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ABSTRACT

The current study seeks to answer the questions of how and why bilinguals code switch as this are the essential questions that need to be addressed when looking at linguistic patterns of bilinguals. This study also incorporates stance, as a great tool for analysis of ways in which we can predict motivations for CS in bilinguals. In an endeavor to explain the language patterns in English Swahili bilinguals in Memphis and Tallassee Florida in the United States of America. The following study address how and why bilinguals code switch, and how different stance taking measures brings out the speaker identities. The study mainly focuses on the intersection between CS, stance and identity to attempt to give an explanation of CS behavior in bilinguals. Three hours of recorded conversations was used for the study.

Subsequent to conversational analysis the study addresses how and why people code switch and kind of stances bilinguals take up to construct their identities. From the study it was found out that bilinguals use situational and metaphorical switching to exhibit how they switch and they switch for purposes of quotations, solidarity and to communicate culturally specific information. On the other hand, further results indicate that CS and stance taking are linguistic practices that enable speakers to construct, reconstruct and negotiate their temporary and permanent identities.
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1.0. INTRODUCTION

The self “emerge[s] from a life of interlocution, moving through time as self-conceptions are constructed, ordered, reordered, contested, revised, pulled apart, and renewed during a person’s lifetime,” (Haviland, 2005, pp. 82).” According to Thornborrow (2004), identity is defined as something that people constantly builds and negotiates throughout their life and through their interaction with each other. This supports the idea that identity is not fixed; it is something that is calibrated over time (Thornborrow, 2004). Identity is comprised of social, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic aspects, the self and the voice (Miller, 1999). One way through which identity is constructed through language is by code switching.

Language is a crucial element in the construction of identity. People commonly identify themselves with community groups, which explain a common yearning for acceptance from members of one’s community. It is through language that people express themselves to others and receive feedback on how others perceive them. Since identity is interactional and language is a tool that people use to gain acceptance from others, identity is constructed through language. Bucholtz & Hall (2005) defines identity as positioning oneself and others in a social situation. Therefore, identity exists as an emergent product because it is a result of interactions. This study investigates whether English-Swahili bilinguals in the United States use code switching to negotiate and reconstruct their identities.
1.1. An Introduction to Code switching, Stance and Identity

In linguistics, code switching (CS) may be defined as the alternation between one or more languages. It is a natural process because it often occurs unplanned amidst the conversation between bilinguals. Considering the structure of language, it can be referred to as the successive occurrence of lexical and grammatical units that belong to different languages. The units range from words to sentences. According to Gumperz (1982), CS is a linguistic practice developed by simultaneous bilinguals, that is, they grew up in a society where both languages are spoken, and both languages have an official status. There have been misconceptions about the fact that bilinguals use CS as a way to fill in their inadequacy in language. It is in fact, however, true that bilinguals use CS to fill in gaps for words or expressions, but this does not mean that they are not proficient. Rather, it helps them to achieve their communicative goals effectively. They are not always aware that they have switched and often cannot report the reason why they switched to communicate or talk about a particular topic (Wardhaugh, 2006). Although the people who speak more than one language look at this as an unconscious phenomenon, the occurrence of CS is not random.

Hozhabrossadat’s (2015), paper “Linguistic identities: How CS Helps in Constructing Otherness in Multilingual Societies” came to the conclusion that when human beings interact, they unconsciously use linguistic devices to bond with one another. Similarly, Casas’s (2008) study on Island Puerto Rican Bilinguals, found out there is a relationship between the development of the communication style of CS and the reproduction and enactment of identity categories such as ‘elite’, ‘American’ or Puerto Rican’. In addition, Hanan Ben Nafa, in her paper on CS and Social Identity construction among Arabic-English Bilinguals: A Stance
Perspective indicates that CS is one of the most resourceful linguistic means through which bilinguals perform a multiple aspects of their social identities. Her study shows that some evaluative stances were responsible for some CS speakers’ act. All the above studies have addressed how CS portrays the speaker’s identity. Speakers use language as a part of strategies and practices through which they associate with groups and distinguish themselves from others as a way of constructing their identities (Milroy & Gordon, 2003). However, there has been very little focus on a stance-based approach to code switching. 

The stance-based approach explains the various postures that speakers take as a way of constructing their identities when speaking both or either of the languages. A change of stance is driven by different ideologies (these are a set of beliefs or feelings about how language is used in the social world), and speakers choose a specific code at a particular moment to adopt a worldview or a way of thinking temporarily. The traditional notion of identity is that speaking two languages means dual or contradictory social identities, for instance, a Swahili speaker portraying a Swahili identity when speaking Swahili and an English identity when speaking English.

According to Gumperz (1982), a bilingual’s two languages do not characteristically indicate the contrasting cultural standards of the minority but reflects the larger society of which they are part. In this case, the two codes are being used simultaneously and are viewed as two voices that respond and complement each other (Woolard, 1995). In Gumperz’s model, bilinguals usually consider the minority language as an in-group “we-code” and the majority language as the out-group “they code.” Some researchers such as Stroud (1992) and Errington (1988) think that Gumperz’s model does not apply to all groups, for instance, Papua New Guinea and Indonesia. This study will establish how code choice helps in constructing the identity of the
speakers. In this case, the study investigates English-Swahili bilinguals and how code choice as they interact influences the construction of their identities.

Several researchers have defined stance relating to the linguistics patterns that speakers use to define who they are. Keisling (2009) defines stance as a way in which speakers express how they relate to their talk (epistemic stance) and the speaker’s expression of their relationship to their interlocutors, (their interpersonal stance). In this case someone who is patronizing takes the interpersonal stance, while a person who is very certain about what he or she is saying takes the epistemic stance. Anderson (2014), on the other hand, defines stance as the way in which speakers position or align themselves through talk. Stance encodes how the speakers will position themselves in terms of form and content, including what is said and with whom one is speaking. It is a way to communicate individual and community value systems and also advertise one's identity. DuBois (2007) defines stance as a public performance or deed by social performer, positioning, evaluating and affiliating with other subjects with respect to any significant scopes of socio-cultural field achieve this.

1.1.1. Statement of the Problem

The current study seeks to address code switching in English-Swahili bilinguals. The central aim is to investigate why and how bilinguals from Kenya alternate between English and Swahili. The study will explore various motivations for CS and how they occur. The study further investigates how people construct their identities by taking up various stances. Li Wei, (1998) mentions that sociolinguists who have studied code switching tend to look at extra linguistic features such as topic, setting, culture, norms, relationships between participants and ideology development that influences the speaker's choice of language. This study examines the
above structures in order to come up with features that speaker’s exhibit when they use language.

1.1.2. Significance of the Study

This study is important to the field of linguistics and other fields such as applied linguistics, bilingualism and education. The results from this study are useful to linguists to understand how and why immigrants show certain patterns of language use when speaking and the message they are trying to pass across when they switch between languages. Results could also be used in the educational settings to predict how CS may promote or affect learning and literacy levels in bilingual schools. This will enable us to find out how bilinguals construct their identities by taking different stances. Most sociolinguistics researchers on English-Swahili CS have concentrated more on the linguistic factors, but little attention has been placed on how the speakers construct identities through stance taking, hence the following questions are addressed in this study:

1. Why and how do English-Swahili bilinguals code switch?
2. What kind of stances do bilinguals take up in conversational narratives as a way of constructing their identities?

1.2. Historical Background of Swahili and English in Kenya

Swahili, also known as Kiswahili, is a Bantu language. It is a lingua franca of several African countries including Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Mozambique and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Swahili is a national language in Kenya spoken by nearly 100% of the Kenyan population. It has approximately 39 million speakers, although they do not speak standard Swahili. People who live in rural areas use Swahili more (Vitale, 1980). Even the
illiterate population knows some basic Swahili, because it is influenced by various grammars of the languages that people speak in the rural areas. Swahili is taught from grade one to high school level and also is a distinct academic discipline in public and private universities.

On the other hand, English, is the official language of Kenya. It is the language that was inherited from British colonialists after Kenya attained independence in 1963 and serves the purposes of communication in schools (elementary school to university level), the parliament, TV and radio broadcasting, administration and for official communication. Students take all subjects in school in English except one, which is Swahili.

This study is based on data collected from English-Swahili speakers in the United States in different social settings, such as offices, schools and normal day-to-day conversations. The social setting, social events and situations always affect code choices. The physical environments in which people operate in their daily lives can be defined as ‘setting’, while the social situation can be referred to as a group of people gathered in a particular setting at a specific time for a certain event.
2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Bilingualism

Bilingualism is the ability to speak two languages. However this definition is quite problematic because many individuals with varying bilingual characteristics can be classified as bilingual. According to Bloomfield (1933), bilinguals are those who have native-like control of two languages and are highly proficient in both languages. According to Matras (2009), this kind of proficiency makes the speaker a balanced bilingual. Li Wei (2000) also defines a bilingual as a speaker who uses two languages and can use both of them in a conversation. In contrast, Romaine (1995) and Auer (1988) define bilingualism as an act that is performed through different forms of bilingual speech, for instance, code switching, with a kind of fluency that is not abstractly or strictly exact. This study has adopted Bloomfield, Romaine’s and Auer’s definition of a bilingual, because sociolinguists do not view CS as a weakness to the part of the speaker but as the ability to use both languages without a problem.

McLaughlin (1984) argues that a child’s simultaneous acquisition of two languages is not equivalent to acquiring a first and second language. Both of the languages appear as first languages although in some situations one language may dominate the other depending on the situation and the participants in the conversation. McLaughlin suggests that simultaneous bilingualism could occur at any age less than a cut off age of three years, and this case applies to the English- Swahili bilinguals, because most of the children in Kenya are born in a society where both adults and peers speak both languages; there after they are taught in both languages
in school, hence grow up speaking both of the languages. The speakers are also proficient in speaking, listening, reading and writing.

Usually, in Kenya, most of the children acquire English and Swahili simultaneously from the time they start growing up if they live in an environment where adults speak both languages. Most bilinguals who exist in Kenya can speak fluently and write in both of the languages. The languages are used for different purposes; for instance, Swahili is used at home, in the streets and while chatting with friends, while English is used at school, offices and government. Fishman (1972) supports this by commenting that it is rare to find any person who is equally competent in both languages and across all situations. Bloomfield (1933) mentions that it is rare for bilinguals to have a balance between the two languages; hence one of the languages will always be dominant. In Kenya, Swahili is dominant since it is used by majority of the people; it is a national language, and a lingua franca within East Africa. The use of either of the languages is triggered by the situation and the contexts of which the language is being used and the communicative functions as stated by Grosjean (2010). Most English-Swahili bilinguals switch their languages because there is a constant need for adaptation to their linguistic resources and to the different situations in which they find themselves. From the above arguments, English-Swahili bilinguals qualify to be referred to as bilinguals.

2.2. Code

In this study, ‘code’ is viewed as grammatical and lexical items such as nouns, phrases and clauses. In this study, ‘code’ and ‘language’ have been used interchangeably, for instance, code to mean "language" and vice versa because English and Swahili belong to different linguistic/grammatical systems (Muysken, 2000). Some authors have viewed them as different terms (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001). In this study, the term code is not only used to mean a
different language (Romaine, 1995).

2.3. Definition issues in CS

One area that has received much attention is the definition of the term code switching (CS). As the field of CS grows, the more debatable views arise regarding its definition and reference terms. CS mostly occurs when a speaker switches from one code to another, either intentionally or unintentionally. There are two major types of code switching: intersentential and intrasentential (Saville-Troike, 2003). Intersentential CS is accomplished at a sentence interval. For instance, an example from English-Swahili code switching where speaker F, G and H are engaged in a conversation, the first two sentences are spoken in Swahili and the last two sentences are switched to English as shown in example 1, excerpt 4.

(1.) Except 4,

65. F: mmh
66. G: hii ni ya chapati au ni ya maandazi?
   ‘is this for chapati(Kenyan flat bread) or is it for mandazi(Kenyan snack)?’
67. H: ni ya chapo
   ‘it's for chapo(short form for chapati)’
68. G: you use milk?
69. H: yah
70. G: milk and water or just milk?
71. H: milk and water.

Intrasentential switch on the other hand is the one that occurs when the switch is done in the middle of a sentence. Poplack (1980) gave an example as follows, “Sometimes I will start a sentence in English y termino espanol. For instance, in example 2a, excerpt 2 is an example of English-Swahili CS that has intrasentential switch. The speaker starts the sentences in English and then midway, the speaker changes to Swahili.

(2a.) Excerpt 2

18. D: That is so…. I can’t believe X mwenyewe ndio alisema hivyo.
‘That is so….. I can’t believe that X herself is the one who said so’

Sometimes the switch might occur within a word, phrase or sentence. In both cases the speakers are usually unaware of the switch. The switch could be from one language to another, a dialect to another, or from one style of speaking to another. In the example below, the speaker switches from Swahili to English then to his ethnic dialect, a perfect example of intrasentential CS. At the beginning the switch occurs within words for instance the speaker says *alafu* which means ‘and then’ in English and then says “buffet” which is in English. The rest of the phrases are spoken in Swahili ‘*akikula akiangalia kwa simu aki*’ and then back to English, and the last word he says ‘*Chingurue*’ he switches back to his ethnic dialect Bukusu.

(2b.) Excerpt 7

192.MB: *alafu* buffet, *akikula akiangalia kwa simu aki* post ‘*chingurue*’ (means pig in Bukusu an ethnic language in Kenya)

‘And then buffet, when he/she eats looking at the phone posting pigs (to mean pork)’

The definition of CS has always varied from one linguist to another. Scholars such as Haugen & Weinreich, who have been considered in history as the initiators of code switching research, define it as: “The ideal bilingual switches from one language to the other according to appropriate changes in the speech situation e.g. (interlocutors, topic, situation e.t.c.) but not in an unchanged speech situation and certainly not within a single sentence.” (1953:73)

In this definition, they view the ability to switch between sentences as CS, but those who switched between words are considered unable to use both of the languages effectively. Hymes (1974) defines CS as the alternative use of two or more languages, varieties of the language or speech styles. On the other hand, Gumperz (1982: 59) defines CS as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchanges passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems as when a speaker uses a second language either to reiterate his message or to reply
to someone’s statement.” “Crystal (1987), on the other hand, views CS as when two people who are bilinguals alternate two languages during a conversation. Bokamba (1989) defines CS as the mixing of sentences, phrases and words from different grammatical systems across sentence boundaries in the same speech event. Myer-Scotton (1993:47) defines CS as, “use of two or more languages in the same conversation, usually within the same conversational turn or even within the same sentence of that turn. It is simply shifting from language A to B. It does not matter if it is within the same sentence or not. In this paper, CS is a representative of both intersentential and intrasentential switching, including switches that occur between long stretches of text. A word that is borrowed from a foreign language and has been completely integrated into the lexical system of the language is not considered as code switched. Wei (2000) describes code switching generally as a phenomenon that occurs when bilinguals switch between languages that are available for them to use. It is a very common act in bilinguals and it occurs within linguistic units that have different lengths. Sometimes it makes an appearance in sentences, words and phrases. In some cases, a long speech might start in one language and end in another language.

