CODE-SWITCHING AMONG HAUSA-ENGLISH BILINGUALS IN MANCHESTER, UNITED KINGDOM: SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES AND PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS

A dissertation submitted to The University of Manchester for the degree of Master of Arts in the Faculty of Humanities

2016

JALALUDEEN IBRAHIM
ID: 9602974

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

LIST OF CONTENTS

Word count: 14,085

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1	-	First person
2	-	Second person
3	-	Third person
ACC	-	Accusative
CM	-	Code-mixing
CMPL	-	Complementiser
COP	-	Copular
CS	-	Code-switching
DEF	-	Definiteness
DEIC	-	Deixis
DET	-	Determiner
EXST	-	Existential
F	-	Feminine
FUT	-	Future
GEN	-	Genitive
INST	-	Instrumental
M	-	Masculine
NEG	-	Negation
PART	-	Particle
PAST	-	Past Tense
PL	-	Plural
POSS	-	Possessive
PROG	-	Progressive
SG	-	Singular

ABSTRACT

Code-switching (henceforth CS) in spontaneous speech has been around for millennia, and arguably since the emergence of distinct languages. While communicative strategies of this phenomenon have been well-documented across a variety of languages, little is known about the characteristics of Hausa-English CS. In an attempt to fill this gap, this study aimed at investigating the syntactic structures of CS and its social and pragmatic functions in the speech of Hausa-English bilinguals in Manchester, United Kingdom. First, a review of literature on CS was conducted with a view to providing theoretical foundation for the analysis of the data set. Then, a description of the participants and their linguistic background was provided, along with an explanation on the ethical consideration in the methods section. The naturally occurring data used in this study was collected during informal conversations recorded at locations in different times and analysed based on various available approaches. The findings of this study revealed that switches in Hausa-English do not occur at random; rather they are constrained by set of grammatical rules of both participating languages. The study also revealed that nouns are the most switched items, followed by discourse markers (interjections, particles, fillers & conjunctions), verbs, adverbs, prepositions, pronouns and then determiners. The findings further demonstrated that Hausa-English bilinguals employ CS to enhance their everyday conversational interactions. Additionally, they indicated that CS occurs in the speech of Hausa-English bilinguals to serve functions as: reiteration, quotation, clarification, low level of competence in English, lexical gap, grammatical loan and unique referent. It was concluded that insertion (intra-sentential) and alternation (inter-sentential) are the two structural patterns in Hausa-English conversation, triggered by various conversational contexts. The study was both grounded in structural linguistics and sociolinguistics.

DECLARATION

I declare that no portion of the work referred to in this dissertation has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY STATEMENT

i.   The author of this dissertation (including any appendices and/or schedules to this dissertation) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the "copyright") and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

ii.   Copies of this dissertation, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made **only** in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has entered into. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii.   The ownership of the Copyright, patents, designs, trademarks and other intellectual property (the "Intellectual Property") and any reproductions of copyright works in the dissertation, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this dissertation, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.

iv.   Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialization of this dissertation, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24420), in any relevant dissertation restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, and The University Library's regulations (see http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/about/regulations/_files/Libray-regulations.pdf).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Yaron Matras, who was always available and patient throughout the period of this study. His constructive criticism proved invaluable to the final draft of this dissertation. I wish to thank my Programme Director Dr. Tine Breban, especially for inspiring my interest in the topic of this dissertation. Many thanks to Sarah Smith of the Postgraduate Taught Office for the various kinds of help she gave me. I am indebted to all my course-mates, most especially Randah Alfuhaydi and Louise Middleton, for that academic fraternity at The University of Manchester. Myriad of thanks to Federal University Birnin-kebbi for sponsoring my studies through the TETFund intervention. To my family, I say a very big thank you for always being there for me. I appreciate you all beyond the telling of words.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

CS is a well-known phenomenon among bilinguals in any given speech community. Thus, once contact is established between languages, there is tendency of mixture of varieties or shift from one linguistic system to another, and language choice patterns emerge in the process, which become very common in bilingual behaviour. Grosjean (1995: 259) asserts that, "bilinguals are not the sum of two complete or incomplete monolinguals but have a unique and specific linguistic configuration". Haugen (1956: 10) argues that bilingualism is present "at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language". The concept of bilingualism is associated with CS as speakers must be able to use more than one language in order to code-switch. CS as one of the language contact phenomena is broadly defined as the use of two or more languages in a conversation. This language contact phenomenon has captured the attention of researchers in the field of Linguistics and other related fields for the past few decades.

Manchester is a multi-lingual city with over 150 different languages (Matras & Alex, 2015: 1). In a typical urban setting like Manchester, with a heterogeneous population of people from different linguistic background, it is common to see people shift from one language to another during conversation. Toribio (2009: 10) claims that, "bilinguals only code-switch with other bilinguals with whom they share a dual language identity. For many, CS is a speech form that allows for the expression of their membership in two cultures: the dominant and the minority". This claim has through the years received much recognition from researchers in the area of CS. The subjects of this study are Hausa-English bilinguals from Nigeria. At the time of this study, all of them were living in Manchester.

This study was conducted to gain a better understanding of the rules that govern CS and to examine its functional roles. The theoretical models considered for the data analysis in this study include: Poplack's *equivalence constraint* and Myers-Scotton's *MLF model* for the

structural approach. Gumperz's notion of *metaphorical CS* and Auer's *sequential approach* to CS were utilized to examine the conversational roles of CS. Other relevant models were employed in the process of discussion.

1.2 AIM OF THE STUDY

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the phenomenon of CS among Hausa-English bilinguals in Manchester, United Kingdom. In order to achieve this aim, the study seeks answers to the following questions:

1. Are certain categories more easily switched than others? If yes, what makes some categories more switched than others?
2. What are the syntactic constraints of the two languages in the occurrence of CS?
3. What triggers CS among Hausa-English bilinguals?
4. Does switching between Hausa and English carry any specific socio-pragmatic meaning?
5. What are the factors controlling this phenomenon in the speech of Hausa-English bilinguals?

1.3 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study will add to the existing literature on CS, specifically on Hausa-English bilingual interaction. Findings gained from this study will help to provide insight on how and why CS occurs in the speech of bilinguals. This study will also help promote language diversity. In this study, the researcher will focus on the analysis of CS in the sentences extracted from the recorded data, based on the theories mentioned in the literature.

1.4 ORGANIZATION OF WRITING

The researcher arranged the writing in order to be systematic as follow:

Chapter One: Introduction

It contained the general introduction, aims of the study, significance of the study and the organization of writing.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

It provided the literature review which concerns the concept of CS and its typologies. It also reviewed the distinction between CS and borrowing, perspectives on CS as well as the theoretical framework of the study. This chapter further reviewed some previous studies on Hausa-English CS.

Chapter Three: Methodology

It described the research methods employed for the study such as the research design, sampling, method of data collection, method of data analysis and ethical considerations.

Chapter Four: Results

It provided the analysis of the results.

Chapter Five: Findings and discussion

This chapter discussed the findings and the interpretation of the results.

Chapter Six: Summary of findings and conclusion

It provided the summary of the findings and the general conclusion.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with a detailed description and definition of the term CS. Defining CS here includes distinguishing it from other language contact phenomena such as "borrowing", and explaining the distinction between different types of CS that may occur in bilingual speech. It also discusses some relevant points in some of the models concerned with CS. This chapter further reviews relevant literature and examines some previous research that has been conducted on Hausa-English CS.

2.2.1 DEFINING CS

Intentionally or unintentionally, bilingual speakers do shift from one code to another when they interact. The shift can be from one dialect to another or from one language to another for some reasons. This shift is what the sociolinguists refer to as CS, which they define as "the use of more than one language in the course of a single communicative episode" Heller (1988: 1). Even though much has been written about CS, there is still no consensus among linguists with regard to what the definition of CS actually is - the definition of this phenomenon varies from one linguist to another. It is important to note that not all researchers use terms the same way, as some refer to CS as "code-mixing" (henceforth CM), although some scholars use either of CS or CM to denote the same practice. Interestingly, as was adopted by linguists from the field of communication technology, both phenomena utilize the term "code" referring to a "mechanism for the unambiguous transductions of signals between systems" (Gardner-Chloros, 2009: 11). Stockwell (2002: 8) describes "code" as "a symbol of nationalism that is used by people to speak or communicate in a particular language, or dialect, or register, or accent, or style on different occasions and for different purposes." This implies that when two or more speakers communicate in a speech, it can be said that the system of communication that they employ is a "code". This suggests that the term "code" is now used by linguists as an "umbrella term for languages, dialects, styles, etc" (Gardner-Chloros, 2009: 11). Therefore, whenever people choose to speak, they are usually required to select a particular code, and they may decide to

switch or mix codes in the process.

 According to Poplack (1980: 583), CS can be defined as the act of "alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituents." To Gardner-Chloros (2011: 4), CS refers to the use of several languages or dialects in the same conversation or sentence by bilingual people. Grosjean (1982: 147) claims that "CS is the alternation in the use of two languages (or even more) in the same discourse. The switch can happen within words, clauses, or sentences. However, there is only a switch in the language, not an integration of the word, clause or sentence into the other language." Then Gumperz (1982: 59) refers to CS as "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems". On the other hand, Essien (1995: 272) describes CM "as a language phenomenon in which two codes or languages are used for the same message or communication." Muysken (2000: 1) describes CM to "refer to all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence". Gardner-Chloros (2010:12) in an attempt to draw a distinction between the two terms states that, "when two languages are used in the same clause, I use the term CM, and in two or more clauses CS is used".

