the subject prefix, the tense marker and the root verb as the affixes that are obligatory in every grammatical sentence.

The subject prefix in the Kiswahili verbal system is represented by bound morphemes. The subject prefix is able to express both person and number in a sentence.

'Respect as you have been told you respect your mother.'

In example 7 (i) and (ii) '*wa-*' (*they*) and '*u-*' (*you*) are used to express number and person respectively. While '*u-*' is represents the second person singular, '*wa-*' represents third person plural.

Tense in Kiswahili may be discussed just like English as it is used to express time and aspect. Both languages use bound morphemes to express tense. Kiswahili expresses past, present and future represented

by affixes '-na-', '-li-' and '-ta-' respectively. On the contrary, English has no verb inflection for the future.

Example 8

- i) *Baba alipika chakula*
'Father cooked food'
- ii) *Baba anapika chakula*
'Father is cooking food'
- iii) *Baba atapika chakula*
'Father will cook food'
- iv) *Baba amepika chakula*
'Father has cooked the food'
- v) *Baba hupika chakula*
'Father cooks food'

In example 8 sentence (i), the past tense marker '-li-' is used to describe cooking that was done sometimes ago. In sentence (ii) the morpheme '-na-' is used to show that the action is taking place as the speaker is speaking. Present tense also marked by 'a-'. In sentence (iii) (-ta-) is used to describe some activity to be done in future, in this case cooking while '-me-'. Aboum and Bastiaanse [44] note that present perfect marker is used often to describe an activity that happened in the past in Kiswahili compared to English. As further observed, continuous and perfect tenses are also expressed using bound morpheme (hu-) and (-me-) in sentence (v) and (iv) respectively.

Table 2: A Summary of Tense in Kiswahili and English.

Tense	Kiswahili	English
Present tense	-na-	am, are, is
Past tense	-li-	was, were
Future	-ta-	will, shall
Continuous tense	Ki	'be+ -ing
Perfect tense	-me-	has, have, had
Simple tense	hu-	's

a) Number

Number in a Kiswahili verb was expressed using different bound morphemes depending on the class a noun belongs to. Specifically, the noun class of the subject in a sentence determined the morpheme. However, a morpheme that was attached to a singular verb was different from that attached to a plural root verb. For example in noun class 1 singular is represented by 'a' prefix while the plural is represented by the prefix 'wa'. For instance in the words 'mtoto' and 'watoto'. Similarly, in Noun class 3 'ji' is a singular prefix that combines with the stem 'we' to form the word 'jiwe' while plural prefix 'ma' joins with stem 'we' to form the 'Mawe'.

Code switching between a main verb in Kiswahili and English can cause syntactic constraints because of a number of syntactic rules. A main verb in Kiswahili is formed by many bound morphemes while English has free morpheme. Poplack [45] developed free Morpheme constraint, which states that code switching may not occur between bound morphemes. As a result, it would not be possible to code-switch from English to Kiswahili between subject prefix (table 1). Similarly, although the verb expresses number in both languages the positioning is different. A bound morpheme prefixes the root verb in Kiswahili while free morphemes are used to express the number.

Further observation on the tenses reveal that, although tenses in both English and Kiswahili is expressed using bound morphemes, there are two main differences. First, Kiswahili has a tense morpheme that

is used to express future, which English lacks. Secondly, tense in Kiswahili is expressed by a bound morpheme prefixed to the root verb while in English it suffixes it. Because of the observed differences, an Equivalent constraint is likely to result [46]. Finally, negation in Kiswahili is expressed by a bound morpheme 'ha' that prefix all the other morphemes in the word while in English a free morpheme 'not' is used after a helping verb.

Both English and Kiswahili have two types of auxiliary verbs: Primary and Modal. The auxiliary verbs are used before the main verb.

b) Primary auxiliaries

Like the primary auxiliaries in English, the Kiswahili ones are used as copular verbs in the sentences. Copular verbs do not have independent meaning and their main function in a sentence is to relate elements in a clause or sentence particularly subject and complement. For instance in example 9 (i), the copular verb 'ni' is used to join the subject morning and its complement 'morning' in a statement while in 4 (ii), the copular verb is used to express negation. Examples in Kiswahili include NI, -LI-.-KO, -MO, -NA, YU, and WA.

Example 9

- iii) *CS: Morning ni asubuhi*

Aux.V

ENG: Morning is morning'

Aux. v
- iv) *KIS: Juma, mtoto si wangu*

ENG: Juma, the baby is not mine
 CS: Juma, the baby *si* mine.