All bilinguals who code switch from one code to another do so because they are competent in both languages, not because they are lacking in any of the languages (Genesse et al, 2004). Below is an example of English-Swahili CS; the conversation below involves three participants F, G and H. F is giving G an account of something that happened earlier in the day. The data below is a good example of CS because it clearly shows how the conversation represents two different grammatical systems, or two different languages. The words, phrases and sentences have been mixed up in the same speech event example 3 excerpts 5.

(3.) Excerpt 5

119. F:…video kwa phone, alafu all of a sudden one of the cops akamtackle like huyu
mwingine akamuangusha chini wakaanza kumfinya hivi chini, I think alikua kisema ‘what did I do, what did I do’? wakamuambia if you don’t sijui what I will shoot you.

‘Video on her phone and then all of sudden one of the cops tackled like this, and the other one put him down and pressed him down, I think he was saying, ‘what did I did I do, what did I do?’ they told him if you don’t, I don’t know what I will shoot you’

120. G: Mmmh
121. H: just two seconds na wakampea six bullets.
‘Just in two seconds they gave him six bullets’
122. F: Six?
123. G: Waah,
In this case it does not seem as if the speaker is lacking in any of the two languages because, he gives the account of what happened in Swahili:

(4.) Excerpt 5

119.F: akamtackle like huyu mwingine akamuangusha chini wakaanza kumfinya hivi chini,
‘Cops tackled like this other one put him down and pressed him down like this’
I think alikua kisema ‘what did I do, what did I do’? wakamuambia if you don’t sijui what I will shoot you.
‘I think he was saying, ‘what did I did I do, what did I do?’ they told him if you don’t, I don’t what I will shoot you’

In example 4, excerpt 5, the speaker uses each of the languages for a specific purpose. The speaker gives the direct quotations of what is being said in English and narrates the story in Swahili. It is clear from the above excerpt that speaker does not have a deficiency in any of the languages, but rather each of the languages has an important function depending on the context in which it is being used.

Since this phenomenon occurs mostly in bilingual and multilingual communities it signifies memberships in different social groups. Most people code switch for several reasons but one of the main reasons is because they want to identify themselves with a particular group and negotiate their positions in their interactions and relationships with others. Most of the bilinguals in Kenya code switch between English, and Swahili, and sometimes they have included their ethnic languages.
There has also been a discrepancy when it comes to the distinction between CS and code borrowing (CB). The two phenomena, although they have the same origin, two languages or speakers of different languages contact occur at a linguistic level. CS and code borrowing are distinct. Gardner-Chloros (1995) notices that, although there have been a lot of cases where single word switching has been associated with borrowing; code switching and code borrowing are different. According to Malmkjær (2002), borrowing occurs when words or phrases from one linguistic system have been taken and absorbed into another linguistic system. One of the examples that have been used is the word ‘computer’ in German. Myers-Scotton (2003) attributes the spread of the loans/borrowed words that are used in the speech of the young people to the media. The major difference between switching and borrowing, therefore, is the fact that when a word is borrowed it is integrated in the linguistic system from which it is borrowed, while the words in code switching are used in their usual form. Secondly, according to Appel & Muysken (1987), unlike code borrowing, code switching is spontaneous and the way someone integrates those languages is what makes a distinction between the two language phenomena. In this study, a borrowed word and not code switching, because most of the borrowed words have been adapted on a phonological and morphological level in the borrowed language but words that are code switch are not.

2.4. Historical Development of CS Research

Recent studies support code switching from a sociolinguistic point of view, with an identification of various constraints on code CS, stimulating investigations of morphology, syntax and phonology.

The main focus of studying CS has been focused on grammatical, syntactic and
phonological features (Azuma, 1991). Questions of function and meaning have been largely ignored, but grammatical theory has failed to answer questions such as why and how the switching occurs. Auer (1984) urges that as much as there are have grammatical restrictions on CS, the conditions are not necessary, as they do not give enough reason for or effect of a switch.

Sapir (1929) says that it is not enough for linguists to examine language as a grammatical system rather than a practice of an individual. The analyses that they get might not be important outside the linguistic field. Sapir (1929) calls this a tradition that threatens to become isolated when not vitalized by interests that lie beyond the formal interest in language itself. This paper focuses on the sociolinguistic approach to CS, which is an area of research that focuses beyond the formal interests of languages; it sheds more light on the social and cultural functions of language use.

Researchers such as Sapir (1929) and many others have seen the need for linguists to enrich their studies with social inquiry. Areas such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, philosophy and social sciences should formulate their studies on the basis of the methodologies and findings of research done by linguists. Sapir (1929) urges linguists to make their focus on the broader social settings rather than linguistic features only.

“It is peculiarly important that linguists, who are often accused, and accused justly, of failure to look beyond the pretty patterns of their subject matter, should become aware of what their science may mean for the interpretation of human conduct in general. Whether they like it or not, they must become increasingly concerned with the many anthropological, sociological, and psychological problems which invade the field of language (Sapir, 1929: 214).”

In the 1960’s more scholars continued to advocate for more socially involved linguistics studies
of CS. Hymes (1964) felt that the kind of linguistics studies of CS for which Sapir was advocating was disappearing, and therefore required new approaches, such as ethno-linguistics and sociolinguistics.

In the current research trends and communities, CS has become the norm, but it is very difficult for people who do not speak the language to notice. It has become famous because of an increase in immigration and globalization. Winford (2003), as mentioned the following factors are the greatest contributors to CS; first, the long-term constant bilingual societies especially from Africa and Asia.; second, colonization in the developing countries introduced a lot of European languages that have become the official languages of countries that had other languages originally; third, people have moving from less industrialized countries to industrialized countries for political or economic reasons.

Before CS could be recognized fully by linguists it was called ‘language interference’ and ‘broken language’, until scholars such as Blom and Gumperz (1972) dealt with a group of people from a Norwegian fishing village making scholars more interested in the social side of the use of language. After Blom’s research more studies attempt to look at the social functions of CS. Some of the studies focus on Spanish-English CS as it spread in most of the African cities that are multilingual. In the 1980’s and 1990’s research on immigrant to the western countries began to surface. English-Swahili has been researched too; although most of the research has paid attention to morphological, semantic, phonological and syntactic features of CS.

2.5. Review of the Relevant Literature for the Study

2.5.1. Approaches to Code Switching

The broad question that most sociolinguists would like to answer about CS is, “Why do
speakers use CS?” For this question to be answered, researchers have conducted their studies in macro- and micro-perspectives of code switching. The macro level looks at language choice at the community level, while the micro level looks at language at the interactional level. Fishman (2000) built on this idea by introducing the notion of ‘domain analysis’: language choice is limited to a domain, which could be topic or type of vocabulary used, setting or situation and participants and the function of the interaction.

The micro level introduces the Bloom and Gumperz’s (1972) notion of situational and metaphorical CS. This notion develops further by introducing conversational CS (Bloom & Gumperz 1982), which is composed of the purposes, such as quotations, e.g., quoting what someone else said; personalization vs. objectification; message specification’ when one wants to make his/her message clear or be very specific; reiteration used when the speaker has to say one thing so many times for emphasis; and interjections to show surprise. Saville- Troike (1982) lists eight functions of CS: softening or strengthening a command, for humorous effect, direct quotation or repetition, lexical need, exclusion of other people within hearing, avoidance or repair strategy, and intensifying or eliminating ambiguity. Lastly, Muhlhausler (1980) categorizes the functions of code switching as referential, expressive, integrative, phatic, metalinguistic and poetic. Auer (1995) developed the Gumperz (1972) notion further using the conversational analysis (CA) approach.

The main reasons why people code switch is for signaling topic change (Fishman, 1972; Hoffman, 1991), effective production (Azhar and Bahiyah, 1994), personalizing messages (Koziol, 2000), as a distancing strategy (David, 1999) and dramatizing key words (Auer, 1998). Rihane (2013) finds that people code switch for solidarity, social status, topic, affection, and persuasion. People diverge or converge in a conversation using their speech as reflection of a
certain socioeconomic background.

CS in some situations echoes Goffman’s (1974) frontstage and backstage behavior. Front stage behavior is associated with the standard dialect while backstage behavior is associated with the local dialect, which is meant for solidarity and creating ‘islands’ (creating an environment either to include or exclude other people from the conversation) in the office. ‘Front stage’ a reflection of internalized norms and expectations for how speakers should behave, are partly shaped by the setting and the role speakers’ play, while ‘backstage’, speakers are freed from norms and expectations that shape their behavior and it is always more relaxed and comfortable. A good example is Fishman’s (1972) scene in which a boss and his secretary, both Puerto Ricans, code switch using Spanish and English. When the boss is giving directions about a letter to his secretary, he uses English exclusively, but when he speaks to his secretary about the addressee, he switches to Spanish since the nature of the conversation is informal. In this case, in front stage behavior the boss is expected to speak in a standard dialect when in the office, but he switches to back stage when he speaks to his secretary in Spanish.

The social functions of code switching show a clear-cut distinction between situational and metaphorical CS (Blom & Gumperz, 1972: Gumperz, 1982. Situational CS is conditioned factors in a situation where the interaction is taking place. For instance, people may use their native language at home and switch to English when they go to the office, government or school setting, even when other bilingual speakers are present in the same setting. On the other hand, metaphorical CS occurs within a single interaction, because this kind of switching explores how codes associate to bring out the communication effect. Myers-Scotton (1993a) gives an example of an interaction in a bank in Nairobi when the customer approaches the teller with situational appropriate Swahili. When the teller refuses to process the customer’s transaction, he/she
switches to Luo. By doing this, the customer appeals to the teller’s sense of ethnic loyalty and obligation toward kin.

_Clerk (Swahili): Ee-sema. 'OK-what do you want?' (lit.: 'speak')_

_Customer: Nipefomuyakuchukuapesa. 'Give me the form for withdrawing money.'_

_Clerk: Nipekitabu kwanza. 'Give me [your] book first.' (Customer gives him the passbook.)_

_Customer: Hebu, chukuafoomyangu. 'Say, how about taking my form?'_

_Clerk: Bwana, huwezikutoapesaleokwasabuhujamalizasikusaba. 'Mister, you can't take out money today because you haven't yet finished seven days (since the last withdrawal).'

_Customer (switching to Luo): KONYA AN MARACH. 'Help, I'm in trouble.'_

_Clerk (also switching to Luo): ANYALO KONY, KIK INUO KENDO. 'I can help you, but don't repeat it.'_

The other way that Gumperz (1982) looked into multilingual communities is by exploring the _we-code_ and the _they-code_. This model by Blom and Gumperz (1972) which identity-related issues around CS are introduced proposed that CS can represent group identity and solidarity and also signal different other aspects of identity that are present in different speech situations affecting the way and form of the language being used. When English-Swahili bilinguals use English and Swahili in their communication they use one of the codes as an in-group marker which signals identity and the other as an out-group identity marker. For instance,

(5.) Excerpt 7

182. MC: was I telling you, _huyu jamaa ameo mu_ Australia, Australia……..
183. MB: every weekend, they have to go and stay in a hotel.
184. MA: _au waende_ dinner
185. MB: Friday _ikifika munaenda kwa_ hotel, _mnaacha tu nyumba yenu mzuri, mnaenda kulala kwa hotel sasa, wanafanyanga hivyo, wana mserve tu the next weekend sasa_
tukaenda kwa forest twenty kilo metres.
‘On Friday you go to a hotel, you just leave your good house, they you go and sleep in a hotel, they do that, you are just served, the next weekend we went to the forest twenty kilometers away.
In the above excerpt, speaker MA, MC and MB and utilize they-code in their communication, specifically using, ‘waende’ ‘go’ line 184 and ‘wanafanyanga hivyo’ ‘they do that’ line 185, even though speaker MB was part of the people who had gone to a hotel for a weekend. In this case, the speaker is trying to signal another identity an out-group.

According to Gumperz (1982), when we-code model is applied to Hindi/Punjabi and Spanish we-code in most cases is used to strengthen the ethnic identity and in most cases addresses personal issues. On the other hand “they” code is usually used neutrally and mainly closely related to the speakers of the other code. In conclusion, the speakers’ choice of code and how they use language is termed as a reflection of some elements of their social and ethnic identities. In this study the “we” and “they” code is in handy when determining the kind of identities that the speakers are trying to portray when they are speaking either of the languages.

2.6. Code switching and Stance Taking

Stance is defined as the position of the speaker with regard to their utterances’ form and content. Stance is basically categorized into two epistemic stances: authoritative stance and affective or evaluative stance (Jaffe, 2009). Gumperz (1999) was the first to mention the concurrence between stance taking and code switching, stating that code switching occurs between ‘objectification’ and ‘personalization’: during a conversation whether the statements that speakers say reflect their personal opinions or knowledge of the situations and whether it is a known fact. In an attempt to explain stance taking, Keisling (2009) claims that stance taking is the primary goal of a speaker in a conversation. He considers stance as the primary reason why
people talk. Stance is one of the definite ways that speakers can detect identity expressed through talk. Johnstone (2009) argues that social identity is as a result of stances that have been used over time.

Anderson (2014) on the other hand defines stance as way in which speakers in conversations convey their orientations and feelings through talk. Jaffe (2009), states that stance is a way through which a speaker's individual and community value systems can be revealed. Stance is also regarded as a way of advertising identity because it is the main reason why people engage in a conversation all together, and the linguistic choices that people make are in line with the stances that people take. Stance therefore is not something that is static; it changes over time.