Matras (2009: 101) clarifies that CM is used by some to refer to language mixing within the phrase or utterance, reserving CS for the alternation of languages in-between utterances or phrases. He adds that other linguists "employ CM to denote the structures that are the product of language mixing and do not occur in the speech of monolinguals. Yet another use of CM is a cover term for various types of language mixing phenomena" (Matras 2009: 101). Similarly, Sridhar (1996) explains that whereas CM occurs intra-sententially, CS occurs inter-sententially. Examples (1) and (2) below attempt to illustrate the difference between the two terms. Example (1) illustrates CM (also known as intra-sentential switching), with two English lexical items "office" and "accountant" inserted into the grammatical frame of Hausa, the host language. Muysken (2008: 253) calls CM insertion. Example (2) is an illustration of CS (also known as inter-sentential switching) since the alternation is not within the utterance but in two different clauses.

1. *Rabi ta ce da naje* office *din* accountant *ne na kai masa takardu*

   "Rabi said as I went to the office of the accountant to submit some documents"

   <div align="right">(Alkasim et al. 2016: 158)</div>

2. Thank you, sir. *Sai an jima*.

   "Thank you, sir. See you next time".

   <div align="right">(Yusuf 2012 in Inuwa Y .I. 2014: 165)</div>

From this brief overview of the term CS, it is clear that different researchers use different definitions of this phenomenon. Consequently, in this study, I shall be using the single term, CS, to refer to both cases.

2.2.2 TYPES OF CS

Poplack (1980: 605) in a study of Puerto Rican Spanish-English bilinguals in New York City, outlines three major types of CS:

i.   **Tag-switching** which involves the insertion of a tag in one language into the grammatical frame of another language.

ii.   **Intra-sentential switching** which involves switching which occurs within the clause or sentence boundaries.

iii.   **Inter-sentential switching** which occurs outside, at a clause or sentence boundary, where each clause or sentence is in one language or another.

This typology shows that two types of CS exist: intra-sentential and inter-sentential, since tag CS can be classified as a type of intra-sentential CS as it involves insertion of lexical items. Similarly, Myers-Scotton and others categorized CS into: intra-sentential and inter-sentential (Myers-Scotton 1993: 5).

Muysken (2000: 3) describes that CS is typically divided into three main types:

i.   **Insertion** which involves the insertion of an alien word or phrasal category from one language into a structure of the other language.

ii.   **Alternation** which occurs between structures from languages.

iii. **Congruent lexicalization** which involves influence of dialect within language use. This refers to a situation where two languages share a grammatical structure which can be filled with lexical items from either language. Consider the following example:

3. That's what *Papschi mein*-s to say

"That's what Papschi mean-s to say"

(German-English; Clyne 1987: 756 in Muysken, 2000: 12)

In (3) above, first the English word order is adapted to Dutch, then the Dutch-like word *mein* appears to be like the English *mean,* which seem to be semantically close. To be sure, *mein* is inflected with English third person –s. It can be said that the use of the German verb *mein* was triggered by the use of a German name, *Papschi*.

2.3 DISTINCTION BETWEEN CS AND BORROWING

Though the distinction between CS and borrowing is not new in this area of research, it is important at this juncture, to be clear with the boundaries between the two closely related phenomena. This distinction is more a complicated issue than the perceived distinction between CS and CM, though Pfaff (1997: 295) quoting Gumperz and Hernandez-Chaez (1975) speaks of "CS as a type of borrowing". CS occurs when two languages come into contact: "the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent" (Poplack 1980: 581). According to Haugen (1956: 40), borrowing can be described as "the regular use of material from one language into another so that there is no longer switch or overlapping except in a historical sense" while CS can be described as "a situation where a bilingual introduces a completely unassimilated word from another language into his speech". Romaine (1985: 131) considers culture-specific items such as food, cultural-specific nouns or cultural institutions as borrowing. Gumperz (1982: 66) states that "borrowing can be defined as the introduction of

single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one variety (i.e language), into the other. The borrowed items are fully integrated into the grammatical system of the borrowing language and they are treated as if they are part of the lexicon of that language and share the morphological and phonological systems of that language. CS by contrast relies on the meaningful juxtaposition of what speakers must process as strings formed according to the internal syntactic rules of two distinct systems." Collins (2003: 4) argues that the basic difference between CS and borrowing is that borrowing has an L1 history, while CS does not have this history. He claims that code-switches "are brought into the stream of speech consciously, as part of L2 – a speaker's second grammar".

In distinguishing between CS and borrowing, Matras (2009: 110-111) who describes CS and borrowing as a continuum of uses available in multilingual repertoire, attempts to offer a comprehensive set of parameters based on the following measures: the degree of bilingualism (bilingual speaker vs. monolingual speaker), the degree of composition (elaborate utterance vs. single lexical insertion), functionality of the items (special conversational effect, stylistic choice vs. default expression), the unique character of the referent (lexical vs. Para-lexical), its operationality (core vocabulary vs. grammatical operations), the regularity (single occurrence vs. regular occurrence) and the structural integration (not integrated vs. integrated). The CS-borrowing continuum is clearly illustrated in figure 1.

Bilinguality
bilingual speaker ↔ monolingual speaker
Composition
elaborate utterance/phrase ↔ single lexical item
Functionality
special conversational effect, stylistic choice ↔ default expression
Unique referent (specificity)
lexical ↔ para-lexical
Operationality
core vocabulary ↔ grammatical operations
Regularity
single occurrence ↔ regular occurrence
Structural integration
not integrated ↔ integrated
Code-switching ↔ borrowing

Figure 1. Dimensions of CS-borrowing continuum (Matras, 2009: 111)

This suggests that the distinction between CS and borrowing is not a simple one as it involves a bundle of criteria arranged in a continuum. For example, in the bilinguality continuum, CS is likely connected with speakers who are able to maintain separation "between subsets of their linguistic repertoire – their 'languages' and to use them if necessary, in separate contexts" while the monolingual speakers on the other side of the bilinguality continuum, may not be able to activate any word-forms from another language, implying that "there are no code-switches, only borrowings, established through a diachronic process of propagation throughout the monolingual speech community" Matras (2009: 111-112). In Matras's view, there is no theoretical boundary between CS & BR.

Pfaff (1979: 295) as cited in Sridhar & Kamal (1980: 3) also observes that the two terms make completely different claims about the competence of the individual speaker: borrowing usually occurs in monolingual speech, while CS is necessarily a product of bilingual competence. Sridhar & Kamal (1980: 3) further reveal that CS is different from borrowing in the following ways: (1) switched elements do not fill "lexical gaps" in the host language; (2) switched elements are often sequences longer than single words; (3) switched elements are not necessarily assimilated into the host language by regular phonological and morphological processes; and, (4) switched elements are not restricted to a more or less limited set accepted by the speech community of the host language. Grosjean (1982: 308) claims that in CS, there is no integration of the word(s) or clause(s) into the language spoken, while in borrowing, there is morphological and phonological integration. Grosjean further reveals that there are two types of borrowing: 1. Speech borrowings or nonces which occur at individual level; and 2. Language borrowings or established loans which occur at community level (1982: 308). There seems to be more similarities than differences between the two concepts.

2.4.0 PERSPECTIVES ON CS

2.4.1 STRUCTURAL PERSPECTIVE

In the past few decades, studies on this approach to CS have attracted the attention of linguists and still have not reached agreement on the universal grammatical constraints. Gardner-Chloros & Edwards (2004: 104) maintain that, "research in this field has largely concentrated on finding universally applicable, predictive grammatical constraints on CS, so far without success". Approaches under this perspective aim at identifying grammatical constraints that are concerned with CS. This perspective argues that CS is not a casual phenomenon but a systematic and linguistic one. One of the leading proponents of this aspect of CS is Poplack (1978/1981) who proposed two syntactic constraints that govern CS: the free-morpheme constraint and the equivalence constraint, where she argued for the word-order equivalence between the participating languages. Other researchers who contributed to the structural description of CS include Lipski (1978) and Pfaff (1979) who suggested constraints from the

perspective of linear equivalence. There are others (Woolford, 1983, Halmari, 1997) who analysed CS in a non-linear approach within the theory of government and binding (Chomsky, 1981). I will discuss Myers-Scotton's MLF model (1993) as one of the approaches to this field of study in the "theoretical framework" section. Although this perspective remains important, it fails to answer the question why bilinguals code-switch. Therefore, I will also deal with CS from the sociolinguistic perspective which looks beyond the formal aspects and concentrates more on the social and pragmatic functions CS may have.

2.4.2 SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

This perspective is concerned with how meaning is created in CS and what specific functions it serves. In their agenda-setting article on a study in a small town in Norway, Blom and Gumperz (1972: 126) discovered that alternating codes among the local people was both patterned and predictable, and they identified two different concepts of code choice: *situational switching* and *metaphorical switching*. Situational switching as the term implies, signals a change in the situation – the participants here redefine each other's rights and obligations. In metaphorical switching on the other hand, the situation remains the same when there is change in the speaker's choice or topic – the speaker here aims to achieve a specific communicative effect. Blom & Gumperz were the first to focus on the functions of CS and later introduced another concept "conversational CS" (1982). Gumperz argues that CS is triggered by factors within the conversation itself. Therefore, CS is, according to Gumperz, considered as *contextualization cues*, "where he sees the code, the dialect, and even style switch processes, as well as prosodic features of speech and formulaic expressions, as implicit ways of conveying meaning as part of the interaction between speakers" (Gumperz 1982, 1992). This interactional perspective was further developed by Auer (1984) using a *conversation analysis* (CA) approach to analyse performance data on CS. This sociolinguistic approach to CS will be applied to this study to answer the broad question why do Hausa-English bilinguals switch between Hausa and English.