The positioning of the copular verb in both English and Kiswahili allows switching between the two languages as illustrated in example 9. Poplack [47] supports such switch in Equivalent constraint who argued that code switching should occur at points, which the surface structures of two languages map, to each other.

The auxiliary verb in Kiswahili like in English plays a special function of indicating the tense as illustrated in example 10.

Example 10

i) KIS: Janet *a-li-kuwa akishona sweta*.
 aux M(V) O
 ENG: ‘Janet was knitting a sweater’
 *CS: Janet alikuwa akiknit a sweater

ii) KIS: Jane *a-ta-kuwa akishona sweta*
 Aux M(V) O
 ENG: ‘Jane will be knitting a sweater’

In example 10(i) above, in the helping verb ‘*alikuwa*’, ‘*-li-*’(was) which is a tense marker in Kiswahili, prefixed the root verb ‘*-kuwa*’ to indicate that the action started in the past. Similarly, the infix ‘*-ta-*’(will) in the auxiliary ‘*a-ta-kuwa*’, indicates that the action will take place in the future as illustrated in example 10 (ii) above.

d) Modal auxiliaries

Kiswahili modals just like in English usually accompany the main verb. However, Aboum and Bastiaanse [48] observe that unlike the English modal, Kiswahili ones are inflected for agreement.

Example 11

i). Whitney *akiwa na kalamu mbili na Jonny hana*,
 a-na-weza kumpa Jonny moja
 Modal Aux + V

ii) ‘... ..she can give Jonny one’
 Modal aux + V

iii) CS: She can *mpa* Jonny one.

v) *CS: *anaweza* give jonny one.

vi) *Nani wa-li-weza kumtusi mwalimu?*
 Modal aux) +V O

vii) Who could have abused a teacher?
 Modal aux + V

The verb ‘*anaweza*’(singular + present tense + can) and *waliweza* (plural + present tense + can)’ are the modal auxiliaries used before the main verbs in example 11 (i) and (vi) respectively ‘*Kumpa*’(give) and ‘*kumtusi*’(abuse). In such sentences the infix ‘*-na-*’ and ‘*-li-*’, in the modal auxiliaries are used to express tense

while the prefix ‘*a-*’ and ‘*wa-*’ show the number. ‘*a-*’ and ‘*wa-*’ are used to express singular and plural respectively. However, the Modal auxiliary in Kiswahili expresses both the tense and the number, while the English modal auxiliaries express tense but not the number.

Code switching between modal auxiliaries in English and Kiswahili is conditional. For instance, in example the switch between the modal auxiliary ‘can’ and the main verb ‘give’ is allowed. However, a switch between Kiswahili modal ‘*anaweza*’ and the English modal ‘can’ should not be allowed since Kiswahili is bound while English one is a free morpheme. Similarly, the modal auxiliary ‘*waliweza*’ cannot be switched with ‘could have’.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the agglutinative nature of the Kiswahili verb gives it a complex structure compared to English. As a result, the use of Kiswahili verb during English lesson may disadvantage learners due to the syntactic differences.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- i) Code switching should be applied with caution by ensuring that rules of the target language are followed.
- ii) Code-switching may be used during English lesson to bring out the difference between the two languages to avoid negative transfer.
- iii) The study recommended that a critical look at the languages used during development of the second language for proper guidance on how to use L1 during L2 lesson.

REFERENCES

1. Chomsky N. Reflection in Language: Pantheon: New York. 1975. Print.
2. Selinker L. Rediscovering Interlanguage. London: Longman publishers. 1992. Print.
3. Chomsky N. 1975. See note 1.
4. Trudgill P. Dialects in Contact. Oxford: Blakwell. 1986, 1998. Print.
5. Nthiga P. Patterns and Functions of Code-Switching in Pre-Primary Classroom Discourse in Selected Schools at Kasarani Division Nairobi. Unpublished MA. Thesis, Kenyatta University. 2003. Print.
6. Field W. Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts. Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishing Company. 2002. Print.
7. Sridhar S, Sridhar K. The Syntax and Psycholinguistics of Bilingual Code-Mixing. Studies in Linguistic Science. 1980; 10: 203-215.
8. Bokamba E. Are there Syntactic Constraints on Code-Mixing? In K. Denning (Eds.), Variation in