There are three major types of stance authoritative or epistemic, evaluative and affective/interactional stance. According to Jaffe (2009), an affective stance represents the emotional states of the speaker while the epistemic stance represents the degree of certainty about their propositions in which they are socially grounded. The affective/evaluative stance according to Besnier (1990), plays the role of evaluation, presenting oneself and positioning which is the key to stance taking. Affective stance also plays a major role in social and moral indexicality. Jaffe (2009:7), defines affective stance as, “laying claims to particular identities and statuses as well as evaluating others’ claims and statuses.”

The evaluative stance, according to Hunston & Thompson (2000), has three functions, first it expresses the opinion on the speaker or the writer and also manipulates the attitude of the hearer trying to highlight and mark boundaries in the discourse because when evaluating an interaction, it is important to compare it to the norm. For instance, when one takes an attitude such as uncertainty it indexes powerlessness. The second function is that to enable interlocutors to manipulate each other’s attitudes. Ochs (1992) shows how some linguistic forms can index
stances, such as certainty, and interpersonal stances, such as friendliness, or actions, such as apologies. For instance, the affective stance can indicate shared and culturally specific structures of norms and positions for its expression and can be used in placing societal boundaries salient to the work of social classification and delineation. These are some of the ways in which individuals can claim some identities and statuses as well make an evaluation of what other claim and their statuses. This type of stance compares and contrasts people, entities and categories.

The epistemic/authoritative stance on the other hand is also grounded in culture because the interlocutors claim some degree of knowledge and authority (Jaffe, 2009). The authoritative stance lays claim to knowledge and then sets up and authoritative positioning of the stance taker. The major purpose for the epistemic stance is to establish some authority between the participants in a conversation, and basically to locate the source of the authority in the larger socio-cultural field. In some cases the speakers use this type of stance in search of social wealth that contributes for one to be acknowledged as having real or authoritative knowledge.

Lastly, the interactive stance shows alignment and disalignment with the interlocutors. Anderson (2014), Jaffe (2009) also comments that this kind of stance can provide cues for interpretation of utterances. An example of this kind of stance is “I hear you”. Alignment is where by the speaker shows accommodation or solidarity with the interlocutor while disalignment is when the speaker distances or does the opposite by creating a social distance or opposes other people’s views.

Sociolinguistics explains why speakers make conscious or unconscious linguistic choices, how the choices that they make are unnatural, and how people end up making similar or different choices. Stance can be described as a way of linking a linguistic variable indirectly to social
meaning, usually referred to as indexicality (Ochs, 1992). Indexicality makes an examination of identity construction and negotiation of identity through language realistic. Speaker stance in CS is brought out by the use of certain linguistic features. Stance acts as a way through which relationships are personified. The more speakers take a particular stance the more that they become naturally associated with the linguistic style that they use. The use of a specific linguistic feature may be directly associated with a particular speaker. Therefore, through socialization and recurring performances enlightening ideologies are instantiated. It is through exploitation of specific and ideologically informed linguistic variables that stances temporarily become natural and a particular way of speaking becomes directly associated with speakers of a specific social group. Ochs (1993) says that speakers change some aspects of their identity by taking different stances and adopting linguistic styles that are different.

Jaffe (2009) mentions that stance taking is very effective and notable when two codes are used when speaking. Bilinguals have an “added stance resource” unlike monolinguals; with bilinguals, there are some interesting effects when investigating two codes. In this study, I conduct an investigation of how stance is utilized by bilinguals in order to make sense of what they are speaking. Apart from close reading, the study builds on what other researchers have done when looking at stance taking. In Anderson’s (2014), the authoritative stance was enacted by people who have lived in the Metropolitan Detroit area for more than four decades and was based on personal experiences with fellow Appalachian migrants. The evaluative stance is also brought about by comparing cultures and on the cultural importance on how to prepare a certain meal. Interactive Stance, on the other hand, establishes or builds a common ground, sometime indicates understanding and empathy. Speakers position themselves in a way that tells that they understand the nature and purpose of an event.
Eckert’s (1989 & 2000) work in Detroit high school is another good example of how stance examined. The study looked at the way the adolescents take a certain stance and how this relates to their social life. Factors such as the manner in which they dressed and choosing among school activities were explored. These activities become styles that are linked to their social identities.

Kiesling (2004 and 2005) puts some labels to the pairs of stance taking choices that are used to index certain social identities to explain the reason why a particular style of stance would index a particular social identity. The features or behavior that appear together repeatedly with the same style are ideologically linked with social identity.

The concept of indexicality was first introduced by Ochs (1992). It normally indicates how a linguistic fact or concept can be considered a sign it resembles what it symbolizes. Bucholtz & Hall (2010) defined an index as a linguistic form that is dependent on the interaction setting for its significance.

Indexicality can be related closely to Myers-Scotton (1993) markedness model. She argues that for CS to have a social motivation or discourse function that depends solely on the speaker and the audience. Both the speaker and the audience are always aware of what is conventionally expected of them in a community. The fact that there is a mutual agreement between the audience and the speakers of what is expected is what brings about the marked and the unmarked choices.

2.7. Stance and Identity

According to Bucholtz & Hall (2005), identity is defined as the social positioning of self and other. The identities constructed are neither permanent nor constant; rather, they are dynamic and negotiated in every situation (Hall, 1996). For one to construct an identity that is
durable, one needs to be part of a community of practice. Identity is revealed through a community of practice which is defined by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1999) as a group of people who have come together because of a common goal; the people have developed a shared way of doing things, the way of talking beliefs and practices. Wenger (1998), notes that people in a community of practice must have a common engagement and share the repertoire of practices. The community of practice enables people to negotiate meaning of their practices and connecting the meaning to what is known and what is unknown to people. As the interlocutors interact they can be described with a number of characteristic displaying several identities at the same time.

Stance, on the other hand, is a sequence of dynamic activities whereby, the interlocutors evaluate and make assessments and position themselves in relation to the people to whom they are talking, to the objects and to the surrounding environment (Du Bois, 2002a). Stance taking comprises several turns with a focus on a specific topic. In order to analyze stance, one should make sense of the sequential activities and events that are taking place between the interlocutors. As the activities and events unfold the stances of the interlocutors are organized. After the language if used in the interactions gives additional information about socio-cultural values and beliefs that the people hold which are similar to their identities.
3.0. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Participants

The participants are English-Swahili bilinguals from Kenya who currently live in the United States. The participants are mainly from Memphis and Tallahassee where there are large Kenyan communities. A total of 17 people in different social settings were recorded. There were a total of 11 male and 6 female participants (see appendix 2). Most of the participants are English-Swahili who have resided in the United States for upto 10 years. The subjects have the same education backgrounds; they have graduated with their first degree and are now pursuing their master’s or doctoral degrees. Their age ranges from 18-40 years old. All the participants have a good communicative knowledge of English and Swahili; this is evident because they have been able to pursue different levels of education successfully. Most of the participants know other members in the conversation because all conversations are from people who know each other in a tightly- knit social circle.

3.2. Procedures

Participants were asked to record their daily conversation at home after work, at school and in normal day-to-day conversations. In some cases the researcher collected data directly from the participants. The participants were asked to carry the recorder and hit record whenever they engaged in a conversation to ensure that the data collected is natural and that CS is taking place in the most natural environments. A one-hour recording from different social setting was
collected from various participants.

This paper fully complied with the University of Mississippi’s ethical procedures. Before collecting data, the researcher always made sure to seek consent and approval from the participants and inform them of the aim of the research on the consent form. In some cases, oral consent was sought before data collection to make sure that all the standards of the treatment of human subjects was met. Anonymity of the subjects was kept through randomly selected initials or nicknames in the transcriptions. The researcher received Institutional Research Board (IRB) approval before beginning the study.

3.3. Data Collection

The conversational data for this study was obtained from audio recordings made over 12 weeks from May to July. Data was obtained from informal, spontaneous face-to-face interactions from English-Swahili bilinguals from the Memphis Kenyan community and the Tallahassee Kenyan community, well known to the researcher. Out of the possible data collected the conversations were sampled in recorded home settings, school settings, and especially in university office settings because most of the participants are graduate students. The researcher collected some of the data and some of it was taken by the participants. The researcher recorded some participants in the Memphis area while attending some of the social functions held by Kenyans there. In Tallahassee the researcher was able to record some data when visiting. In some cases where the researcher was not able to record the data in person, she asked the subjects to record themselves whenever they engaged in a conversation. According to Sebba and Wotton (1998), the qualitative method is preferable because the researcher will not influence the data in any way. It is recommended that the researcher should not take part in the
conversations; it is easy for a researcher to influence data to favor his/her study. In addition, Milroy (1987) mentions that in order to get quality results the researcher should not control the data.

3.4. Transcription of Recordings

After data was collected, transcription established the instances of English-Swahili CS. At the beginning a free transcription was done, and later an equivalent translation was given below the utterances that are in Swahili. In the translation, the phrases in English are in normal font, while the phrases in Swahili are italicized. Utterances can either be attributed as either English or Swahili are written in normal font.

3.5. Data Analysis

This study uses qualitative data analysis method. It examines how and why bilinguals code switch. In this section data is categorized into various themes depending on the setting, participants, topic and the context on which the communication is taking place. Once these categories have been established then patterns of why and how bilinguals code switch is established with the help of Conversational Analysis model CA. According to Auer (1984), the CA model is a good approach to the study of social interactions that looks into both verbal and nonverbal day-to-day interactions. It remains one of the most successful approaches in the analysis of social interactions. The model has two main advantages: it prioritizes the sequence of the conversation and at the same time pays attention to the influence of the turns being exchanged. It also “limits” the “external” freedom to interpret because it relates his or her interpretations backs to the members (Auer, 1984).

The major aim of using this approach is to show how orderly ordinary conversations can
be. Gafaranga (2005) indicates that the CA model accounts for the orderliness of a conversation as an activity in its own right (2005: 291), this is a discovery procedure that tells us that there is not only order in a conversation but the order interprets the speaker’s turn.

Researchers who use CA believe that meaning of switching is brought about by the sequential development of the conversational interactions, because the CA does not look into details of the social messages and the identities of the speakers, as it is focused more on sequential analysis. This model is very important in this study. Looking at why and how code switching occurs in Swahili-English, focuses on the local, turn by turn interpretation of code switching meaning brought out as the conversation evolves (Li Wei, 1998). CA requires the data to be collected in the form of audio or video recordings, by putting a camera in a room where conversations are taking place. A detailed transcription is followed by a detailed analysis that aims at identifying recurring patterns.

The study addresses how different speakers take up different stances as a way of constructing their identities. In this case, the available data is looked at in a more thoughtful and critical way focusing on the most significant information and patterns in order to understand the different types and meanings of the stances that speakers take.
4.0. RESULTS

This chapter presents the results on how and why people code switch. This section also explores areas such as situational and metaphorical switching. It also explores some functions of CS such as quotations, solidarity, belonging or we/they-code and the use of CS to communicate culturally specific information. The last section, explores the kinds of stances and how they enable participants to construct their identities. Some of the stances explored are authoritative, evaluative, and interactive.

4.1 How and why do people CS

4.1.1. How?

a. Situational and Metaphorical CS

According to Bloom and Gumperz (1972), the situational and metaphorical CS attempts to address how and why CS occurs. Situational CS occurs when the shift makes a change in topic while metaphorical switching occurs when the shift occurs for emphasis. Situational switches also depend on the function that the linguistic variety has been allocated by the society; this could be a particular place, persons and topics. Although metaphorical switching also depends on societal functions, the switch most of the time depends on its effect when it’s first used, it is basically used to emphasize or draw attention. According to Gumperz (1982), situational CS is most cases intersentential switching rather than intrasentential switching but in this study
situational switching was, as shown in excerpt 4.

(12a.) Excerpt 4

96. H: Huwa wanatufanya mambo.
‘They do wonders’
97. G: ndio maana hawa Americans wanatuonanga wanaona hawa wajamaa kweli.
‘This is why Americans look at us and they wonder these guys really’
98. H: hawa wanaonea waluhya, wanasema eti mluhya ni Luhya tu. (laughs)
‘They look down upon the luhyas., they say that a luhya is just a luhya (laughs)’
‘that is one thing I have never imagined, the guy is serious eating seriously’
100. H: nyi mnacheka na yeye anashiba.
‘you guys are laughing and the guy is satisfied’
101. G: si wale walikua naye walikua tu wanamwangailia hivi,
‘I wonder whether those who were with him were looking at home just like this’
102. H: imagine mwenye alitake hiyo video (they laugh) how can you stop yourself from laughing.
‘Imagine the person who took that video (they laugh) how can you stop yourself from laughing’
103. G: (laughing) how, how, how let's say you work together, and there you go sharing this video with your co-workers, how do they even see you at work?
104. H: yah

In the above example, speaker H and G take turns as they speak about a guy who was recorded eating a pizza at restaurant back in Kenya. The whole conversation is in Swahili, but lines 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101 and part of 102 show when the topic shift begins to happen.

Speaker H and G shifts the topic from the guy who was being recorded to the person who was recording him and perhaps his officemates. As the topic shifts there is also a change in code. The conversation that was initially in Swahili is shifted to English.

Excerpt 10, example 12b is another example of situational switching, as speaker NNB is interacting with his friends asking them about their plans for Memorial Day, he is code switching between English and Swahili. Blom & Gumperz (1972) mentioned that when speakers switch situational it is always because a change of topic has occurred or the participants in the conversation have changed.
254. NNB: *kesho tunaenda wapi* memorial day?
   ‘Where are we going tomorrow for memorial day?’
255. NNR: Nick *alisema anachoma mbuzi akasema twende tukule mbuz, uko na mpango?*
   ‘Nick said that he will barbecue goat, he said that we should go and eat goat, do you have plans?’
256. NNB: just sit here relax,
257. NNR: *hiyo sio mpango, tumeacha kama Aga anachoma nyama.*
   ‘That is not a plan, we left home when Aga was barbecuing some meat’
258. NNB: *Nani anachoma nyama?*
   ‘Who is barbecuing?’
259. NNG: Aga.
260. NNB: *Anachoma nyama?*
   He is barbecuing meat?’
261. NNR: Mmh,
262. NNB: *Wapi, hapo kwenu?*
   ‘Where?, at your place?’
263. NNR: *hapo home yah..*
   Yeah, at home’
264. NNB: *nyama choma?*
   ‘Barbecue’
265. NNR: mmh,
266. NNB: are you serious?
267. NNR: yah,
268. NNB: *ako na grill hapo nje?*
   ‘he has a grill outside there’
269. NNR: *kadogo, Men, nimeswim mpaka naskia njaa.*
   ‘a small one, Men, I swam until I am feeling hungry’

In the above example, speaker NNB uses Swahili in most of his utterances, as shown in lines, 254, 255, 258, 260, 262, 264, and 268. This however changes immediately when his wife gives a call. His wife had travelled and called him to let him know that she had arrived safely. The speaker switches to English to speak to his wife, as shown in excerpt 12c:

Example (12c)

276. NNB: (talking on his phone)’hey how are you, am doing good. My phone just died. Yah, yah aah yah hey love, how are you, ooh, excellent, excellent. Where are you guys heading now, Oooh, okay? Excellent, excellent she had a
good flight? Ooh, well. How long was it? Ooh, okay right...okay. Ooh okay. Did he charge you for the luggage? Yah, I am here with G and R they came to swim so...M says hi R.
277. NNR: He says hi back.
278. NNB: she says hi back. Hey love did they charge you for the luggage? Ooh, okay all right I will let you rest okay? Okay I love you. Okay bye. (Singing)

The change in participants from friends to wife and change of topic influenced the switch in the conversation above.