2.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

This study is premised on different models, beginning with Poplack's model in which CS is

subject to two constraints: the *free-morpheme constraint* and the *equivalence constraint*. In free-morpheme constraint, "codes may be switched after any constituent in discourse provided that constituent is not a bound morpheme" (Poplack, 1980: 585). This stipulates that switching cannot occur between a lexeme and a bound morpheme. In the equivalence constraint, "code-switches will tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and   L2 elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e. at points around   which the surface structure of the two languages map onto each other" (Poplack, 1980: 586). In this study, I attempt to test the validity of Poplack's proposed constraints.

Another relevant model for the study under consideration is the one proposed by Myers-Scotton, the *Matrix Language Frame (MLF)* which is one of the theories that attempt to explore the grammatical field of CS. This model was proposed to explain instances of intra-sentential switching. The concept of the MLF was first influenced by psycholinguistic theories related to the studies of speech production by Levelt (1989) and Azuma (1993), "where the process begins with the formulation of a non-linguistic preverbal message in the conceptualizer" (Jidda, 2014: 92). The MLF is known as the dominant model of insertional CS (Winford 2003: 126). This model posits that when two different languages interact in a discourse, one controls the frame - building the constituents while the other supplies the inserted elements. The language in charge of building frame is known as the Matrix Language (ML) or base language which supplies the system morphemes (functional) to the frame and also controls content morphemes; it is the ML that sets the grammatical frame of mixed constituents. The one that supplies the inserted elements (into an ML frame) is known as the Embedded Language (EL) Myers-Scotton (1993: 83). According to this model, content morphemes can be supplied by both the ML and the EL.

Drawing a distinction between content and system morphemes, it can be explained that content (e.g. nouns, verbs, adjectives and some prepositions) morphemes express semantic and pragmatic aspects and assign or receive thematic roles. System (e.g. function words and inflections) morphemes on the other hand express the relation between content morphemes but do not assign or receive thematic roles. Myers-Scotton (2002: 15) clarifies that "content

morphemes are the main elements conveying semantic and pragmatic aspect of message and system morphemes largely indicate relations between the content morphemes". To Matras (2009: 130), system morphemes are "roughly equivalent to grammar" while content morphemes are "roughly equivalent to lexicon". The concept of this distinction can also correspond to other dichotomies such as: content-function words and free-bound morphemes. While content morphemes are essential in conveying message in communication, system morphemes are there to build grammatical frames.

It is pertinent to note that in the MLF model, Myers-Scotton doesn't adopt the "sentence" as an appropriate unit of analysis, instead she advocates that as a unit of analysis, CP (Complement Phrase) is more appropriate because "even within a sentence, the grammars may not be in contact" - she defines the CP as "the syntactic structure expressing the predicate-argument structure of a clause, plus any additional structures needed to encode discourse-relevant structure and the logical form of that clause" (Myers-Scotton, 2002: 55). The CP here assumes that the unit of structure includes complementiser position.

The MLF model identifies three (3) types of CS constituents governed by related constraints: 1. **Mixed constituents** (including morphemes from both ML and EL), 2. **ML islands** (which have only ML morphemes) & 3. **EL islands** (which have only EL morphemes). Using the content-function morpheme distinction, Myers-Scotton (1993: 83) proposes two principles to account for the asymmetric relationships in a bilingual interaction of mixed constituents: 1. the **morpheme-order principle**, which states that, "in the ML + EL constituents of singly-occurring EL lexemes and any number of ML morphemes, surface morpheme order will be that of ML"; and 2. the **system morpheme principle**, which states that, "in ML+EL constituents, all system morphemes which have grammatical relations external to their head constituent (i.e. which participate in the sentence thematic role grid) will come from the ML". According to Myers-Scotton (1993: 69), "there are no CS utterances with 'helter-skelter' constituents". The ML islands within the MLF model are constituents that are made up of only ML morphemes and equally well-formed in the ML (Myers-Scotton, 1993: 139). This is also applied to the EL islands –

constituents that are entirely made up of EL morphemes. In this case, two languages are processed separately in units called islands.

In an attempt to avoid a clash of lexical congruence, Myers-Scotton & Jake (2000: 96) further developed the MLF model to a Four-Morpheme (4-M) model. This extended version of the model retains the content morphemes, which are directly elected, as one of the four entities. System morphemes are now classified into three subcategories which all together become: 1. Content morphemes 2. Early system morphemes 3. Late bridge system morphemes & 4. Late outsider system morphemes. The 4-M model argues that some functional elements are conceptually activated at the level of mental lexicon along with their content morpheme heads. To the best of my knowledge, the MLF model has been tested with CS data from some African languages such as Sotho and Swahili, but there are no readily published studies of Hausa as a participating language in the CS data set.

To examine the functional/conversational role of CS, Auer's sequential approach (1984) to interaction was utilized. This sequential approach to CS is made manifest in Auer's statement, "any theory of conversational code-alternation [Auer's term] is bound to fail if it doesn't take into account that the meaning of code-alternation depends in essential ways on its 'sequential environment'" (Auer, 1984: 116). This implies that the interactional meaning of CS can be best interpreted in the context of the preceding and following utterances. Auer in his sequential model first establishes a distinction between participant-related CS and discourse-related CS language alternation. Auer refers the participant-related CS to "the attributes of the speaker" (1988: 192) and discourse-related CS as the "use of CS to organize the conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance" (1998: 4). Another important point to this approach is the consideration of CS as a *contextualization strategy* (Auer, 1984: 90) similar to the one proposed by Gumperz (1982).

2.6 PREVIOUS STUDIES ON HAUSA-ENGLISH CS

English enjoys a very prestigious status among Hausa speakers and the Nigerian community at

large. Such prestige is vividly seen where people tend to switch from their local languages to English to create a special effect. English has become not only a "practical necessity" but also the language of officialdom in Nigeria (where Hausa is widely spoken). This role of English in the Nigerian community contributes in the way English is influencing Hausa at all levels whether in syntax, phonology, semantics, morphology, with one of the most remarkable influences being the mixing of English in Hausa language. This gives rise to a frequent manifestation of CS within the spontaneous conversation of bilinguals either in Nigeria or in the diaspora. The study of CS with reference to Hausa and English seems to be very limited based on the researcher's knowledge.

Yusuf (2014) investigated the social meanings of Hausa-English CS among Hausa bilinguals studying at University Utara, Malaysia. In his study, he found that Hausa bilinguals alternate between Hausa and English to perform some functions: to make an objective comment, to quote a speech made by someone without dropping the intended meaning, to share the individuality that fixes them together and to address different audiences within the same utterance - he argues that bilinguals, "code-switch to avoid message ambiguity by uttering the same statement in another language to clarify the message to the anticipated listeners" (Yusuf, 2014: 171).

Another study on Hausa-English CS is the one by Chamo (2012), which concentrated in Hausa-English CS in contemporary *kannywood* films. He concluded that CS is mostly influenced by the emotional situations of the character, though in few cases, the characters in the *kannywood* films use the phenomenon to share an identity with a member of a certain group. He argues that "CS in *Kannywood* films is a conscious behavior rather than unconscious one in the spontaneous conversation" (Chamo, 2012: 87). Similarly, Alkasim et al. (2016) carried out a research on CS in three Hausa novels: *Mai Kaunata* (My Love), *Rayuwar Gayya* (Revenge) and *Matan Zamani* (Women Nowadays). They found out that CS was used in the texts mainly to entertain the target readers while the authors display their level of bilingual creativity through their characters. Here CS functions as a linguistic device used for communicative purpose.

The present study sets out to add to investigate the grammatical patterning of CS in mixed Hausa-English naturally occurring speech through the lenses of relevant models and also to answer the question concerning the socio-pragmatic functions of Hausa-English CS. To the best of my knowledge, researchers on language contact have not investigated the syntactic structures and conversational functions of Hausa-English CS. Thus, this study is an attempt to fill in the wide gap that was left open by previous researchers, which will also be an addition to the existing literatures on Hausa-English CS.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology used in this study. According to Sudaryanto (1993: 9), method is a kind of systematical work plan through which research work become easier in order to achieve its main purpose. This chapter also discusses the research design, sampling, unit of analysis, method of data collection, method of data analysis and ethical considerations.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

This study utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative method was necessary in accounting for the frequency of switches in the recorded spontaneous speech data. The qualitative was necessary as the researcher attempted to interpret the results by way of assessing non-quantitative facts observed in the study. According to Craswell (1998: 7), qualitative approach allows the researcher to share in the perceptions and understanding of others and to know how people learn about and make sense of themselves and others.

3.3 SAMPLING

Eight participants (six males and two females) participated in this study, including the researcher. All the participants are middle-aged between Twenty Four (24) and Thirty Four (34) years. All participants are native speakers of Hausa from northern Nigeria who demonstrate competence in English. To Tustin et. al. (2010: 346), convenience sampling can be used in the exploratory phase of a research project. The sample participants for this study were chosen on the basis of being readily available and assessable. All participants have qualifications equivalent to the first University degree and above.