- Language. California: Stanford University Press. pp 35-51. 1989. Print.
9. Wardhaugh R. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 1998, 2006. Print.
 10. Field W. 2002. See note 6.
 11. Sridhar S, Sridhar K. 1980. See note 7.
 12. Grosjean F. *Bilingual Life and Reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 2010. Print.
 13. Valdes-Fallis G. *Code-Switching Among Bilingual Mexican-American Women: Towards an Understanding of Sex-Related Language Alternation*. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*. 1977; 7: 65-72.
 14. Poplack S. *Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Terminology en Espanol: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching*. *Linguistics*. 1980; 18: 581-618.
 15. Bokamba E. 1989. See note 8.
 16. Macaro E. *Code Switching in L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy*. In E. Llurda (ed) 2002) *Non-Native Language Teacher. Perspectives, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*, London: New York Publishers pp.63-84. 2012.
 17. Malmakaejar K. *The Linguistic Encyclopaedia*. London: New York Publishers. 1991. Print.
 18. Sridhar S, Sridhar K. 1980. See note 7.
 19. Krashen S. *Principles and Practices of Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamum Press. 1985. Print.
 20. Cook V. *Using the First Language in Classroom*. *A Canadian Language review*. 2001; 57(3): 403-423
 21. Celik S. *Opening the Door: An Examination of Mother Tongue use in Foreign Languages Classroom*. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*. 2008; 34: 75-85
 22. Macaro E. 2012. See note 16.
 23. Lin A. *Classroom Code-switching. Three Decades of research*. *Applied Linguistic Review*. 2013; 4(1): 195-218.
 24. Valdes-Fallis G. 1977. See note 13.
 25. Schimed J. *Accepted Language Behaviour as a Basis for Language Teaching: A Comparison of English in Kenya and Tanzania*. In C. M. Rubagumya (Ed.) *Language in Education in Africa*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp. 123-132. 1991.
 26. Macaro E. 2012. See note 16.
 27. Ellis R. *Linguistic Universals and Second Language Education*. In the study *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1994, 2012. Print.
 28. Croft W. *Typology and universals*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2003. Print.
 29. Wimmer R, Joseph D. *Mass Media Research: An Introduction*. Canada: Thompson Wordsworth. 22. 2006. Print.
 30. Milroy L, Gordon M. *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell. 2003. Print.
 31. Gay R. *Educational Research: Competences for Analysis and Application*. London: Charcles E. Mairill Publishing Company. 1981. Print.
 32. Milroy L. *Observing and Analyzing Natural Language: A Critical Account of Sociolinguistics Methods*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1987. Print.
 33. Leech G, Deuchar M, Robert H. *English Grammar for Today: A New Introduction*. London: Macmillan Publishers ltd. 1985. Print.
 34. Carter R, McCarthy M, Mark G, O'Keeffe A. *English Grammar Today. An A-Z of Spoken and written grammar*. Cambridge University: Cambridge University Press. 2011. Print.
 35. Collins P, Hollo C. *English Grammar*. New York: Palgrave. 2001. Print.
 36. Bunyi GW. *Language Switching in Standard Four Kiswahili Medium and Kikuyu Medium Classroom-An Exploratory Study*. Unpublished MEd Thesis; Kenyatta University. 1986. Print.
 37. MacSwan J. *Code-Switching and Generative Grammar: A Critique of MLF Model and Some Remarks on "Modified Minimalism*. *Bilingual. Language and Cognition*. 2005; 8(1): 1-22.
 38. Polome E. *Swahili Language Handbook*. Washington. D. C: Centre for applied linguistics. 1967. Print.
 39. Ng'ang'a W. *Semantic Analysis of Kiswahili Words using the Self Organising Map*. *Normadic Journal of African studies*. 2005; 12(3): 405-423
 40. Sang K. *Agrammaticic Aphasia Verb and Argument Patterns in Kiswahili –English Spontaneous Language*. *South African Journal of Communication Disorders*. 2015; 62(1): 89-103
 41. Polome E. 1967. See note 38.
 42. Sang K. 2015. See note 40.
 43. Abuom TO, Bastiaanse R. *Characteristics of Swahili–English bilingual Agrammaticic Spontaneous Speech and Consequences for Understanding Agrammaticic Aphasia*. *Journal of neurolinguistics*. 2012; 25: 276-293
 44. Abuom TO, Bastiaanse R. 2012. See note 43.
 45. Poplack S. 1979, 1980. See note 14.
 46. Poplack S. 1979, 1980. See note 14.
 47. Poplack S. 1979, 1980. See note 14.
 48. Abuom TO, Bastiaanse R. 2012. See note 43.