Metaphorical switching on the other hand, show that a change in language does not cause a change in the speech event (Gumperz 1982). Instead interactants exhibit the different relationships that they hold rather than altering the rules and regulations that are in operation. The allusion comes to effect through the use of language that serves as a metaphor (Blom & Gumperz 1972), as shown in excerpt 3:

(12b.) Excerpt 3,

30. D: Yah. Men, I went to Kenya I met one of my classmates, the number one guy in the school men, the top three.
31. C: Yah,
32. D: Men! Anauzasimu.
‘Men! He sells phones’
33.C: Yah, you told me about it, so how was the conversation?

Example 12b is a good example of a metaphorical switch. In this conversation, the topic does not change, but the switch occurs to express astonishment/surprise. In this conversation speaker D tells when he met his high school friend after so many years. The friend in question was always the best student in their class when they were in high school. Speaker D expects that since his friend was at the top of his class, he should have a better job and maybe have a high social status. Therefore, in order to express his surprise, he switches to Swahili to explain further that his classmate has a cell phone business, which in Kenya is not considered as a good job
white-collar jobs are more prestigious than blue-collar self-employment, as stated in line 32.

Continuing to examine metaphorical switching,

(12c.) Excerpt 7, line 196

196. MA: wallabadilika, lakini huyu hawezi badilika. (Switches to ethnic dialect) ‘omundu kachile muduka, kavwene enguo ndai’, kaama mu duka elio, ache kanyole enguo ndai’

‘They changed but this one cannot change. ‘Some has gone to the shop and has seen a nice dress and leaves the shop and goes to another one to get good clothes’

197. MB: hata Kenya iko hivyo eeh, (they both laugh)

(They all shout and talk at the same time)

In example 12c, the conversation is carried out in Swahili, but a metaphorical switch happens when the speaker switches from Swahili to her native language Bukusu. She switches to Bukusu to give a metaphor, where she refers to women as a ‘nice dress’. The metaphor means that even though men have nice women/wives (nice dresses) they never get content and so they move from one shop to another to try and find other nice dresses.

In the example 12d, speaker A is talking about Kenyans an how they are spontaneous when they come to America.

(12d.) Excerpt 1, line 1-3

1. A: Lakini honestly mtu yeyote anatoka Kenya, as in tuko tu ile like, tuko spontaneous …tuna…we take it as it come.

‘But honestly any person who come from Kenya as we just like we are spontaneous, we… we take it as it come’

2. B: yes,

3. A: sio, sisi sio watu wa kungu eti ku organize whatever comes tu we take.

‘We are not, we are not the kind of people who plan that we organize whatever comes we just take it.’

The switches occur when speaker A tries to emphasize how Kenyans are not selective and they take jobs as they come. He uses Swahili in some phrases but for emphasis he repeatedly uses the statement ‘we take it as it comes’ line 1, and whatever come tu ‘we take’ line 3.
4.1.2. Why?

a. Quotations

Alfonzetti (1998) suggests a deeper attention to quotations than they have been given before. It is one of the most repetitive functions of CS. In most cases when a speaker wants to quote another speaker’s message in a conversation he/she is likely to use a different language. Alfonzetti (1998) further says that the reason why people do this is because they are trying to imitate the language the locator used originally. Gumperz (1982), on the other hand says that CS has significance in quotations. This is evident in excerpt 5.

(6.) Excerpt 5

119. F: Video kwa phone, alafu all of a sudden one of the cops akamtackle like huyu mwingine akamuangusha chini wakaanza kumfinya hivi chini, I think alikua kisema ‘what did I do, what did I do’? Wakamuambia if you don’t sijui nini, “I will shoot you.” ‘video on her phone and then and all of sudden one of the cops tackled like this other one put him down and pressed him down, I think he was saying, “what did I did I do?” they told him if you don’t, I don’t what, “I will shoot you”
120. G: Mmmh
121. F: just two seconds na wampea six bullets.
‘Just in two seconds they gave him six bullets’
122. H: Six?
123. G: Waah,
124. F: …on the chest. Mpaka mtu alikua anarecord akashtuka akaacha kurecordakkanza kulia
‘One on the chest. Until the person who was recording was so astonish and stopped recording and started crying.’
‘He cried, “Ooh my God, they shot him.”

Speaker F is giving an account of a video that he saw earlier on in the day to interlocutor H. Interlocutor F expresses his own part of the narration in Swahili, as seen in lines 119, but when he quotes what the police or what the victim in the conversation says (lines 119 and 125) he switches back to the original language in which the sentiments were given.

Excerpt 7, The conversation was between a Kenyan and an Australian.
187. MA: camping

188. MB: eti camping, mvua wacha inyeshe nauliza huyu jamaa, “sasa hii mti ikikatika ianguke, (they both laugh) how will you transport me all the way from Australia to Dubai, then to home?’ watu wataniona mi ni…(they all laugh) akasema ‘haiwezi katika, na ni miti ndefu na ni mvua inamwagika tu ni the same soil kama ya huku na mti ilikuja like this one.

‘That we were camping, it rained a lot and I asked this guy, what if this tree breaks and falls (they both laugh) how will you transport me all the way from Australia to Dubai then from Dubai to home (to mean Kenya) how will people look at me … (they all laugh) he said, that the tree won’t break and the trees were very tall and it was raining a lot, the soil type is just the same as the one here (United States) and the tree was like one (pointing at a tree).

The original conversation is held in English, but when telling the narrative, the interlocutor quotes part of his words in Swahili and the rest in English. The quotation in Swahili is basically for humorous function and the rest is delivered in English.

b. Solidarity or belonging/We-they code

The we/they code model according to Gumperz (1972), has brought up identity related issues into CS research. In most cases, the we-code is used to signal an in group identity and shows solidarity or ethnic identity while the they-code is used as an out group identity marker. We-code is usually used to express some more neutral ideas and usually concerns people who speak the other code. When a speaker makes either of the choices of language use, it is considered a way of constructing their identities both social and ethnic.

(8.) Excerpt 1

1. A: Lakini honestly mtu yeyote anatoka Kenya, as in tuko tu ile like, tuko spontaneous…tuna…we take it as it come.
   ‘But honestly any person who come from Kenya as we just like we are spontaneous, we… we take it as it come’
2. B: yes,
3. A: sio, sisi sio watu wa kupanga eti tu organize whatever comes tu we take.
   ‘We are not, we are not the kind of people people who plan that we organize whatever comes we just take it.’
3.B: we take it, we take it.

In example 8, there has been a utilization of the we-code. Speaker A is talking about how Kenyans behave when they are offered jobs here in the United States when they first arrive here from Kenya. To show solidarity, Speaker A uses the we-code. For instance, in line 1, the speaker constantly uses ‘tu’ which is a first person plural subject prefix in Swahili, ‘tuko’ (we are like), ‘tuna’ (we), ‘sisi’ (we plural).

(9.) Excerpt 7

180. MA: *mu America usimfanyie kitu* Friday, *mtakosana kwa nyumba.*
‘An American do not do anything to them on Friday, you won’t be in good terms’

181. MB: *hiyo ndio shida yao, kwa sababu, alikua anaambia Paul ama nani?*
‘That’s their problem, because, I was telling Paul or am not sure who it was?’

182. MC: was I telling you, *huyu jamaa ameo mu Australia, Australia……*
‘Was I telling you that there is this guy who has married an Australian?’

183. MB: every weekend, they have to go and stay in a hotel.

184. MA: *au waende* dinner
‘or they go out for dinner’

185. MB: *Friday ikifika munaenda kwa hotel, mnaacha tu nyumba yenu mzuri, mnaenda kulala kwa hotel sasa, wanafanyanga hivyo, wana mserve tu the next weekend sasa tukaenda kwa forest twenty kilo metres .*
‘On Friday you go to a hotel, you just leave your good house, then you go and sleep in a hotel, they do that, you are just served, the next weekend we went to the forest twenty kilometers away.

The second example shows how the they-code can be used to show an out-group identity or create a social distance. In this excerpt, the speaker uses terms such as ‘shida yao’ to mean “that’s their problem”, ‘waende’ (“they go”), ‘wanafanyanga hivyo’ for “they do that”. The speaker constantly uses ‘-wa-’ the third person plural subject prefix and ‘-a’ a third person singular prefix for human beings showing, that speaker is creating a social distance between him and his Australian friend. Leaving the house and going out for dinner, vacation and restaurants is not the speaker’s social orientation.

c. **Communicate culturally specific knowledge**
There is also an instance where the subjects are speaking in English with single word switches between their conversations.

(10.) Excerpt 3

50. D: because one of the guys, for him, and I am not saying this is bad or good, for him his thing is he wants to build a “simba” *(a small traditional house that boys live in when they get to adolescent)* and get married and start a family.

51. C: Which is not bad.
52. D: that is very good but that’s what he is working towards, that’s what.
53. C: maybe it’s a short-term goal.
54. D: A,a,a yah, either way you know, so, and I am not saying that is bad or anything, there is nothing wrong with that,
55. C: Mmh,
56. D: it’s just like; I don’t think like that anymore, you know, that’s not what I want to do. Building a “simba” is not even either in my ladder.
57. C: (laughing) in your list,
58. D: is not even in my list of things to do.
59. C: Mmh,
60. D: maybe a “simba” is some kind of house right?
61. C: Yah, it’s a house.
62. D: it’s a house you…
63. E: so you don’t want them to build a house?
64. D: No, No,No that’s not even in my Agenda.

In example 10 above, the single word switch is very specific to culture. The word “simba” of lines 50, 56 and 60 is normally used to refer to a small structure built for boys after they reach puberty. The term is a shared vocabulary within the Luo and Luhya ethnic groups in Kenya. The whole conversation is in English but this word is specific to an ethnic group in Kenya is used.

(11.) Excerpt 10

235. NA: Hello
236. NB: hello sema,
   ‘Hello how are you?’
237. NA: poa, sitaki kupigia E kelele ako anasoma.
   ‘I am doing great; I do not want to be so noisy E is studying’
238. NB: ooh, *anasoma*?
‘Oooh, he is studying?’

239. NA: Eeh, *alianza kupatiwa homework?*
‘Eeh, they have started giving him homework’

240. NB: wow! That’s nice.

241. NA: *yaani hii homework iko* due in two weeks

In example 11, the two speakers in a phone call conversation are talking about homework. Most of the conversation is in Swahili except for the word ‘homework’. The conversation is between graduate students: one of the students has a two-year-old son who is working on some homework that is due in two weeks. ‘Homework’ is used because it is institutional vocabulary. Interlocutor NB seems very surprised, “Eeh, *alianza kupatiwa homework?”* The speaker uses it in a question because homework is a culturally specific term used more in the academic institutions. The interlocutors are surprised due to the fact that a two-year-old already has homework that actually needs some research.

4.2. CS and stance taking

The authoritative stance is used when one claims he/she has knowledge and hence establishes authority,

(13.a) Excerpt 1

1. A: *Lakini honestly mtu yeyote anatoka Kenya, as in tuko tu ile like, tuko spontaneous…tuna…we take it as it come.*
   ‘But honestly any person who come from Kenya as we just like we are spontaneous, we… we take it as it come’
2. B: yes,
3. A: *sio, sisi sio watu wa eti tu organize whatever comes tu we take.*
   ‘We are not, we are not the kind of people people who plan that we organize whatever comes we just take it.’
4. B: we take it we take it.

Example 13 a, is a conversation between two Kenyans talking about how Kenyans grab opportunities when they first get to the United States from Kenya. Speaker A and B are enacting
various authoritative stances based on the knowledge that they have about Kenyans, showing that speaker A has some significant knowledge about Kenyans who immigrate to the United States. Repetition is also one of the ways in which speaker A conveyed his authoritative stance. He repeats the phrase “we take it, we take it as it comes” and speaker B supports the statement (line 1, 2, 3, 4). He emphasizes his knowledge about Kenyans and how good they are when it comes to taking jobs when they get here.

(13b.) Excerpt 1
5. A: si like anybody mwenye anasema ati …unless kama ni from a very rich family in Kenya.
   ‘Is like anybody who says that…unless if they are from a very rich family in Kenya.’
6. B: there are people who have…you know, there are people who have a structured life Aaah, let say umetoka working outside Kenya, corporate offices, alafu unaniambia eti unesimama pale kwa gas station unauzia watu (laughs) you cannot take it, you cannot tell that person that they take it as they come. [AUTH]
   ‘There are people who have … you know. There are people who have a structured life aaah. Let say you are from working outside Kenya, corporate offices, and then you tell me that you are standing at a gas station selling to people (laughs) you cannot take it, you cannot tell that person that they take is as it comes’
7. A: Yah, there is someone who told me exactly (laughs) he had a very good corporate job. Someone told me that he had a very good job in Kenya, akakuja huku then akaenda kazi ya warehouse, kubeba sijui stuff from the car. [INT]
   ‘Yeah, there is someone who told me exactly (laughs) he had a very good corporate job. Someone told me that he had a very good job in Kenya, then he came here, then he went for a warehouse job, lifting stuff from the car
8. B: Mmmh 
9. A: then he wished he had gone back.
10 B: Aaah,

Example 13b, is another example of an authoritative stance. In lines 5, 6, and 7 speaker B takes an authoritative stance to claim how well he knows Kenyans who come to the United States. He mentions that any Kenyan who immigrates will seize opportunities as they arrive unless they are from a rich family. He even gives a personal experience with a Kenyan who has such an experience by giving an example of one person who came from Kenya and had a very good job and then he got a job at a warehouse; the person wished that he had gone back to Kenya
since he could not take it. The fact that he can give a specific example means that he has had
some personal relationships with some Kenyans in Memphis. Speaker B has stayed in Memphis
long enough in order to make such claims.