Table 1: Profile of the Participants

Participant	Gender	Age	Level of Education	Occupation	Years Spent in Manchester	Age at Immigration
S1.	Male	34	PhD.	Sch. Teacher	5	29
S2.	Male	32	PhD. (Current)	Student	4	28
S3.	Male	29	M.A.	Other	2	27
S4.	Male	26	MSc.	Other	4	22
S5.	Male	31	B.A.	Other	2	29
S6.	Female	24	BSc. (Current)	Student	3	21
S7.	Female	27	M.A. (Current)	Student	2	25
S8.	Male (Researcher)	29	M.A. (Current)	Student	1	28

3.4 METHOD OF COLLECTING DATA

The participants were surreptitiously audio-recorded while interacting spontaneously. The language samples were collected over a period of three (3) months. However, for the purpose of this study, only some excerpts have been chosen for analysis. The domains examined have been primarily the home and school settings and informal interactions between interlocutors during lunch time, dinner or leisure time. To ensure quality of recordings as well as smooth transfer of data, a special recorder was used which has an SD card and the ability to transfer data into the computer file. To mitigate observer's paradox, the recorder was usually activated about ten minutes into the conversation. The participants were earlier informed at the point of seeking their consent that, the recording could take place when they least expected it. After each recording, the researcher would play it to the participants for them to know what was recorded out of their conversation.

3.5 METHOD OF ANALYSING DATA

The data were transcribed using Hausa and English orthography. Words and utterances were classified according to language (Hausa, English or mixed). From the large amount of data (recorded conversation) collected, only some excerpts have been chosen for analysis. The excerpts have been segmented into examples for convenience. The examples in the data were analysed qualitatively using various approaches with a view to obtaining an overview of the multidimensional functions of CS by way of classifying instances of switches according to types. A quantitative analysis of the types of switches was also done in order to account for frequency of the type of switch in the data. In the analysis, English was written in regular font, while Hausa was italicized - the gloss in English was written below each utterance.

3. 6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

McDaniel and Gates (2001: 66) revealed that a high standard of ethics and professionalism go hand in hand. Tustin et al. (2010: 46) outlined an overview of general ethical obligations researchers have towards participants in a research. That: participants should not be harmed or deceived but be willing and informed and should also be held in confidence.

The participants in this research were willing to participate and they were well-informed from the early stage of data collection. The data they provided was confidential as clearly stated in the Participant Information Sheet. Since the recordings were done in informal settings where personal issues could be discussed, all segments of sensitive issues have been expunged in an attempt to protect the participants' privacy. The data was processed anonymously as names of participants were replaced by a code number; real names were not used in any way.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This chapter presents the results obtained from the analyses of the data for the present study. A quantitative analysis was first carried out to account for the frequency of occurrence of instances of switches based on syntactic categories. From the data obtained, switches seem to occur in many syntactic categories, although certain types of elements are more likely switched than others. Sridhar S. N & Kamal K. S. (1980: 4) reveal that there is a generalization that except for single nouns, the higher the constituency of the element, the more likely it is to be switched: thus, conjoined sentences, main clauses, subordinate clauses, major constituents such as noun phrases, verb phrases and prepositional phrases are among the most frequently switched elements. They further claim that among single words, nouns outrank all others in frequency of switching, followed by adjectives, adverbs and verbs. Grammatical items on the other hand are the most freely inserted items regardless of the different constraints governing each language (Poplack, 1980: 596). In the excerpts for this study, the recordings yielded approximately 242 instances of switches which were bi-directional: English to Hausa and Hausa to English, although there are more instances of the former.

Table 2: Distribution of Switched Categories (Single Words)

Syntactic Category of Switched Elements	English into Hausa (No. of Switches)	Hausa into English (No. of Switches)	Total Number of Switches
Nouns	56	2	58
Discourse markers	21	18	39
Verbs	19	0	19
Adverbs	5	3	8
Prepositions	3	2	5
Pronouns	0	7	7
Determiners	0	5	5
Total	**103**	**38**	**141**

Nouns > discourse markers (interjections, particles, fillers & conjunctions) > verbs > adverbs > prepositions > pronouns > determiners

Table (2) above reveals that nouns are the most switched items, followed by discourse markers (interjections, particles, fillers & conjunctions), verbs, adverbs, prepositions, pronouns and then determiners. This stands in marked contrast to the findings of Nortier (1990): Moroccan Arabic/Dutch, Gardner-Chloros (1991): Alsatian/French, Backus (1996): Turkish/Dutch and Bentahila and Davies (1995): Moroccan Arabic/French among others as cited in Matras (2009: 133). All instances of single words insertion have been counted in this table, totaling 141. Terminologies related to names of specific or unique referents such as proper nouns (Matras, 2009: 107) have all been counted as single nouns. Consider the following examples:

4. [S3 discussing about an international transaction his local bank once handled].
   Saboda   su-n   faara,   da   su ka   yi   na   farko ya tafi   a **official rate**.
   because 3PL-DEF. startPAST,   when 3PL PART. do PART first   it goPAST PART.
   Because they tried it, the first one they did was at the official rate.

5. [S2 discussing about a particular bank account through which he receives his monthly allowances from his sponsor].
   Amman dai   inda   ake   turo   man kudi   daga makaranta
   but   PART where PART.   receive GEN. money from school
   But where I receive my allowances from the school

   a **account** *dina ne   na*   **Zenith Bank**.
    in   GEN. COP PART
    is through my Zenith Bank account.

In example (4), the English term *exchange rate* inserted in the structure of the host language is a specific referent, which has no equivalent in Hausa. Translating this term requires effort that

wouldn't be well invested (Matras, 2009: 107) since it is the commonly used term even among Hausa monolinguals. In Example (5), two English terms *account* and *Zenith Bank* are inserted in the Hausa sentence. The term *Zenith Bank* here can be said to be an institutional concept – it is also a proper noun. The use of this specific referent in this context is what evoked the importation of another associated unique referent *account* into the utterance. Instances like *official rate* and *Zenith Bank* were all counted as single nouns in the distribution.

Unlike some recent studies such as Cantanose-English switching (Virginia Y, & Stephen M., 2016: 10) where nouns are only inserted in their bare forms even when the sense is plural, typical cases of noun switching in the present study accommodate both singular and plural nouns forms. Consider examples (6) and (7) below:

6. [S8 trying to narrate something about his friend's experience with a bank].
   Akwai   wani **friend** *dina*
   thereEXST. 3MSG.   my
   There is a friend of mine

7. [S2 expressing disappointment over the failed plan of the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) on international students].
   Kuma su   su-n   ce za   su   rika   ba **students** *na*   CBN
   And   3PL 3PL-DEF. say FUT. 3PL   PART give   PART.
   And they said that they will be giving students at the CBN rate.

Pronouns in Hausa show different forms according to the syntactic function they serve. For example, gender is distinguished in the second and third persons singular. There is no instance of occurrence of English pronoun into Hausa in the present study, but there are instances of Hausa pronouns into English structure. Consider the following example:

8. [S4 discussing about the Chemistry classes he used to attend]

    For example in Chemistry as well *naa san   da   cewa* I have attended some lectures.

                                                    1SG know PART. that

    For example in Chemistry as well, I know that, I have attended some lectures.

Determiners in Hausa are essentially demonstratives, number and quantifiers. In most cases determiners function to specify, modify or quantify nouns. There is no instance of switching of English determiners but there are instances of switching around Hausa determiners in the data for the present study. Consider the following example:

9. [S7 narrating about her friend who graduated the previous year]

    Because *wata* she graduated last year…

            DET

    Because a lady graduated last year…

Wata in the above example functions as a determiner.

Table 3: Distribution of Switched Categories (Clauses & Phrases/Constituents)

Syntactic Category of Switched Elements	English into Hausa (No. of Switches)	Hausa into English (No. of Switches)	Total Number of Switches
Phrases/Constituents	28	14	42
Main Clauses	26	12	38
Subordinate Clauses	11	10	21
Total	**65**	**36**	**101**

As can be observed in Table 3 above, there are a total of forty two (42) phrases/constituents switches that occurred in the transcribed data, twenty one (21) of which are English into Hausa and fourteen (14) are Hausa into English. Switches around main clauses occurred in thirty eight (38) instances, twenty six (26) of which are English into Hausa and twelve (12) are Hausa into

English. In the case of subordinate clauses, there are a total of twenty one (21) switches, eleven (11) of which are English into Hausa and ten (10) are Hausa into English. In the whole, there are a total of one hundred and one (101) switches around phrases/constituents and clauses that occurred in the data for the present study. Examples will be provided in the "discussion" section.

CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1.0 STRUCTURAL APPROACH TO CS

CS research in this field has largely concentrated on finding universally applicable, predictive grammatical constraints, so far without much recorded success (Gardner-Chloros & Edwards, 2004: 104). In this analysis, I begin by looking at two approaches to the structural description of CS. First, is one of the earliest approaches: Poplack's (1980: 586) *equivalence constraint*. Then Myers-Scotton's (1993) *Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model*. These models are chosen for this study because they seem to explain some of the switch patterns that occur in Hausa-English CS from the structural perspective.

5.1.1 SURFACE WORD ORDER IN HAUSA AND ENGLISH

According to Poplack's *equivalence constraint* (1980: 586), "CS tends to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and L2 elements doesn't violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e. at points around which the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other". Coincidentally, both Hausa and English have the same basic SVO (Subject-Verb-Object) word order. Like English adjectives that normally precede their nouns, Hausa adjectives too precede their nouns except in certain specific instances such as in the case of definite numeral adjectives that follow their nouns. In her claims, Poplack didn't specify what degree, of correspondence must obtain for structures of two languages to be considered equivalent. There are instances that oppose to Poplack's observation in the present study. Consider the following examples:

10. [S2 discussing with S8 about the documents he (S2) needed to send]

    …wai **two format** *su-ke*   *so,*

     PART   3PL-PART want

   *…*they want two formats

In example (10), though *two format* and *format biyu* may seem equivalent to a certain level of

analysis, they do, of course, differ with regard to the order of elements within the structure, and to that extent, they are not equivalent. Thus, strictly speaking, there is a violation of the ordering rules since the switch doesn't comply with the syntactic structure of Hausa where a definite numeral adjective follows the noun it modifies.