   Evaluative stances make comparisons and contrasts of different entities, and also express
emotional statuses. In the excerpt below the subjects are planning for a wedding.

14. Excerpt 8

198. MA: utamaduni
   ‘Culture’
199. MD: hizi zinaitwanga flavors…flavors of a wedding day.
   ‘These are called flavors… flavors of a wedding day.’
200. MA: huyu mu mama mwenye ako na maleso ako wapi hata,
   ‘This lady who has ‘lesos’ where is she’
201. MR: ooh, kumbe ni mtu unatafutia biashara?
   ‘Oooh so you are for a business opportunity for someone?’
   (they all laugh)
202. MA: hapana unaona kama huna maleso , sasa kwa leso si iko nini…
   ‘No, you see in you don’t have ‘lesos’, what is there in a leso (I think to mean that the
profit is little)’

In the conversation above the speakers are talking about a wedding and also brainstorming on
ways that they could make a wedding more colorful. The wedding is to take place here in the
United States . Interlocutors are trying to see how they can make the wedding more appealing.

One of the interlocutors insists on buying a ‘leso’ (a special piece of cloth used as an aisle runner
back in Kenya in most traditional weddings). Speaker MA starts by saying ‘utamaduni’ which
means culture MD supports A’s statement by adding ‘these are called the flavors of a wedding
day. This shows as that the interlocutors are evaluating the American wedding culture and
comparing it to their own Kenyan wedding culture. Even though not explicitly they do this
implicitly by suggesting that they should add ‘leso’ to add “flavor” to the wedding.

   In another instance expressing emotional statuses shows evaluative stance. In the excerpt
below,

(15.) Excerpt 8

206. MA: *sio eti* business, (they laugh) *kama unaona ni business tunaenza enda kwa duka*, it is not a business, you think it is a business.

‘It is not like it is business, (they laugh) If you think it is a business then let's go to a shop, it is not a business, you think it is a business’

207. MB: we are just discussing. *Hakuna maneno* we are just discussing, *hakuna maneno*.

‘We are just discussing. There is no problem we are just discussing, no problem.’

208. MA: we just want to make this wedding colorful.

209. MR: yeah

Speaker MB, says we are just discussing twice and ‘*hakuna maneno*” twice. When speaker MA says that if speaker MB thinks it is a business they can go to the shop to buy the ‘*leso*’, MB evaluates A’s claim and notices that this might be a threat to their conversation. This makes B take an evaluative stance to let MA know that he is not posing a threat but simply posing a discussion. He says, “We are just discussing, no problem.”

In excerpt 7, speakers are talking about vacation life here in the United States, and back in Kenya. They are comparing the United States, Australian and Kenyan culture. They make comparisons between the ways that people in America spend their weekends and how people in Australia spend their weekends. In the example below,

(16.) Excerpt 7

180. MA: *mu America usimfanyie kitu* Friday, *mtakosana kwa nyumba.*

‘An American do not do anything to them on Friday, you won’t be in good terms’

181. MB: *hiyo ndio shida yao, kwa sababu, alikua anaambia Paul ama nani?*

‘That’s their problem, because, I was telling Paul or am not sure who it was?’

182. MC: *was I telling you, huyu jamaa ameo mu Australia, Australia……*

‘Was I telling you that there is this guy who has married an Australian.’

183. MB: every weekend, they have to go and stay in a hotel.

184. MA: *au waende* dinner

‘or they go out for dinner’

185. MB: Friday *ikifika munaenda kwa hotel, mnaacha tu nyumba yenu mzuri, mnaenda kulala kwa hotel sasa, wanafanyanga hivyo, wana mserve tu the next weekend sasa*
tukaenda kwa forest twenty kilo metres.
‘On Friday you go to a hotel, you just leave your good house, they you go and sleep in a hotel, they do that, you are just served, the next weekend we went to the forest twenty kilometers away

Speaker MA says that if you tell an American to stay home on Friday you won’t be o good terms. Speaker MB takes an interactive stance to align with speaker MA, saying “that is their problem” ‘hiyo ndiyo shida yao’ showing that in the interlocutor’s culture it is normal to stay home on a Friday night. They say, “They go out to dinner, they go to a hotel,” and the use of ‘they’ in the conversation shows as that speaker MA and MB are trying to claim evaluative stances on cultures that are different from their own cultures. Speaker B goes on to say, “On Friday you go to a hotel, you just leave your good house, they you go and sleep in a hotel, they do that, you are just served, the next weekend we went to the forest twenty kilometers away.”

This conveys the idea that, MB would not leave his house to go out for dinner and to sleep in the hotel. It is a different culture from what he is used to.

(17.) Excerpt 7

186. MA: camping
187.MB: eti camping, mvua wacha inyeshe nauliza huyu jamaa sasa hii mti ikikatika ianguke. (they both laugh) how will you transport me all the way from Australia to Dubai, then to home watu watania da mi ni...(they all laugh) akasema haiwezi katika, na ni mti ndeju na ni mvua inamwagika tu ni the same soil kama ya huku na mti likua like this one.
‘That we were camping, it rained a lot and I asked this guy what if this tree breaks and falls (they both laugh) how will you transport me all the way from Australia to Dubai then from Dubai to home (to mean Kenya) how will people look at me … (they all laugh) he said that the tree won’t break and the trees were very tall and it was raining a lot, the soil type is just the same as the one here (United States) and the tree was like one (pointing at a tree).’

The example above discusses that whatever Australians find fun and enjoyable, MB does not find enjoyable, and in fact dangerous. Camping is a fun activity for people in Australia. Speaker MB, on the other hand, thinks that this dangerous activity would expose his life to danger. His
friend assures him that it is okay and that nothing is going to happen to him.

In all the examples above, the speakers are laying claims about statuses and identities while evaluating other’s claims and statuses.

Lastly the interactive stance is explored. In this paper, interactive stance is considered as either affiliative or distancing. Affiliative stance indicates that there is solidarity and accommodation among the interlocutors while distancing means that there is social distance among the interlocutors.

(18.a) Excerpt 2

11. C: so there are two foreign people who have beeningiliad. ‘So there are two foreign people who were being talked about’
12. D: sema tena. ‘Say that gain’
13. C: you know, so nani there was this incident that happened where nani, this guy from New York who went to do, who went to Orlando he showed the cabo…I think that day after the blood shoot. ‘You know so, he/she there was this incident that happened where he/she, this guy from New York who went to do, who went to Orlando he showed Cabo….I think the that day after the blood shot.’
14. D: Mmh,
15. C: so their, so the conversation ilianzia ‘So their conversation started’
16. D: Na wakaogopa? ‘And they got scared?’
17. C: yah, so wakaanzakusema maybe some of the things Trumph anasema are true you know, like we have left, this is exactly what nani, X said that we have let too many foreign nationals, foreigners into the country. ‘Yeah, so they started saying that maybe some of the things Trump is saying are true you know, like we have left, this is exactly what he/she said, X said that we have let too many foreign nationals, foreigners into the country.’
18. D: that is soo…I have to believe X mwenyewe ndio alisema hivyo. ‘That is soo…I have to believe that X herself is the one who said so’
19. C: you see, she said that it is too easy for new people to get into the country, very easy, mpaka she says that she is not gonna travel outside the country. ‘You see she said that is is too easy for new people to get into the country, very easy, until she says that is not gonna travel outside the country’
20. D: akasema hivyo? ‘She said that?’
21. C: Mmmh, _akasemaeti_ you can, _alafu_ you know that _ukipanda ndege_, you see so many foreigners _unaogopa_. That’s what they were saying _alafu_ so they were saying that, _ukienda hata kwa_ gas station, like all of them, like almost all gas stations _ni_ foreigners _tu_.

‘Mmmmh, she said that you can, and then we you board an airplane; you see so many foreigners until you become scared. That is what they were saying, and then so they were saying that, when you go to a gas station, like all of them. Like almost all gas stations it’s just foreigners’

22. D: (laughing) you know I think the, they are really they don’t know _kwa sababu_ basically what they are saying, discriminate against foreigners, when the African-American community, _imekuwa_ so discriminated so much that…it was a law in nineteen sixty six that women were not able to vote in the US, and so I think somebody of color would be against all….discrimination.

‘(laughing) you know I think the, they are really they don’t know because basically what they are saying, discriminate against foreigners, when the African-American community, has been so discriminated so much that…it was a law in nineteen sixty six that women were not able to vote in the US, and so I think somebody of color would be against all….discrimination.’

23. C: Mmmh,

In the conversation above, speaker C and D take several interactive stances to show that they are in solidarity, at the same time disaligning with other group about whom speaker R is talking. In the excerpt below, speaker C and D are talking about the rate of immigration being blamed on foreigners. The narrative, was carried out around the presidential election period, Speakers R and B are foreign nationals. Both speakers take an affiliative stance in this matter, but when speaker C tells the story, speaker D agrees by saying “mmmh, she said that?” (lines 14, 16, 20, 23):

(18.b) Excerpt 2

24. D: I don’t believe it its just…you know what I mean?
25. C: yah is doesn’t make sense.
26. D: it just doesn’t make sense to me.
27. C: yah,
28. D: you know?
29. C: you know they don’t have that sense that I am a foreign national, so I am there and they are even asking me do you it is even right. They become blind to that I am a foreigner, yah, and I am sitting there with them and they are saying all these things.

In lines, 25and 26 speakers C and D both say, “It doesn’t make sense”. This is a good example of
an interactive stance that mirrors affiliative stance. Speaker C goes ahead to say that X (their workmate) said that one sees foreign nationals in the airport and gas stations and that they have let too many foreign nationals into the country. D aligns with C by uttering statements like, “she said that?”, “I have to believe that X herself said that”. At the end of the conversation they both end with the statement, “it doesn’t make sense.” This means that both C and D align mostly with foreign nationals, and that do not agree with what X and the other officemates were saying about foreign nationals.

(19.) Excerpt 3

30. D: Yah, Men, I went to Kenya I met one of my classmates, the number one guy in the school men, the top three.
31. C: Yah,
32. D: Men! Anauzasimu.
‘Men! He sells phones’
33. C: Yah, you told me about it, so how was the conversation?
34. D: I just said Hi, there was no conversation men, you know once you leave school, once you leave Kenya you are so disconnected from your friend and what I found out is…and I have not said this in bad faith, I have very little in common with my old friends.
35. C: really?
36. D: really,
37. C: Mmh,
38. D: In Kenya, I have very little in common.
39. C: Mmh,
40. D: we don’t talk I mean,
41. C: So you don’t have friends in Kenya?
42. D: I do…you know, because first of all communication is so difficult, you know, and when you go back you haven’t you know maybe ones or two times you..then see I don’t do facebook.
43. C: That’s why you don’t see them.
44. D: you know, so we don’t talk and then when we go I just feel like (after some silence) they have a different perspective of life and I have a very different perspective of life.
45. C: you know we had this conversation one time,
46. D: and for me,
47. C: And I had that perspective but,
48. D: I know me if I am telling you
49. C: and I realized this

In the example above speaker C and D are taking an interactive stance. This case is a little different because speaker D is creating a social distance from his Kenyan friend. Speaker D is telling a story about his high school friend who now owns a cellphone business. He goes on to say that this man was always one of the top three in school, meaning that he performed better while they were in school and that the man was expected to do better in life. Speaker D is claiming a higher social status than his friend. He is creating social distance from his friend in this conversation by saying, “once you leave Kenya, you disconnect with your friends”, and “I have very little in common with my friends.” He says that his perspectives and that of his friends are totally different. In this excerpt, speaker D completely distances himself from his friends.

4.3. Code Switching, Stance and Identity

Speakers’ backgrounds are defined by their membership to social groups into which they were born and raised; this includes gender, religion, social class and race. According to Ochs (1996), social identity entails positions, relationships, and participant roles and other dimensions of social persona that is typically associated with epistemic and affective stances. The question, of which one is, depends on how others view their role and position in a group. A speaker’s interaction is based on the understanding of the interlocutors about each other. When talking to different speakers, people’s identities shifts in a very unconscious and natural way. People’s identities are dynamic and fluid. They always shapes and reconstructs according to the context in time and space. This sections looks at how different speakers take up several stances in order to define who they are.

Example 13 above, occurs at a home setting in the evening after work. Two roommates
are sitting at the dinner table after dinner talking about how Kenyans who come to the U.S. as green card holders take up jobs without being too picky. The two speakers share common languages (both English and Swahili). The setting is very relaxed. In this excerpt, speaker A specifically takes an authoritative when speaking about Kenyans, indicating that he has substantial information about Kenyans. As he enacts this stance, he is definitely trying to construct an identity in the process. There are several ways in which the speaker that portrays that he is constructing a specific identity.

One of the ways that he enacts a Kenyan identity is when Speaker A says that honestly anybody who come from Kenya is spontaneous (excerpt 1 line 1). He makes this claim in Swahili to show that he knows most of the Kenyans who have moved to the United States. He makes the statement to mean that when Kenyans come to the United States they can take up any jobs, it does not matter whether it is a white collar job or a blue collar job. He qualifies his statement by saying that people from rich families would not consider taking any kind of job, showing that speaker A has some substantial knowledge about Kenyans. In the statement above, Speaker A takes an authoritative stance to define being Kenyan in the United States.

The fact that the speaker ‘tuna’/ ‘tuko’ ( line 1), which means ‘we’ in English, is also evidence that he is trying to construct or define an identity. He is showing solidarity in belonging to the Kenyan community. He also says in line 3, ‘sio, sisi sio watu wa kupanga’, which means “Kenyans are spontaneous; they usually take any jobs that comes their way.” The fact that the speaker is constantly using “we” mean that he affiliates himself with being Kenyan.

Johnstone (2009) asserts that, identities are a result of stances that have been used repeatedly. In this excerpt, the speaker enacts an authoritative stance by repeating the statement,
“we take it as it comes, we take it, we take it.” In his statements ‘we’ refers to Kenyans, and so when he repeats he emphasizes his identity as a Kenyan. In excerpt 1, (line 1) he begins by talking about anybody who comes from Kenya and then afterwards he uses ‘we’ to refer to Kenyans. When he makes a repetition of ‘we take it’, this implies that he owns his identity as a Kenyan.

Example 14, excerpt 8 is a conversation at home when visiting with friends; the participants in the conversation are planning for a friend’s wedding. In this conversation the speakers are basically taking evaluative/interactive stances to negotiate their identities. Speaker MA starts the conversation with the word ‘utamaduni’ (line 198), which means “culture”. Speaker MD takes an evaluative stance and adds; hizi zinaitwanga flavors, (line 199) that they are called “flavors” of a wedding day. It appears that the speaker makes both claims in Swahili.

The wedding is supposed to take place here in the United States, but the stances that the speakers take clearly indicate that they are trying to construct a specific cultural identity. This is because they bring into the picture the use of ‘leso’ (which is a special type of cloth in Kenya used as an aisle runner for the bride to use as she steps out of the house) in line 200. The speaker does not directly tell the interlocutors that they should buy ‘leso’, but she checks her phone for the contacts of the lady who sells ‘leso’ she says line 200. MA: huyu mumama wapende akon na maleso ako wapi. Leso is a very culturally specific item that they are considering to include in the wedding; this is a way of claiming a specific cultural identity. Some of the speakers who seem not very conversant with the culture think that speaker MA is trying to create a business opportunity for a friend and that it is not for the sake of the cultural value attached to it. She validates her point on the importance of the cultural items by saying that if they think so they should buy it at the store instead. She insists that the profit is for both the buyer and the seller.
and really the main reason is to make the wedding as colorful as possible by adding some cultural elements.

Excerpt 7 is a conversation in which speakers are comparing their experiences on vacation with friends from the United States and Australia to their own experience in Kenya. Speaker MA starts by making some claims about Americans. In line 180 he says that if one tells an American to stay at home on Friday night one will not be on good terms. He speaks (lines 182, 183, 184, 185) about an Australian friend with whom he went on vacation. Speaker MA enacts an evaluative stance by making claims about Americans and his Australian friends, constructing his own identity and co-constructing his identity with the people with whom he is in the conversation. His identity becomes clearer when he uses words such as ‘they’, (line 181), ‘yao’ ‘there’, (line 184), ‘waende dinner’ ‘they go to dinner’, (line 185) ‘wanafanyanga hivyo’ ‘they do that’. The use of ‘they’ indicates that they are constructing a non-American/non Australian identity. In this case they consider themselves an out-group. He gives another experience when he went on a camping trip with his Australian friend; here he takes an evaluative stance to enact a Kenyan identity when he says,

20. Excerpt 7

186. MA: camping
187. MB: eti camping, mvua wacha inyeshe nauliza huyu jamaa sasa hii mti ikikatika ianguke. (they both laugh) how will you transport me all the way from Australia to Dubai, then to home watu watania na ni mi... (they all laugh) akasema hii wezi katika, na ni mti ndefu na ni mvua inamwagika tu ni the same soil kama ya huku na mti likua like this one.

‘That we were camping, it rained a lot and I asked this guy what if this tree breaks and falls on us (they both laugh) how will you transport me all the way from Australia to Dubai then from Dubai to home (to mean Kenya) how will people look at me … (they all laugh) he said that the tree won’t break and the trees were very tall and it was raining a lot, the soil type is just the same as the one here (United States) and the tree was like one (pointing at a tree).’
In excerpt 7, above he regards to camping in the mountains as a dangerous activity. Even though the Australian friend likes it, he thinks that it might cause some kind of accident. Because this is something they are not used to doing in Kenya, he is worried about what people in Kenya will think of him, in case there is an accident as they camp. Kenyans are not used to leaving their house to go to camping activities or restaurants and hotels to eat and sleep. They both laugh because they are Kenyan and they find it funny.

As the conversation proceeds, the speakers keep taking evaluative/interactive stances interchangeably. In this part of the conversation apart from taking a cultural/Kenyan identity, the speakers reconstruct and negotiate their identities.

21. Excerpt 7

192. MB: alafu buffet, akikula akiangalia kwa simu aki post ‘chingurue’ (means pig in Bukusu an ethnic language in Kenya)
‘and then buffet, when he/she eats looking at the phone posting pigs (to mean pork)’
193: MA ‘vasima chingurue’ hata wa… eeh (switches to bukusu an ethnic language in Kenya)
‘They like pigs’ (to mean pork)
194. MB: we si umejifunzia hapo hapana kula tu Sukuma kwa nyumba, mnaamkako tu…
(laughs)
‘You have learned from there don't just eat kales in the house, you just sit and relax…(laughs)’
195. MA: (switches to ethnic dialect) R, ‘ali nende shida tawe huku akienda nyumbani akifanya hivyo R anamuweka mangumi.
‘R does not have any problems, when they go back home (meaning Kenya) and she behaves like that (wants to go on vacation) he just gives her some blows (means beat her up)

Speaker MA and MB continue to make claims about Americans when they go out to the restaurants. He switches to their ethnic dialect to make some claims: for instance, when speaker MB, says ‘chingurue’ ‘pigs’ to mean pork, and speaker MA says ‘vasima chingurue’ ‘they like pigs’ to mean they like pork. The use of an ethnic language indicates that this speaker in trying to
claim an ethnic identity, by immediately switching between English and Swahili to Bukusu.

Lastly, the speakers in some instances took an interactive stance to construct their identities, whether they are aligning or disaligning, affiliating or distancing. In the first example, two workmates are talking after work. Speaker C is narrating to speaker D about what some of their workers were discussing when he was away. Speaker C takes an interactive stance by repeating what they said about foreign nationals’ (excerpt 2, line 11, 17, 19, and 21). In this conversation, he uses English most of the time because the actual story took place in a formal setting, but he is reporting to a workmate who had left for lunch when the conversation took place. As mentioned above, when a speaker uses a certain feature repeatedly, this kind of stance becomes directly associated with their identities. Here as the speaker repeatedly says the above words line 2, 11, 19 and 21, he is also constructing himself a foreign/immigrant identity. Speaker D on the other hand takes an interactive stance, as he aligns with speaker C to co-construct an immigrant identity. He does this by saying, ‘sema tena’, ‘Mmmh’, “that is sooo, I have to believe X is the one who said so, and she said that?” “Yah, you know?” At the end of the conversation both C & D conclude by saying yeah, “it doesn’t make sense.” which means that they both agree that whatever the workmates were saying about foreigners do not make sense to them.

Excerpt 3, example 19 consists of the same speakers from excerpt 2 C and D talking about their friends in Kenya and their current relationship. As Anderson (2014) mentions, identity is something that is always fluid and only bound by the moment in time. Identity is not something static and unchanging. Burkette (2016) states that the stances that speakers take enact some forms of identity. Speaker D in two different situations takes up the interactive stance to
construct different identities.

In the example above, Speaker C and D both take the interactive stance to enact an immigrant identity. In the second conversation, speaker D is disaligning with his friends in Kenya and claims a more personal identity and social status. He does this by saying statements such as:

22. Excerpt 3

34. D: I just said Hi, there was no conversation men, you know once you leave school, once you leave Kenya you are so disconnected from your friend and what I found out is… and I have not said this in bad faith, I have very little in common with my old friends.

When he left Kenya to come to the United States he disconnected from most of his friends. When he went back to Kenya he found that they had very little in common. In order to maintain good relations with C, who is Kenyan and probably still has some good ties in Kenya, he says that he does not say this in bad faith. He keeps on constructing his personal identity by saying statements such as,

23. Excerpt 3

38. D: In Kenya, I have very little in common. you know, so we don’t talk and then when we go I just feel like (after some silence) they have a different perspective of life and I have a very different perspective of life. Because one of the guys, for him, and I am not saying this is bad or good, for him his thing is he wants to build a “simba” (a small traditional house that boys live in when they get to puberty) to build a house and get married and start a firm.

51. C: Which is not bad.
52. D: that is very good but that’s what he is working towards, that’s what.
53. C: maybe it’s a short-term goal.
54. D: A,a,a yah, either way you know, so, and I am not saying that is bad or anything, there is nothing wrong with that,
55. C: Mmh.
56. D: it’s just like, I don’t think like that anymore, you know, that’s not what I want to do. Building a “simba” is not even either in my ladder.
In the above examples, speaker D takes interactive stances to create a social distance with C and with his Kenyan friends. In this case, he takes and evaluative/interactive stance to distance himself from his friends by saying that they have very little in common. In line 44, he says that they don't talk and have very different perspectives of life. In lines 50-58, they talk about building a 'simba’ very important house for the boys, and once they have one it is a great accomplishment. Speaker D thinks that this is a short-term goal and actually is not even on his list of chores. All these statements show how speaker D distances himself from the Kenyan identity to construct his own unique personal identity.

4.4. Other Identity Indices

In the all the excerpts various aspects mentioned that directly index a unique Kenyan identity. In some cases, the name ‘Kenya’ is mentioned to create a social distance from Kenyans or a non-Kenyan Identity but in other cases it is used as a way of creating a unique Kenyan identity. In Excerpt 1, lines 1,5,6 and 7 the speaker stresses Kenyan identity when he repetitively says “Kenya” and “Kenyans”, (excerpt 3 lines 34,38 and 41) mentioned in order to distance him from Kenyan identity. Speakers also use other phrases like “back home”, (excerpt 4, line 86 and excerpt 7, line 187):

24.Excerpt 4
86. G: *uliona ingine hapo jamaa amewekwa ameenda pizza joint huko nyumbani.*
‘Did you the other one that guy was posted in a pizza joint back home (to mean kenya)”

25. Excerpt 7

187. MB: *eti camping, mvua wacha inyeshe nauliza huyu jamaa sasa hii mtikikatika ianguke.* (They both laugh) how will you transport me all the way from Australia to Dubai, then to home (to mean Kenya) watu wataniona mi ni...(they all laugh)akasema
The fact that they are here in the United States and still refer to Kenya, as home is a great implication of their Kenyan Identity.

Ethnic identity in most cases is an affiliative construct, where an individual position himself or herself and is categorized by others as one who belongs to a cultural or ethnic group. According to Cheung (1993), affiliation can be motivated by factors such as racial, natal (associated with the ancestral homeland), and symbolic (clothing, artifacts, holidays and foods).

In the excerpts there is also a way that the Kenyans have brought out their ethnic identities. First, this happens when the speakers in several occurrences speak in their ethnic languages even though they are in an English speaking country. As they switch to their native languages, speakers are negotiating and reconstructing their identities to affiliate themselves with their kinsmen. This is evident in excerpt 7, where the speaker uses Luhya to say ‘chingurue’ to mean ‘pork’ and also ‘vasima chingurue’ “they like pork.” In the example below,

26. Excerpt 8

194. MB: (switches to ethnic dialect) R, ‘ali nende shida tawe huku akienda nyumbani akifanya hivyo R anamuweka mangumi.
195. MA: R does not have any problems, when they go back home (meaning Kenya) and she behaves like that (wants to go on vacation) he just gives her some blows (means beat her up)
(They all talk at the same time)
196. MB: walibadilika; lakini huyu hawezi badilika. (Switches to ethnic dialect) ‘omundu kachile muduka, kawwene enguo ndai’, kaama mu duku elio, ache kanyole enguo ndai’
 ‘They changed but this one cannot change. ‘Someone has gone to the shop and has seen a nice piece of clothing and leaves the shop and goes to another one to get good clothes’
Speaker MA, switches to his native language in line 194 to express a cultural practice of wife battering. He says that if MR takes his wife to Kenya and she demands that she wants to go on vacation he should simply beat her up. This practice is also very cultural and more inclined to the speakers’ ethnic group. They practice violence to show authority over women.

Finally, there are items that are very specific to Kenya mentioned in the conversational narratives that index either a Kenyan identity, cultural or ethnic identity. ‘Leso’ is a piece of clothing that women in East Africa normally tied around their waist when performing different house chores. This unique piece of cloth is also used during traditional and even now in modern white weddings as aisle runner. The fact the speakers are talking about a wedding and they are thinking of buying this item to make the wedding colorful means that they remember and would like to embrace their cultural roots. Naivasha is a town in Kenya known for producing fresh flowers. When the speakers settle for getting flowers instead of the ‘leso’ one of them has a flower that he claims is from Naivasha. This means that this speaker has connection with Kenya and thinks that flowers from Naivasha are fresh and probably the best. The mention of ‘simba’ is also another way in which speakers define their cultural identities. Speakers are culturally informed, as they use the word to construct a cultural identity. The mention of Kenyan food, chapati and mandazi and how they are prepared is also an indication that the speakers are indexing Kenyan identities. There is also a mention of how Kikuyu girls and Luhyas people behave. In the Kenyan comedy industry, a common joke is that Luhyas like food while Kikuyu women have a special style of cooking their food. The fact that these jokes have been mentioned in the conversation means that the speakers are enacting a Kenyan identity.
5.0. DISCUSSION

5.1 Discussion of Results

The definitions of CS from previous research form the basis of the current study. Specifically, CS patterns in the current study involved alternating between English and Swahili and sometimes switching additionally between English, Swahili and other languages. CS patterns identified were at the word level, the phrase level, intrasentential and intersentential. My results did not agree with Haugen & Weinreich (1953), who state that CS should be intersentential and the speech situation such as topic, participants and situation should change.

My Results also confirm that situational and metaphorical CS explain how bilinguals code switch. From the data, situational CS depends on the function assigned to the code that is in use. Bilinguals exhibit this kind of switch depending on the topic, place and participants in the conversation. From the data, it is evident that a change in topic or person leads to a switch in the code being used in most conversations English to Swahili or vice versa. Metaphorical switches, on the other hand, occur when a speaker wants to draw attention and emphasize a point. In this study, metaphorical switches are used to show astonishment, to give a metaphor and for emphasis. The reasons why bilinguals code switch include for quoting, for solidarity and to communicate culturally specific knowledge. There were no CS instances found that would represent a formal/informal kind of switching because the speakers tended to CS more freely when speaking about informal or personal experiences with their friends and family. The study
could not address front stage and backstage behavior as put forward by Goffman (1974).