11. [S6 discussing about the salary of staff of a Nigerian company she once worked for]

Salary ***na-su***   per month I'm telling you is a lot of money.

PART-3PL

Their salary per month I'm telling you is a lot of money.

12. [S7 discussing about her graduation which comes up in July]

So graduation ***na-mu*** is July.

PART-1PL

So our graduation is July.

Example (11) shows the switched item of Hausa possessive pronoun which violates the word order of English NP. Example (12) is a similar construction with (11) since the pronoun there is embedded according to the rule of Hausa and not English. MacSwan (1997: 55) argues that the equivalence constraint may be an "essentially correct generalization" in the sense that the syntactic rules of both participating languages are not violated.

It is worthy of note that examples (11) and (12) are interestingly instances of switch around possessive pronouns which researchers in this area believe to be extremely rare in most languages. Researchers consider possessive pronouns to be part of the categories that "constitute a kind of 'rest class' of elements that have pragmatic-semantic saliency among the grammatical categories" Matras (2009: 208). Examples (11) and (12) here counter such claim that switches are rarely found around possessive pronouns.

5.1.2 VERB INSERTION

Unlike English verbs that change tense by changes in the verb form, Hausa verbs for the most part, do not change to mark tense differences. While in English verbs are morphologically inflected, in Hausa tense differences are marked by different sets of subject pronouns. Based on the transcribed data for this study, only English verbs in the *ing* form seem to be inserted into the Hausa structure. Consider the following examples:

13. [S7 discussing her plans of traveling back home after graduation].

    Erm… *sai   na-a   yi* **graduating**.

           until 1SG-FUT do

    Erm… until I graduate.

14. [S2 discussing with S8 about the document he was to forward back in Nigeria]

    Akwai   waniabu   da   su-ka   ce   mu-yi **submitting** *wai*

    theirEXST. something PART 3PL-PART say-PAST 1PL-do   PART

    There is something they said we should submit

15. [S3 discussing about a transaction he wanted GT Bank in the UK to handle for him]

    Da a-ce   GT Bank a-nan   din za   su   iya **processing** *min.*

    If   PART-say   PART-here DEF. FUT. 3PL   can   GEN.

    Had it been the GT Bank here can process it for me.

In examples (13), (14) and (15), all the inserted verbs are in the *ing* form just like all other instances of English verbs insertion in the data, while the subject pronouns mark the differences. In (13), *na* is a pre-verbal pronoun marking first person singular (both gender) while the inflected *a* is a future marker - *a* in this context has less sense of obligation just as the *za* future maker in example (15). In (14), *su* is a pre-verbal pronoun marking third person plural (both gender) while the inflected *ka* is used as a marker of relative past tense. In (15), *za* is a marker of future tense. These instances confirm that unlike English, TAM (Tense Aspect Marker)

in Hausa are indicating using separate morphemes not inflected on the main verb (Zahid A. et al., 2014: 56). This is an apt illustration of the Myers Scotton's (1993) matrix-based switch as the overall structure is determined by the grammar of the ML Hausa.

The above sentences (13-15) will be ungrammatical if the inserted English *ing* verbs are maintained as shown below:

> Erm… *sai   na-a   yi* graduating.
>
>   until 1SG-FUT do
>
> * Erm… until I ***graduating***.

> *Akwai   waniabu   da   su ka   ce   mu-yi* submitting *wai*
>
> theirEXST. something PART 3PL PART say-PAST 1PL-do   PART
>
> * There is something they said we should ***submitting***.

> *Da a-ce   GT Bank a-nan   din   za   su   iya* processing *min.*
>
> If   PART-say   PART-here DEF. FUT. 3PL   can   GEN.
>
> * Had it been the GT Bank here can ***processing*** it for me.

In the English context, single Hausa verbs insertion doesn't easily occur. Hausa verbs are only inserted at phrasal level, in the most part preceded by a Hausa particle, a Hausa light verb such as *yi* "do" or a Hausa pronoun. Consider the following example:

> 16. [S6 discussing about the attitude of some complaining staff of her former place of work]
>   The next day ***an   koma*** complaint.
>
>   PART   return
>
>   The next day they return to their complaint.

In (16), the verb *koma* "return" is preceded by a Hausa particle. The particle *an* here plays the

role of a pre-verbal pronoun *su* + a definite marker *-n* (a combination of third person plural and a definite marker). This sentence will be ungrammatical if the verb is inserted without the company of any other element from Hausa.

> * The next day ***koma*** complaint.
>
>   return
>
>   The next day return to their complaint.

However, it should be noted that only English *ing* verbs can be inserted into the Hausa structure. I verified this fact by attempting to omit the *ing* in the inserted verbs in the following constructions:

17. [S8 discussing the transaction he carried out using an ATM machine the previous day]

    Jiya   naa je   naa-yi **withdraw**(ing) *din kudi   a*   ATM…

    Yesterday 1SG go-PAST 1SG-do   DEF. money PART

    I went and withdrew money from the ATM yesterday…

    * *Jiya   naa je   naa-yi* **withdraw** *din kudi   a*   ATM…

18. [S4 discussing his friend's experience when he made attempts to pay the last installment of his tuition fee]

    Yaa   yi   **try**(ing) *ya   biya kudi-n   shi*   last installment

    3SGM do-PAST   3SGM pay   money-DEF. 3SGM(ACC.)

    He tried to pay his last installment (tuition fee)

    * *Ya   yi*   **try** *ya   biya kudi-n*   *shi*   last installment

The underlined bare verbs *withdraw* and *try* in (17) and (18) when inserted into the said

constructions only succeeded in making the sentences ungrammatical because of the missing *ing*.

Turning to the strategies for verbs borrowing, it is worthy of note that languages borrow verbs by means of different strategies as some may borrow by simply inserting a root-like form of a verb from another language into their own morphologies, while some may employ some special derivation process. According to Moravcsik (1978: 111), any lexical item whose meaning is verbal can never be included as a part of borrowed properties. From the context of this study, such claim can be interpreted as saying verbs are not likely borrowed as verbs. Thus a verb transferred from one language to another in the first instance will be borrowed and treated as a noun or another class. As cited in Matras (2009: 176), Wichmann and Wohlgemuth (2007) name four (4) different types of strategies in a hypothesised hierarchy: light verbs > indirect insertions > direct insertion > paradigm transfer, which Matras (2009: 176) in an attempt to interpret the actual strategy involved slightly renames without a hierarchy:

i.   No modification of the original form of the verb ('direct insertion')

ii.   Morphological modification of the original form of the verb (indirect insertion')

iii.   Insertion of the original form of the verb into a compound construction where it is accompanied by an inherited verb ('light verb')

iv.   Import of the original verb along with its original inflection ('paradigm transfer')

As revealed in the results section, there is no instance of English verbal borrowings from Hausa in the data set for this study, but there are instances of Hausa verbal borrowings from English – Hausa verbs into English can only be considered at phrasal level as confirmed in the previous examples. Following the review of the four major patterns of borrowing, the process of Hausa verbal borrowing from English is primarily associated with "indirect insertion" strategy. English verbs are often treated as non-verbs when transferred into Hausa. Consider the following examples:

19. [S4 explaining about the transactions his friend attempted to make but not successful].

…amman still *ba'a yi succeeding ba*.

   But   NEG. do   NEG.

…but it (transaction) was still not successful.

20. [S4 discussing about a gathering of Nigerians in Manchester during festive period]

Wannan gathering *din   shima…*

ThatDEIC .   DEF also

That gathering also…

In (19), the verb *succeeding* is underspecified for part-of-speech membership as it functions as an adjective in the recipient language. In this case, the adjective *successful* modifies the transaction. In (20), the English loan verb *gathering* which seems to be a gerund inserted into the Hausa utterance functions as a non-verb – it is specifically treated as a noun. Admittedly, Moravcsik generalization may not count as universal but often applies. With regards to the hypothesised hierarchy, 'indirect insertion' strategy implies a high degree of bilingualism here.

5.1.3 INTER-CLAUSAL CS STRUCTURE

The purpose of this section is to explain the position of various clausal elements code-switched in the English syntax and those of English code-switched in the Hausa syntactic structures, specifically subordinate clauses and coordination. Behzad, A. (2007: 4) claims that some researchers suggest that switches that are larger than one word are "true code-switches", that "one-word switches" are mere borrowings. The focus in this section is not to distinguish code-switches from borrowings but to analyse various kinds of code-switched subordinate elements. The assumption in this study is that all the participants are bilinguals with higher degree of proficiency and accuracy qualified to involve in such kind of complex CS.

Subordinate clauses usually have a subject and a verb while the link between such clauses and an independent clause will often be relative pronoun or subordinating conjunction. From the

results obtained in the previous chapter, there are instances of switching around subordinate elements, especially as adverbial and adjectival clauses. Some are even in their noun forms. However, the focus will be more on temporal situations. Since both Hausa and English subordinating conjuncts can join main and subordinated clauses. We can classify this into two main broad parts:

1. Hausa subordinate clause with an English main clause
2. English subordinate clause with a Hausa main clause

5.1.3.1 HAUSA SUBORDINATE CLAUSE WITH AN ENGLISH MAIN CLAUSE

Different Hausa subordinate clauses are embedded in English main clause. Consider the following examples:

21. [S1 discussing about the Nigerian Hausa speakers he once met in Salford]

    I met about ten at a time ***lokaci-n   salla-r   Magriba.***

                        time-DEF. prayer-DEF   sunset.