Further, the results show how bilinguals through CS take up different stances and how this accounts for the kind of identities that they construct. The kind of stances that participants in this study took up was a representation of the kinds of identities that they were trying to construct. CS and stance taking are linguistic practices that enable speakers to construct, reconstruct and negotiate their temporary and permanent identities. Some of the stances taken up by speakers include; authoritative, evaluative and interactive when they are either aligning or disaligning with the interlocutor. The above analysis confirms that through CS speakers of a language take up different stances to negotiate their identities. Some of the identities that Kenyans display in this study are the Kenyan/immigrant identity and some personal identities.

The results from this study agree with the results from the previous research, specifically Blom & Gumperz (1972) notion of situational and metaphorical switching. These two notions were used to illustrate how speakers code switch. Situational CS in this study was used when a change of topic occurred (as in example 12.a, excerpt 4). Metaphorical switching is used when emphasizing, showing astonishment and when giving a metaphor (as in example 12b, 12c and 12d in excerpts 3, 7 and 1 respectively). According to Blom & Gumperz (1972), some of the findings on how bilinguals code switch (for quotations, showing surprise and emphasis). Koziol (2000) list some purposes as for signaling topic change that are also evident from the results above. The reason why speakers code switch is supported by studies such as Rihane (2013), who found out that speakers code switch in order to show solidarity, social status, topic and affection. This is shown in my data in examples 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Gumperz’s (1982) we-/they-code is helpful in this study, because this model introduces identity related issues. There is an implication that when bilinguals CS, they use they-code or
we-code to either create an out-group or an in-group. In this study, English-Swahili bilinguals used we-code to create an in-group and show solidarity, while they used the they-code to create an out group and distance themselves (as in examples 8, excerpt 1 and example 9, excerpt 7).

The results, show that stance is the main goal of a speaker in a conversation and that one’s social identity results from stances that have been used over time. The current data shows that evaluative, authoritative and interactive are the main types of stances that speakers took up. The conversations reveal that the authoritative stance is presented when a speaker claims some degree of knowledge or authority. In this study, speakers who have lived in the United States and Kenya for a longer time enacted an authoritative stance to show how well they understand and well they know Kenyans or Kenya. The evaluative stance in most cases overlapped with the interactive stance, and was mainly used when speakers were comparing and contrasting United States and Kenyan culture, vacations, and lifestyle in general. The interactive stance showed alignment and disalignment. Speakers aligned in most cases to show solidarity and disaligned to show social distance. From the study authoritative, evaluative and interactive stances were enacted in order to construct a Kenyan identity, which houses many other personal, social, ethnic, cultural and immigrant identities.

5.2. Limitations of the Study

Although this study has yielded the expected results it still has some limitations. One of the limitations of the study is that the authoritative, evaluative and interactive stances overlapped in most cases. This made it very challenging in trying to figure out the stance being enacted by the speakers. Another weakness of the study is the method of data collection; in this study participants were recorded as they carried their day-to-day conversations. There were no
questions that would lead them to talk about particular topics, contexts or situations which limited the study in ways that could not really help establish how the same group of speakers would CS when talking about different topics in different contexts.

5.3. Conclusion

The logic behind the current study was from the desire to understand how English-Swahili bilinguals code switch and the reason why they code switch. For many people around the world, being a bilingual or a multilingual is the norm, which is why through studies like this we tend to understand how and why bilinguals exhibit the linguistic behaviors that they do.

CS is a linguistic strategy that has been confirmed to be used by many bilinguals. Some researchers think of it as an inadequacy in language, but for sociolinguists it is a rich resource, which is evident from this study. From my study, English-Swahili bilinguals code switch for various purposes. As they code switch they take up different stances to claim their unique, Kenyan/Immigrant identity and many other identities, such as cultural, personal, ethnic, and social. Even though the study was conclusive there is still more to be done to build on the study.

5.4. Further research

It is recommended that further research investigate CS between English, Swahili and other local languages (Sheng and ethnic languages) in relation to stance and identity. In this study there were a few instances where trilingual switching occurred. More data is required to make more conclusive generalizations about this kind of switching. This study included first generation Kenyans who were not born in the United States, but it would also be interesting to look at the CS patterns that the second generation Kenyan Americans born in the United States will exhibit. It would also be interesting to see CS patterns basing on age, gender, different levels
of education and social status. Due to my interest in narrative analysis, I would also like to address whether conversational narratives could be motivations for CS.
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7.0. APPENDICES

7.1. Appendix 1

Code switching examples

Excerpt 1

1. A: *Lakini* honestly *mtu yeyote anatoka* Kenya, as *in tuko tu ile* like, *tuko spontaneous*...*tuna*...we take it as it come.
   ‘But honestly any person who come from Kenya as we just like we are spontaneous, we… we take it as it come’
2. B: yes,
3. A: *sio, sisi sio watu wa kupanga eti tu* organize whatever comes tu we take.
   ‘we are not, we are not the kind of people people who plan that we organize whatever comes we just take it.’
4. B: we take it, we take it.
5. A: *si like anybody mwenye anasema ati un less kama ni* from a very rich family in Kenya.
   ‘Is like anybody who says that…unless if they are from a very rich family in Kenya.’
6. B: there are people who have…you know, there are people who have a structured life Aah, let say *umetoka* working outside Kenya, corporate offices, *alafu unaniambia eti umesimama pale kwa* gas station *unauzia watu* (laughs) you cannot take it, you cannot tell that person that they take it as they come.
   ‘There are people who have … you know. There are people who have a structured life aaah. Let say you are from working outside Kenya, corporate offices, and then you tell me that you are standing at a gas station selling to people (laughs) you cannot take it, you cannot tell that person that they take is as it comes’
7. A: Yah, there is someone who told me exactly (laughs) he had a very good corporate job.
   Someone told me that he had a very good job in Kenya, *akakuja huku* then *akaenda kazi ya warehouse*, *kubeba sijui* stuff from the car.
   ‘Yeah, there is someone who told me exactly (laughs) he had a very good corporate job.
   Someone told me that he had a very good job in Kenya, then he came here, then he went for a warehouse job, lifting stuff from the car
8. B: Mmmh \ 
9. A: then he wished he had gone back.
10 B: Aah,
Excerpt 2
11. C: so there are two foreign people who have beeningiliad.
    ‘so there are two foreign people who were being talked about’
    ‘Say that gain’
13. C: you know, so nani there was this incident that happened where nani, this guy from
    New york who went to do, who went to Orlando he showed the cabo…I think that day after the blood
    shoot.
    ‘You know so, he/she there was this incident that happened where he/she, this guy from New
    York who went to do, who went to Orlando he showed Cabo….I think the that day after the
    blood shot.’
14. D: Mmh,
15. C: so their, so the conversation iliazia
    ‘so their conversation started
16. D: na wakaogopa?
    ‘and they got scared?’
17. C: yah, so wakaanzakusema maybe some of the things Trumph anasema are true you know,
    like we have left, this is exactly what nani, X said that we have let too many foreign..nationals,
    foreigners into the country.
    ‘Yeah, so they started saying that maybe some of the things Trump is saying are true you know,
    like we have left, this is exactly what he/she said, X said that we have let too many foreign
    nationals, foreigners into the country.’
18. D: that is soo…I have to believe X mwenyewe ndio alisema hivyo.
    ‘That is soo… I have to believe that X herself is the one who said so’
19. C: you see, she said that it is too easy for new people to get into the country, very easy,
    mpaka she says that she is not gonna travel outside the country.
    ‘You see she said that is is too easy for new people to get into the country, very easy, until she
    says that is not gonna travel outside the country’
20. D: akasema hivyo?
    ‘She said that?’
21. C: Mmmh, akasemaeti you can, alafu you know that ukipanda ndege, you see so many
    foreigners unaogopa. That’s what they were saying alafu so they were saying that, ukienda hata
    kwa gas station, like all of them , like almost all gas stations ni foreigners tu.
    ‘Mmmmmh, she said that you can, and then we you board an airplane, you see so many foreigners
    intil you become scared. That what they were saying, and then so they were saying that, when
    you go to a gas station, like all of them. Like almost all gas stations it’s just foreigners’
22. D: (laughing) you know I think the, they are really they don’t know kwa sababu basically
    what they are saying, discriminate against foreigners, when the African-American community,
    imekuwa so discriminated so much that…it was a law in nineteen sixty six that women were not
    able to vote in the US, and so I think somebody of color would be against all….discrimination.
'(laughing) you know I think the, they are really they don’t know because basically what they are saying, discriminate against foreigners, when the African-American community, has been so discriminated so much that…it was a law in nineteen sixty six that women were not able to vote in the US, and so I think somebody of color would be against all….discrimination.’

23. C: Mmmh,
24. D: I don’t believe it its just…you know what I mean?
25. C: yah, is doesn’t make sense.
26. D: it just doesn’t make sense to me.
27. C: yah,
28. D: you know?
29. C: you know they don’t have that sense that I am a foreign national, so I am there and they are even asking me do you it is even right. They become blind to that I am a foreigner, yah, and I am sitting there with them and they are saying all this things.

Excerpt 3

30. D:Yah. Men, I went to Kenya I met one of my classmates, the number one guy in the school men, the top three.
31. C: Yah,
32. D: Men! Anauzasimu.
‘Men! He sells phones’
33.C: Yah, you told me about it, so how was the conversation?
34. D: I just said Hi, there was no conversation men, you know once you leave school, once you leave Kenya you are s\o disconnected from your friend and what I found out is…and I have not said this in bad faith, I have very little in common with my old friends.
35. C: really?
36. D: really,
37. C: Mmh,
38. D: In Kenya, I have very little in common.
39. C: Mmh,
40. D: we don’t talk I mean,
41. C: So you don’t have friends in Kenya?
42. D: I do…you know, because first of all communication is so difficult, you know, and when you go back you haven’t you know maybe ones or two times you..then see I don’t do facebook.
43. C: That’s why do.. don’t see them.
44. D: you know, so we don’t talk and then when we go I just feel like (after some silence) they have a different perspective of life and I have a very different perspective of life.
45. C: you know we had this conversation one time,
46. D: and for me,
47. C: And I had that perspective but,
48. D: I know me if I am telling you
49. C: and I realized this…
50. D: because one of the guys, for him, and I am not saying this is bad or good, for him his thing is he wants to build a “simba” (a small traditional house that boys live in when they get to puberty) to build a house and get married and start a firm.

51. C: Which is not bad.

52. D: that is very good but that’s what he is working towards, that’s what.

53. C: maybe it’s a short term goal.

54. D: A,a,a yah, either way you know, so, and I am not saying that is bad or anything, there is nothing wrong with that,

55. C: Mmh,

56. D: it’s just like, I don’t think like that anymore, you know, that’s not what I want to do. Building a “simba” is not even either in my ladder.

57. C: (laughing) in your list,

58. D: is not even in my list of things to do.

59. C: Mmh,

60. D: maybe a ‘simba” is some kind of house right?

61. C: Yah, it’s a house.

62. D: it’s a house you…

63. E: so you don’t want them to build a house?

64. D: No, No,No that’s not even in my Agenda.

**Excerpt 4**

4. Evaluative/Interactive mention of Ethnic groups to Index Ethnic Identity (different). Use of forks, knives showing that they have a different cultural identity they code

65. F: mmh

66. G: *hii ni ya chapatti au ni ya maandazi?* ‘is this for chapati(Kenyan flat bread) or is it for mandazi(Kenya snack)?’

67. H: *ni ya chapo* ‘its for chapo(short form for chapati)’

68. G: you use milk?

69. H: yah

70. G: milk and water or just milk?

71. H: milk and water.

72. G: do you put salt or sugar?

73. H: sugar and salt.

74. G: Ooh, you use honey, do you put carrots?

75. H: I can.

76. F: you can put carrots?

77. G: Yah, even Mullen.

78. H: *Eeh, nimewahi ona watu wengine mapaka wanaweka cabbage* (laughs) ‘Eehh, I have ever seen other people they even add cabbage (laughs)’

79. G: Aaah (laughs)
80. H: *ilikua kwa nini, kwa facebook.*
‘Where was it, on facebook’
81. F: Oooh
82. G: *watu wakasema wasichana wakikuyu mtatuonyesha mambo.*
‘people said that kikuyu girls will show us wonders’
83. H: (laughs)
84. G: *mtatuonyesha mambo, chapatti zimetoka za green (they all laugh) uliona ingine...*
‘you will show wonders, chapatis turned out green (they all laugh) did you see the other one’
85. H: *yaani juu ni...*
‘it is because...’
86. G: *uliona ingine hapo jamaa amewekwa ameenda pizza joint huko nyumbani.*
‘did you the other one that guy was posted in a pizza joint back home(to mean kenya)’
87. H: Oooh, (they laugh), *uliona?*
‘Ooh, they laugh, did you see?’
88. G: *jamaa anakula pizza ni kama nini,*
‘they guy eat pizza like.’
89. F: *nyama.*
‘meat’
90. G: *na anakula hivi, ni kama anakula ugali.*
‘and he eats it like this, it's like he is eating Ugali.’
91. F: Ugali(laughs)
92. G: *anapick vegetables alafu anakula anachukua.*
‘he picks vegetables and the he takes’
93. H: *aki kweli*
‘ooh really’
94. G: *slice ya ile mkate ya pizza alafu anakula kwanza* (laughs)
‘ a slice of the pizza bread and then he eats it first’
95. F: Eeei
96. H: *Huwa wanatufanya mambo.*
‘they do wonders’
97. G: *ndio maana hawa Americans wanatuonanga wanaona hawa wajamaa kweli.*
‘this is why Americans look at us and they wonder these guys really’
98. H: *hawa wanaonea waluhya, wanasesma eti mluhya ni Luhya tu.(laughs)*
‘They look down upon the luhyas., they say that a luhya is just a luhya (laughs)’
‘that is one thing I have never imagined, the guy is serious eating seriously’
100. H: *nyi nnacheka na yeye anashiba.*
‘you guys are laughing and the guy is satisfied’
101. G: *si wale walikua naye walikua tu wanamwangailia hivi,*
‘I wonder whether those who were with him were looking at home just like this’
102. H: *imagine mwenye alitake hiyo video* (they laugh) how can you stop yourself from laughing.