    I met about ten at a time <u>during the sunset prayer session</u>.

22. [S6 discussing how impressed she was when she noticed the attitude of some staff]

    So it was very different for me ***da   na   ganii***

                            PART. 1SG seePAST.

    So it was very different for me <u>when I saw that</u>

In (21) and (22) above, the Hausa subordinate clauses function as adverbial with the elements *lokaci* "time" (when) and *da* "particle" (during). In both examples, the English main clauses precede the Hausa subordinate clauses. The functional elements used in both constituents in (21) and (22) qualify both languages as matrix languages giving the presence of the functional elements of Hausa and English in the structure, for example: *about*, *at* (prepositions) *a* (determiner) of English and *- n, - r* "the" (definiteness) of Hausa. Both the subordinate clause in

(21) and the one in (22) are temporal clauses.

23. [S6 discussing about the attitude of some complaining staff in her former place of work]

Da   na   yi   maganaa da   su it was quite the opposite.

PART. 1SG do-PAST speak   INST 3PL

<u>When I spoke with them</u> it was quite the opposite.

In the case of (23), it is the Hausa subordinate clause that precedes the English main clause beginning with the subordinating conjunction *da* "particle" (when) which is also an instrumental marker here. In Hausa, the instrumental marker *da* usually introduces and immediately precedes the oblique object. In an event where the object is a pronoun, it will appear in the independent form after *da*. Like (21) and (22) above, the functional elements used in the two languages parts qualify both as matrix languages.

5.1.3.2 ENGLISH SUBORDINATE CLAUSE WITH A HAUSA MAIN CLAUSE

There are instances of English subordinating elements which occur in the subordinate clause used in the data. The subordinating conjuncts function as adverbial as exemplified below:

24. [S8 telling S1 that he had also attended a sunset prayer session in Salford]

Na taba zuwa can   salla-r   Magriba **sometimes last month**.

1SG ever   went   thereEXST. prayer-DEF sunset.

I once went there to pray the sunset prayers <u>sometimes last month.</u>

25. [S2 asking S8 about the new banking policy for handling international transactions]

Mutum zai   iya   cika wanna-n abun **anywhere in the world?**

Person FUT. PART fill   that-DEF. PART.

Could one fill in the form from <u>anywhere in the world?</u>

In example (24), the subordinate clause is marked by the temporal *sometimes*. In this

construction, Hausa is the matrix language while English is the embedded language. In (25), the subordinate clause is by the adverbial place *anywhere*, though the construction comes in the form of interrogation.

These switches around clauses are simply considered as cases of alternation, which conform to Muysken's view that, "if the switch takes place at a major clause boundary, alternation is a plausible option" (2000: 99).

5.1.4 CS AROUND DISCOURSE MARKERS

CS occurs around so many elements in different structures including discourse markers. According to Matras (2000: 516), discourse markers are "elements through which the speaker tries to maintain assertive authority by monitoring the way a propositional unit is processed and accepted by the hearer, and by intervening with hearer-sided processing operations (i.e., anticipated interpretations) of the utterance which may cause interactional disharmony and so put the speaker's assertive authority at risk". Crystal (1988: 48) sees discourse markers as the "oil which helps us to perform the complex task of spontaneous speech production and interaction smoothly and efficiently." Toribio (2004: 136) claims that bilinguals are aware of the discourse markers equivalents in both languages when they speak, an act he describes as a conscious desire to juxtapose the two languages "to achieve some literary effects". The present study discusses some of the discourse markers that occur in the speech of Hausa-English bilinguals as obtained in the data.

5.1.4.1 *SO*

The discourse marker *so* is one of the English-origin forms that commonly occur in the data performing a number of grammatical functions. Consider the following examples:

26. [S6 talking about some staff of an organisation who complained of not being well-paid]
    So *wai su* personnel *din   ba'a   biya-n   su* as much as shell and other companies.
         PART 3PL   DEF. NEG.   pay-DEF. 3PL

So the personnel complained that they are not being paid as much those in Shell and
other companies.

27. [S8 changed a topic by asking S6 when she would travel back home in Nigeria]

So *yaushe za   ki   koma gida*?

        when   PART 2SG-F return home?

So when would you return back home?

In example (26), *so* functions as a topic-developer by attempting to introduce additional
information to the preceding utterance (They are not well-paid as much as shell, because the
company I worked for was NDPR: Niger Delta Petroleum Resources). In (27) *so* functions as a
topic-initiator because the previous topic ended with the preceding utterance (I know Jimeta
very well). So the use of *so* in this context signals the initiation of a new topic with the speaker
asking the listener when she would be traveling back home in Nigeria.

28. [S7 explaining how long she stayed in a camp]

So, *na   zauna   a* camp *din* for one month.

        1SG stayed   in   DEF.

So I stayed in the camp for one month.

29. [68 discussing the registration procedure for sponsored students]

So *su   kuma   abunda su ke   yi   nan   idan ka   zo* as a sponsored student

        3PL PART.   what   3PL CMPL do hereDEIC if   2SG come

    So what they do here is, when you come as a sponsored student

In (28), *so* functions as a summarizer which the speaker used to sum up what the listener should
conclude from the previous utterances. In example (29), *so* functions to clarify information to
the listener about the topic under discussion, a construction similar to that in example (26).
From the instances of its occurrence above, I can conclude that *so* is predominantly utterance-

initial.

5.1.4.2 ENGLISH *OKAY* AND HAUSA *TO*

The discourse marker *Okay* which originates from English is now so popular in use among Hausa-English bilinguals and even among some monolinguals, that one would think that is has completely entered into the lexicon of Hausa. Let us consider some instances of its occurrence in the data for the present study:

30. [S2 acknowledged that one could sign a certain form to speed up an international bank transaction]

    Okay. Okay, *mutum zai   iya   cika wanna-n abun*

                   GEN.   can PART fill   that-DEF. PART.

    Okay. Okay, one can sign that

31. [S2 grasps information on the type of form to sign in the bank]

    Okay, *wanda mutum zai   cika* Form A

           Which   GEN.   FUT. Fill

    Okay, the one that one can sign Form A

32. [S8 demanding for confirmation to the previous information]

    Okay, *wai   a   can*   Department?

          PART in thereDEIC

     Okay, in the Department there?

In example (30), the function of *okay* indicates conversational solidarity with the ongoing discussion. The duplication of the discourse marker *okay* in this context is to confirm that the speaker is following the discussion, though with some degree of curiosity. In example (31), the use of *okay* signals an acknowledgment of receipt of information which the interlocutor deems of importance. In example (32) below, *okay* functions as a confirmation check while it indicates

S8's intimate interest in S2's immediate utterance that elicits a response. The response here can come either from S8 or from S2.

33. [S2 acknowledged comprehension of the previous information]

   Okay, *to,* this is interesting.

   　　　PART

   Okay, this is interesting.

The discourse marker *to* in (33) which is of Hausa origin functions in the rhetorical sense of having established a point. The co-occurrence of *to* with *okay* in this context signals comprehension to the preceding information and also in agreement with what was said. The discourse marker *to* can be roughly translated as *okay* in this context of use. So *to* here is just like a repetition of *okay* as occurred in (30).

5.1.4.3 *YEAH* AND *EH*

34. [S4 responding to an utterance that invited an affirmation]

   Akwai   wannan   gaskiya, **yeah***.*

   thereEXST. that   truth

   That is true, yeah.

35. [S8 confirmed the preceding utterance]

   Yeah *…* ***Yeah***, you can do it.

   Yes   yes

   Yes… yes, you can do it

36. [S2 affirmed the preceding utterance]

   Eh, *amman* it is not working, *gaskiya.*

   Yes, but   truth

   Yes, but it is not working, honestly

In (34), the discourse marker *yeah* which appears in the final position of the Hausa structure expresses an affirmative response to the preceding utterance – in this case, it functions as a turn-terminator since the speaker expresses wishes to relinquish the floor. In (35), it appears at the start of the turn and functions as a straightforward affirmative. In example (36), the non-lexicalized *eh* "yes", is equivalent to *yeah* in a Hausa construction. Its occurrence in sentence initial is evidence that it also functions as an affirmative response acknowledging the previous unit as it marks turn. Jucker and Smith (1998: 181) cited in Jim (2006), describes the discourse marker *yeah* as a "reception marker" which they claim that is more commonly used in conversations between strangers than between familiar interlocutors.

In the contrary, the occurrence of *yeah* in both (35) and (36) is in conversations between interlocutors who are familiar with each other. *Yeah* can appear either turn-initial (as in 35 & 36) or turn-final (34). It should be noted that in (34) there is a duplication of *yeah* which only co-occur to emphasize the affirmativeness. From an Australian German study, Clyne (1972: 136) cited in Jim (2006: 1883) reports that, "some speakers followed the interjection from one code by that from the other code for emphasis in German discourse: *yes ja, ja yes, nein no, no nein."* Alternatively, it can be argued that *yeah* in (33) is co-performing the function of a pause-filler.

5.1.4.4 OTHER PATTERNS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS SWITCHES

In example (37), Hausa *kuma* is equivalent to the English *also* which signals providing additional information to the previous topic. With the use of *kuma* here, S7 further establishes a connection between the subsequent utterance and the previous topic. In some contexts, *kuma* may function as a coordinating conjunction as illustrated in (38).

37. [S7 discussing about the strictness in her former place of work]

    Kuma you had to work every day, so no Saturday, no Sunday.

    also

    You also had to work every day, so no Saturday, no Sunday.

38. [S8 talking about the banks he operates with]

I bank with GTB **kuma** I bank with Zenith.

          and

I bank with GTB and I bank with Zenith.

In (39), the discourse marker *ko* is equivalent to the English *"right"* which functions as a confirmation check. It also signals that the proposition is drawing to an end

39. [S8 wanted to confirm what the interlocutor said about traveling]

July this year, *ko*?

        PART.

July this year, right?

However, the above findings reveal that, on the whole, discourse markers in Hausa-English switching are versatile and mostly function as affirmatives, summarizers, closers, topic developers or topic initiators. They also appear in all positions: utterance-initial, utterance-final and utterance-medial. According to Schiffrin (1987: 328), discourse markers can be syntactically detached in utterances. Auer (1991: 326) reveals that CS around discourse markers in bilingual conversations becomes more significant as a marked choice of a specific code in relation to other linguistic items from other codes.

5.2.1 PRAGMATIC/CONVERSATION ANALYTIC APPROACH TO CS

Linguistic research on CS has come a long way over the past few decades, which usually focuses on two distinct but related dimensions: structural and sociolinguistic. In the previous part, I discussed the structural approach to CS as primarily concerned with the syntactic constraints governing its operation. This part will handle the sociolinguistic dimension which is concerned with the role of social factors such as context and speaker's role relationship (Blom J., & Gumperz J., 1972) with a view to analysing language choices of interlocutors as identified through meanings that emanate from switching in conversation. According to Auer (1995: 116),

to effectively analyse and theorise the meaning of CS, there must be an interpretation of each incident in respect to the utterances that either precede or follow the code-switch.

5.2.2 MOTIVATIONS FOR CS AMONG HAUSA-ENGLISH BILINGUALS

What is interesting is that there are different conversational functions in the CS literature that are found to be overlapping. For instance, Gumperz (1982: 75-80) identifies six (6) functions of CS as: (1) quotations, (2) addressees specification, (3) interjection, (4) reiteration, (5) messages qualification, and (6) personification versus objectification. These functions were drawn from the CS data of selected language pairs: Slovenian-German, Spanish-English, and Hindi-English. In a study of CS between different varieties in India, Malik (1994) cited in Yusuf (2014: 166) proposed ten (10) communicative functions of CS in bilingual conversations, thus: (1) lack of facilities in one language, (2) lack of registral competence, (3) a semantic significance, (4) addressing different audiences, (5) sharing of an identity or solidarity, (6) to intensify and emphasize a particular point, (7) the mode of a speaker, (8) habitual expressions, (9) pragmatic motives, and (10) attention attraction. Auer (1995: 120) identifies eight (8) functions: (1) reported speech (2) change of participant constellation (3) parentheses or side-comments (4) reiterations (5) change of activity type (6) topic shift (7) puns, language play, shift of key and (8) topicalisation, topic/comment structure. Feasibly, the list may go longer as regard research on "conversational functions" of CS. In this study, I will relate the analysis to these theories, with emphasis on Auer's sequential approach to interaction (1984). Beginning with the concept of "contextualization cue" in "code-alternation" (Auer, 1995: 123), there are various instances of switching in my data for explanation. Consider the following:

40. *Amman saura-n   duka ahh   su   tashi su   ce,*
    But   CMPL-DEF   all   ahh   3PL   stand 3PL say
    But the rest would be complaining,

    "wallahi, I am tired of this job. I'm going to… I'm going to *ehn* resign from this job,
     (by God - a form of oath).

and I am going to get another Job somewhere else.”

41. *Sai   na   ce,*   “*wow*, this is amazing”.

   then 1SG   sayPAST.

   Then I said “wow, this is amazing”.

In example (40), S6 was talking about the attitude of some staff she once worked with in a particular organization in Nigeria where she did her internship few years ago. To the best of her knowledge, the staff were well-paid by their employer but they were ungrateful as they had always complained about their salaries simply because they had the knowledge that a similar organization was paying its own staff better. She started the topic in Hausa but later switched to English when quoting the staff. The switch here highlights a contextual assumption that it is the staff talking and not her. This suggests that “contextualization cue” (Gumperz, 1996: 379) invokes an interpretation for the rest of the content of the utterances, depending on the context of occurrence. Auer (1992: 21) added that the concept of “contextualization cue” as advanced by Gumperz depends on the understanding of context as flexible and reflexive. This further implies that “contextualization cues” don’t have referential meaning. In essence, utterances are interpreted by a process of inferencing. Example (41) is a similar construction with (40), but in this case, S6 was quoting herself. She was trying to express how impressed she was when she first met the staff, particularly how serious they were handling their office equipment. The switch here highlights the contextual assumption that she quoted exactly what she said when the activity of the staff of her organization caught her attention.

However, there are instances where code-switches defy a straightforward account of “contextualization cue” since they don’t seem to be motivated by the intention to either convey pragmatic meaning or invoke any process of inferencing. Consider the following examples:

42. *Kuma su   sun   ce za   su   rika   ba* **students** *na* **CBN** ,

   And   3PL 3PL-DEF. say PART they keep on give   PART.

   And they said that they will be giving students at the CBN (Central Bank of Nigeria) rate,

   to   amma har   yanzu ni ba-n   san me ke faruwa   ba.

   PART but   still now   1SG NEG-DEF. know what COP happening NEG.

    but I still don't know what is happening.

43. *Eh, ba   ka gani ba   a* **E-program** *dinka   ba*

   Yes, NEG 2SG see NEG.   in   DEF-2SG NEG.

   Yes, didn't you see it in your E-program.

In the first part of example (42), the speaker (S2) talked about the new policy introduced by the Central Bank of Nigeria which would allow Nigerian students from any part of the world to use their debit cards for transaction at the official rate. In the second part of the sentence, he expressed his disappointment as to why they still have not implemented the policy. With the insertion of *students* and *CBN,* the speaker doesn't necessarily mean to convey inferences and so there is no contextualizing. Hausa-English bilinguals make it a habit to use the English term *student* in place of its Hausa counterpart *dalibi* when speaking with another Hausa speaker whether bilingual or monolingual and that makes its status unmarked. Its insertion is only a substitution, which the speaker finds easier to activate and process. *CBN (Central Bank of Nigeria)* on the other hand is a specific referent. In example (43), S2 was talking about the document he was directed to submit to his sponsor back home through an online platform called *E-program,* at the same time he asked his interlocutor if he has received a similar notification since both of them are beneficiaries of the same sponsor. The term *E-program* here has no readily available equivalent in Hausa. The speaker in this kind of situation has no choice than to switch to English to fill in the lexical gap there. The difficulty in getting an equivalent expression in this situation could have triggered the switching for the speaker to fully express

himself. The absence of hesitation and pause in the utterances is a clear indication of the ease with which the insertions were made.

With regard to the use of language in domains, bank is one of the examples of domains that require English as a dominant language where financial terms are only expressed in this code, as observed in my data. Consider these examples:

44. *Jiya   naa je   naa-yi   **withdrawing** din kudi   a **ATM** sai   a   hankali*
       Yesterday 1SG go-PAST 1SG-do   DEF. money PART PART PART careful
       I went and withdrew money from the ATM yesterday, it was too bad

45. **Exchange rate** *sai   kara   hauhawa ya   kai.*
                             PART   increase high   CMPL PART.
       Exchange rate is just going high.

46. *Saboda   su-n   fara,   da   su ka   yi   na   farko ya tafi   a **official rate.***
       because   3PL-DEF. startPAST, when 3PL PART. do PART first   it goPAST PART.
       Because they tried it, the first one they did was at the official rate.

In example (44), the speaker was discussing about his experience at the *ATM* machine when he went to withdraw money the previous day. The sentence is in the Hausa structure, but he inserted the verb *withdrawing* not because it lacks equivalent in Hausa but because it was easier to process in that context, especially as it involved a mention of *ATM* which is a specific referent. In (45) and (46), the terms *exchange rate* and *official rate* are both financial terms related to the domain bank.

In the listing of his *conversational loci* where switching is likely to occur, Auer (1995: 120) mentions "reiterations" as one of the functions switching serves in conversation. Consider this instance in my data:

47. [S7 trying to express how impressed she was with some staff]

   …Yanda   su-naa aiki,   yanda   su-naa **taking care da equipment** *na-su*.

     how   3PL-be   work, how   3PL-be   PART-3PL

   …how they were taking care of their equipment

In (47), S7 was talking about how impressed she was with the way some workers were taking good care of their equipment in their place of work. She began the sentence in Hausa, and then she later switched to English while translating from the preceding utterance. She did that for the purpose of emphasis.

In relation to Auer's (1995: 127) concept of *negotiation process* in alternation across turns, there are patterns for explanation here. Consider the following example:

48. S7: I wasn't very interested in my course, but my dad said, "just do it, you know,
        just do it", and then we had like these long conversations about it.
    S8*: To me   ki   ka   so   ki   yi*?
        So what 2SG-F PART. like 2SG-F do
        So what did you intend to study?
    S7: Bio-Medicine [laughs].
    S8: Bio-Medicine?
    S1: Eh.
        Yes.

In segment (48), the speaker (S7) was trying to explain to her friend (S8) in English (her preferred language of interaction), how her father encouraged her to study a course different from her choice when the University refused to admit her into a course of her dream. S8 has his own different choice, Hausa, and so he responded in Hausa. S7 on the other hand responded in English, though the expression was a mention of a specific referent *Bio-Medicine*. S8 further

sought a confirmation of what she said in the form of a question. Aware of S8's preferred choice, S7 decided to negotiate the language and so the flow of the conversation continued in the Hausa code. The Hausa *Eh* means *yes* in English as earlier discussed in the previous part. According to Auer (1984: 30), "an interactional issue, related not only to the further development of the conversation (by the impact it may have on it) but also to its preceding sequential context whose [code] bears on the present speaker's choice".