‘Imagine the person who took that video(they laugh) how can you stop yourself from laughing’

103. G: (laughing) how, how, how let's say you work together, and there you go sharing this video with your core workers, how do they even see you at work?

104. F: yah

**Excerpt 5**

105. G: yah, (after some silence) what happened in Baton Rouge today, something happened?

106. H: in Baton Rouge?

107. F: but wali…

‘but they..’

108. G: it was…………….what happened?

109. F: there was some guy who was shot dead.

110. G: but I saw people complaining *nini, nini*.

‘but I saw people complaining that, that.’

111. F: some two cops.

112. H: yah some guy was short dead.

113. F: they received a call that there is some guy with a gun.

114. G: Mmmh,

115. F: but he is not threatening but he had told someone to go…away from there.

116. G: Mmh,

117. F: so,… two white cops were dispatched, that I think it was a shop or gas, gas station. So they found this guy he was there. *So wakaaanza kumpoint gun wakimuongelesha*. So some lady *alikua hapo kando aakaanza kuchukua…*

‘so two white cops were dispatched that I think it was a shop or a gas station. so they found this guy he was there. so they started pointing the gun at the guy as they talked to him. some lady was there beside them she started recording…’

118. G: Video.

119. F:…video *kwa phone, alafu* all of a sudden one of the cops *akamtackle like huyu mwingine akamuangusaha chini wakaanza kumfinya hivi chini*, I think *alikua kisema* ‘what did I do, what did I do’?wakamuambia if you don’t *sijui* what I will shoot you.

‘video on her phone and then ann of sudden one of the cops tackled like this other one put him down and pressed him down, I think he was saying, ‘what did I did I do, what did I do?’ they told him if you don’t, I don’t what I will shoot you’

120. G: Mmmh

121. F: just two seconds *na wampea* six bullets.

‘just in two seconds they gave him six bullets’

122. H: Six?

123. G: Waah,

‘one the chest. Until the person who was recording was so astonished and stopped recording and started crying.’

125. H: alilia Ooh my God, they shot him.

126. F: Men, but the worst part is when the…the wife or maybe girlfriend or…

127. H: it was not the mother, it was the girlfriend?

128. F: no, it was the girlfriend, that was the girlfriend wife or girlfriend.

129. G: coz I saw the interview and the thing the son was presented a crown..

130. F: Ooh yah

131. H: Yah

132. F: that was just the worst moment, I just saw the kid just crying.

133. G: nilikua nimefika hapa ndio nikajaribu kufuata nikaona what is going on in Louisiana. ‘I had reached there then I tried to look for it, I saw what is going on in Louisiana.’

134. F: Yah

135. H: yah

136. F: I felt very bad when that kid, when that kid started crying live on TV. i also felt like crying, because it is very sad, I mean coz there was no reason whatsoever the guy….

137. G: was the guy they were looking for?


139. F: I am not sure even if he was

140. H: I think he wasn’t coz huyo mwenye, venye walimu attck he didn’t even try to reach his gun. Or anything.

‘I think he wasn’t because he himself when he attacked he didn’t even try to reach his gun. Or anything’

141. F: yah yah I think that is the video.

142. G: Jesus Christ!

Excerpt 7

Talking about Vacation

180. MA: mu America usimfanyie kitu Friday, mtakosana kwa nyumba.

‘An American do not do anything to them on Friday, you won’t be in good terms’

181. MB: hiyo ndio shida yao, kwa sababu, nilikua anaambia Paul ama nani?

‘Thats their problem, because, I was telling Paul or am not sure who it was?’

182. MB: was I telling you, huyu jamaa ameo mu Australia, Australia……

‘Was I telling you that there is this guy who has married an Australian’

183. MB: every weekend, they have to go and stay in a hotel.

184. MA: au waende dinner

‘or they go out for dinner’

185. MB: Friday ikifika munaenda kwa hotel, mnaacha tu nyumba yenu mzuri, mnaenda kulala kwa hotel sasa, wanafanyanga hivyo, wana mserve tu the next weekend sasa tukaenda kwa forest twenty kilo metres .

‘On Friday you go to a hotel, you just leave your good house, they you go and sleep in a hotel,
they do that, you are just served, the next weekend we went to the forest twenty kilometers away.

186. MA: camping

187. MB: *eti camping, mvua wacha inyeshe nauliza huyu jamaa sasa hii mti ikikatika ianguke.*

(they both laugh) how will you transport me all the way from Australia to Dubai, then to home to home (to mean Kenya) how will people look at me … (they all laugh) he said that the tree won’t break and the trees were very tall and it was raining a lot, the soil type is just the same as the one here (United States) and the tree was like one (pointing at a tree).’

188. MA: *huku waende...sijui waende wapi mchukue* vacation muende to another state, a week…

‘here they go, I don’t know they go somewhere and take a vacation in another state, a week……’

189. MB: *ikue…*

‘It doesn’t matter’

190. MA: *yeah...hapo mtakua marafiki.*

(they both talk at the same time)

‘Yeah, there then you will be friends’

191. MA: *kwa hoteli, mkule muende kwa ma restaurant.*

‘in a hotel, you eat and you go to restaurants’

192. MB: *alafu buffet, akiikula akiangalia kwa simu aki post ‘chingurue’* (means pig in Bukusu an ethnic language in Kenya)

‘and then buffet, when he/she eats looking at the phone posting pigs (to mean pork)’

193. MA: ‘*vasima chingurue’ hat wa...eeh*(switches to bukus an ethnic language in Kenya) ‘they like pigs’ (to mean pork)

194. MB: *we si umejifunzia hapo hapa kula tu Sukuma kwa nyumba, mnaamkako tu…*(laughs)

‘You have learned from there don't just eat kale in the house, you just sit and relax…*(laughs)’

195. MA: (switches to ethnic dialect) R, ‘*ali nende shida tawe huku akienda nyumbani akifanya hivyo R* anamuweka mangumi.

‘R does not have any problems , when they go back home(meaning Kenya) and she behaves like that (wants to go on vacation) he just gives her some blows (means beat her up)

(they all talk at the same time)

196. MA: *walibadilika, ;akini huyu hawezi badilika.* (switches to ethnic dialect) ‘omundu kachile muduka, kavwene enguo ndai’, *kaama mu duku elio, ache kanyole enguo ndai’

‘they changed but this one cannot change. ‘some has gone to the shop and has seen a nice piece of clothing and leaves the shop and goes to another one to get good clothes’

197. MB: *hata Kenya iko hivyo eeh, *(they both laugh)

(they all shout and talk at the same time)
Talking about a wedding

198. MA: *utamaduni*
‘Culture’

199. MD: *hizi zinaitwanga* flavors…flavours of a wedding day.
‘these are called flavors… flavors of a wedding day.’

200. MA: *huyu mu mama mwenye ako na maleso ako wapi hata,*
‘ this lady who has ‘lesos ’ where is she’

201. MR: *ooh, kumbe ni mtu unatafutia biashara?*
‘Oooh so you are looking for a business opportunity for someone?’
(they all laugh)

202. MA: *hapana unaona kama huna maleso , sasa kwa leso si iko nini…*
‘No, you see in you don’t have ‘lesos’, what is there in a leso( I think to mean that the profit is little)”

203. MD: *faida in both sides, kwa mwenye maleso na ule anataka kutumia.*
‘the profit is for both sides, to the one who sells them and the one who wants to use it.’

204. MR: okay

205. MC: *we unafanya business.*
‘You are doing business’

206. MA: *sio eti business,(they laugh) kama unaona ni business tunaeya enda kwa duka, it is not a business, you think it is a business.*
‘It is not like it is business, (they laugh)If you think it is a business then let's go to a shop, it is not a business, you think it is a business’

207. MB: we are just discussing. *Hakuna maneno we are just discussing, hakuna maneno.*
‘we are just discussing , there is no problem we are just discussing, no problem.’

209. MA: we just want to make this wedding colorful .

210. MR: yeah

211. MD: I said flavours…

212. MB: *basi tumunue maua…maisha hiyo tumeshapanga, si unaona tumetupa yetu hapa.*
‘Okay then let's buy flowers, we already have a plan for life , see already have found one for us here.’

213. MR: *hii ndio tutaturnia*
‘we will use this one’
(They all laugh loudly)

‘this is a live flower don't think it is plastic, it is new from Naivasha (a town in Kenya known for growing fresh flowers). (they laugh) it came. R, this one is from Naivasha, don't think that it comes from..’

215. MR: *imekuja na ndege?*
‘it came by plane’,(meaning it was exported)
216. MB: this are red roses from the main one.
217. MR: from Limuru?
218. MA: how I hope hiyo siku mvua isinyeshe.
 ‘How I hope it doesn't rain on that day’
219. MB: mvua haiwezi nyesh.
 ‘it won’t rain’
220. MR: mvua haitanyesha.
 ‘it won’t rain’
221. MB: kwanza…akiimbako tu…
 first, when she just sings’
(they all laugh)
222. MA: ‘warura waye,……………….’
 ‘where did you come from’
223. MB: mvua inanyamaza tu inasema. But ikinyesha tu paka ya harusi nyingi yenye, kubwa
 (laughs out loudly)
 ‘ the rain will just be quiet. but if it rains the wedding itself, alot’
224. MA: kwani pia huwa unabelievingi kwa hiyo?
 ‘Do you still believe in that’
225. MB: mimi nimesema tu, yaani we are just enjoying, kitu najua tu ni mtu mzee akikufa, mvua
 inanyeshanga nyingi.
 ‘I have just said, we are just enjoying, one thing I know for sure is that if an elderly person dies,
it rains alot’
226. MR: mtu mzee?
 ‘an elderly person’
227. MB: mzee, kama ule wa miaka eighty something.
 ‘an elderly person who is like eighty something years old’
228. MR: ooh,
229. MA: lazima mvua inyeshe?
 ‘Must it rain?’
230. MB: mmh,
231. MB: most of the time inanyeshanga sana.
 ‘most of the time it rains a lot’
232. MR: okay,
233. MC: are you serious au tunaongea tu kama story?
 ‘are you serious or are you just telling a story’
234. MA:yes I am serious…it is not something that we joke through.
Excerpt 9
235. NA: Hello
236. NB: hello sema,
 ‘Hello how are you’
237. NA: poa, sitaki kupigia E kelele ako anasoma.
‘I am doing great, I do not want to be so noisy E is studying’
238. NB: ooh, anasoma?
‘oooh, he is studying?’
239. NA: Eeh, alianza kupatiwa homework
‘Eeeh, they have started giving him homework’
240. NB: wow!that’s nice.
241. NA: yaani hii homework iko due in two weeks.
‘I mean the homework is due in two weeks.’
242. NB: Ooh,
243. NA: Just imagine uko na two weeks kusaliza homework.
‘just imagine you have two weeks to complete the homework’
244. NB: Ooh, ni homework…
‘ooh its homework’
245. NA: naomba tukue tumemaliza masomo jameni hizi homework zikianza kutokezea. Ulikua
na homework na zingine ziko due naona inaelweka noma...na ma...
‘I am praying that we will be done with studies seriously, when these homeworks starts to come. You had other homeworks that are due. I see it is understandable, very tricky
246. NB: Yah,
‘Yeah’
247. NA: namwambia yeye angojee yake...yake...yake alafu anataka kusaliza asiende
kuambiuwa hajamaliza.
‘I tell him to wait for his and then he wants to finish so the teacher doesn’t tell him that he did not finish’
248. NB: Ooh,
A: Mmmh
249. NB: wow!utakua una...una...homework mbili yako na yake ya kumsaidia na yako.
‘Woow! you will be, will be... two homeworks his and yours, one to help him and yours.
250. NA: yah I need for now a deep thinking. Kuna zingine zinakuanga ngumu sana.
‘yeah I need for now a deep thinking. Some are usually very difficult’
251. NB: Yah,
252. NA: you have to do research together.
253. NB: mmmh,

Excerpt 10

254. NNB: kesho tunaenda wapi memorial day?
‘Where are we going tomorrow for memorial day?’
255. NNR: Nick alisema anachoma mbuzi akasema tukuse tukule mbuz, uko na mpango?
‘Nick said that he will barbecue goat, he said that we should go and eat goat, do you have plans?’
256. NNB: just sit here relax,
That is not a plan, we left home when Aga was barbecuing some meat’

‘Who is barbecuing?’

He is barbecuing meat’

‘Where?, at your place?’

Yeah, at home’

‘Barbecue’

‘he has a grill outside there’

‘a small one, Men, I swam until I am feeling hungry’

‘Do you know, you, are you serious you were going all the way?’

‘Oooh God, so you went all the way?’

‘Oooh God, so you went all the way?’

‘he went three like one, two, three, four, five, six and seven.

‘talking on his phone’"hey how are you, am doing good. My phone just died. Yah, yah aah yah hey love, how are you, ooh, excellent, excellent. where are you guys heading now, Oooh, okay. Excellent, excellent she had a good flight? Ooh, good. How long was it? Ooh, okay right…okay. Ooh okay. Did he charge you for the luggage?. Yah, I am here with Paul and Rhoda they came to swim so…Trufosa says hi R?

Hi…say hi back.

Hey love did they charge you for the luggage?. Ooh, okay alright I will let you rest okay?. Okay I love you. Okay bye. (singing).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcripts</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in U.S</th>
<th>Excerpts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 1</td>
<td>Speaker A</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excerpt 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker B</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 2</td>
<td>Speaker C</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excerpt 2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker D</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker E</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 3</td>
<td>Speaker F</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excerpt 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excerpt 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker G</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker H</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 4</td>
<td>Speaker NNB</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Excerpt 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker NNR</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker NNG</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 5</td>
<td>Speaker MA</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excerpt 7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker MD</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker MR</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 6</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excerpt 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.0. VITA

Education

Southern University and A&M College Non Degree Credit Courses May 2014
Kenyatta University Bachelors of Education (Arts) July 2013

Academic and Professional Employment

University of Mississippi Teaching Assistant Intensive English Program Aug 2015 - May 2017
Southern University and A&M College Fulbright (FLTA) Aug 2013 - May 2014

Awards and Recognition

University of Mississippi April 2017
Department of Modern Languages
Outstanding Student Award in MA in Linguistics Program

Southern University and A&M College May 2014
Department of Foreign Languages Department
Outstanding Swahili Instructor in the Fulbright (FLTA) Program

Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistant (FLTA) May 2014
Institute of International Education May 2014