To sum up based on the above analysis, the different functions covered by switches between Hausa and English include:

- **Grammatical loans:** it is part of the Hausa speakers' cultural history to adopt loanwords from the languages they have come into contact with. This tendency to adopt loanwords at will made the Hausa speakers more receptive to switching between languages. For example, Hausa has now adopted the English "account" and "bank" as in examples (5) and (15) into its lexicon.

- **Low level of competence in English**: majority of bilinguals have one language dominating the other as the status of a balanced bilingual is rarely achieved. A closer look at most of the switched sentences in the present study demonstrated that the syntactic structure is basically that of Hausa. In this case, speakers easily resort to CS to hide their incompetence in the English language. Example (14) above is a clear example. The speaker (S2) wanted to say, "there is something they said we should forward to them". This has succeeded in exposing the incompetence of the speaker, who pretended to be competent in English, since the word "submitting" was wrongly used in this context.

- **Reporting speech**: sometimes, Hausa-English bilinguals do code-switch to report or quote somebody in relation to the topic being discussed. In Example (40), S6 was quoting some staff she once worked with that she has to switch to highlight that it was the staff talking and not her.

- **Reiteration**: Hausa-English bilinguals often repeat what has just been said in the first language, in the process of which they may paraphrase in the other language for the

purpose of emphasis. Example (47) above is an instance of such occurrence.

- **Lexical gap:** particularly with the development in the area of science and technology, there are terms that are yet to have equivalents in Hausa that the speaker has to resort to switching in order to fill in the lexical gap. As exemplified in (43), S2 has no option but to import the English *E-program*, since it has no equivalent in Hausa

- **Unique referents:** there are certain terms that are unique most of which are names of institutions treated as proper names. Instances of such are illustrated in examples (2) *Zenith bank*, (42) *CBN (Central Bank of Nigeria)* and (44), *ATM*. These terms cannot be translated into Hausa.

- **Clarification:** Hausa-English bilinguals do engage in switching to clarify message ambiguity in the previous point they have made in a conversation. In (11) above for example, S6 switched to another code to make her previous point clear.

CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

This study investigated the occurrence of CS in the speech of Hausa-English bilinguals in Manchester, United Kingdom. The analysis was based on the audio-recorded speech data obtained from the conversations of eight (8) participants. The recordings primarily took place in home and school settings. The focus of the analysis was on the syntactic structures and the socio-pragmatic functions of Hausa-English CS. This study has reviewed different constraints on CS that have been proposed in the literature. The application of various approaches in the data analysis has shown that a particular instance of CS can serve more than one function for the speaker.

Structurally, insertion (intra-sentential) and alternation (inter-sentential) emerged the two switching patterns, with the former proving more frequent. Drawing evidence from the data analysis, it was demonstrated that Hausa formed the base language while English supplied the inserted elements in most of the sentences. This study revealed that nouns are the most switched items, followed by discourse markers (interjections, particles, fillers & conjunctions), verbs, adverbs, prepositions, pronouns and then determiners. Discourse markers in Hausa-English switching are versatile and mostly function as: topic initiators, topic developers, affirmatives, summarizers and closers. They also appear in every part of the sentence (initial, medial and final). The analysis of the subordinating conjunct in this study clearly points to the grammatical function of subordinating clauses as primarily adverbial. What was found interesting in the case of subordinating clauses was how both Hausa and English technically qualified as the matrix languages, specifically in (21), (22) and (23) above. This countered the view of the MLF model. Unlike majority of studies on CS, this study has revealed that switching around possessive pronouns is possible. It further revealed that most English verbs are not inserted into the Hausa structure as verbs; rather, they are underspecified for parts-of-speech membership as they function as adjectives or noun. This study has discussed certain functions of CS among Hausa-English bilinguals and the findings revealed that CS is triggered by various conversational contexts. The functions covered in this study include: grammatical loans, low

level of competence in English, reporting speech, unique referents, lexical gap, clarification and reiteration. Therefore, this study has given a hint about how languages are represented and to what degrees they are separated.

The present study suggests that further study is needed to examine larger data that can give more detailed insights of the characteristics of Hausa-English CS. The data I presented in this study are far from sufficient to explain the said characteristics. There is also the need to look at the case of Hausa-English CS in foreign language classroom to examine students' attitudes and the factors impacting them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Alkasim, H. et al (2016). Code-mixing as a sociolinguistic device in Hausa contemporary literature. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research.* Vol. 3, Issue 3, pp. 154-161.

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Auer, P. (1995). The Pragmatics of Code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.) *One speaker, two languages: cross–disciplinary perspectives on code–switching*. (pp. 115–135). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation*. London: Routledge.

Azuma, S. (1993). The frame-content hypothesis in speech production: evidence from intra-sentential code-switching. *Linguistics* 31: 1071- 1093.

Behzad, A. (2007). Urdu-English code-switching: The use of Urdu phrases and clauses in Pakistani English (A Non-native Variety). *ESP World. Issue 17.*

Blom, J. & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Northern Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication* (Pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rineart, and Winston.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lecture on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Clyne, M. (1972). *Perspectives on language contact*. Melourne. The Hawthorne Press.

Clyne, M. (1987). Constraints on code switching: how universal are they? *Linguistics* 25, 739-764.

Collins, W. M. (2003). "Code-switching behaviour as a strategy for Maya-Mam linguistic revitalization". *OSUWPL*, 57 (Summer), 1-39.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crystal, D. (1988). *The English language*. London: Penguin Books.

Essien, O. (1995). "The English language and code-mixing: A case study of the phenomenon in Ibibio". In Ayo Bamgbose, Ayo Banjo and Andrew Thomas (Eds.) *New Englishes: A West African perspective* (pp. 269-283).Ibadan: Mosuro Publisher and Booksellers.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gardner-Chloros, P. & Edwards, M. (2004) Assumptions behind grammatical approaches to code-switching: when the blueprint is a red herring. *Transactions of the Philological Society,* 102:1, 103-129.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2010). Contact and code-switching. In *The handbook of language contact*, ed. By Raymond Hickey, 188-208.

Grosjean, F. (1982.). *Life with two languages*: *An introduction to bilingualism.* Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press, 370pp.

Grosjean, F. (1995). A psycholinguistic approach to code-switching: the recognition of guest words by bilinguals in Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. & Hernandez-Chavez, E. (1975). Cognitive aspect of bilingual communication. In Hernandez-Chavez A.D. Cohen & A. F. Beltramo (Eds.), *El Lenguaje de los Chicanos: Regional and social characteristics used by Mexican Americans* (Pp.154-164). Arlington, VA: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Heller, M. (1988). Code-switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110849615.

Halmari, H. (1997). *Government and code-switching: Explaining American Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haugen, E. (1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A bibliography and research guide*. American Dialect Society 26.

Inuwa, Y. N. (2014). Significance of Hausa-English code-switching. *Academic Research International* Vol. 5(3), 164-173.

Jidda, H. (2012). Subordinate elements in code-switching conversation structure. *Journal of Linguistics Association of Nigeria* Vol. 17 No.1 & 2. 91-99.

Jim, H. (2006). Bilingual discourse markers: Evidence from Croatian-English code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (2006). 1870-1900.

Jucker, A. & Smith, S. (1998). "And people you know like 'wow'". Discourse markers as
     negotiating strategies. In: Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds.) Discourse markers.
     Theory and descriptions. (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 57). Amsterdam: Benjamins,
     171-201.

Levelt, W. J M. (1989). *Speaking: from intention to articulation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Lipski, J. M. (1978). Code-switching and the problem of bilingual competence. In M. Pradis (Ed.),
     Aspects of bilingualism (Pp. 250-264). Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.

MacSwan, J. (1997) *A Minimalist approach to intra-sentential code-switching: Spanish-Nahuatl*
     Bilingualism in   Central Mexico. PhD dissertation University of California Los Angeles.

Malik, L. (1994). *Sociolinguistics: A study of code-switching*. New Delhi. Anmol.

Matras, Y. (2000). Fusion and the cognitive basis for bilingual discourse markers*. International*
     Journal of bilingualism 4. 505-528.

Matras Y. (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge:
     Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Y. & Alex, R. (2015). Multilingualism in a post-industrial city: Policy and practice in
     Manchester. *Current issues in Language Planning* 16, no. 3. 296-314.

McDaniel, C & Gates, R. (2001). *Marketing research essentials*. Ohio: South West College.

Moravcsik, E. (1978). Universals of language contact. In: Greenberg, J. H. (ed.), *Universals of*
     human language. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 94-122.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). *Dueling languages: Grammatical structure in Code-switching*.
     Oxford: Clarendon.

Myers-Scotton, C. and Jake, J.L. (2000). Testing a model of morpheme classification with
     language contact data.   *International Journal of Bilingualism* 4/1, 1-8.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford:
     Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistic: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*.
     New York: Oxford University Press.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing.* Cambridge: Cambridge
     University Press.

Muysken, P. (2008). *Functional categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pfaff, C. (1979). Constraints on language mixing: intra-sentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language* 55, 291-318.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol. *Linguistics* 18, 518-618.

Poplack, S. (1981). Syntactic structure and social function of code-switching. In: Duran, R. ed. *Latino Language and communicative behavior.* Norwood: Ablex. 169-184.

Romaine, S. (1985). *The syntax and semantics of the code-mixed compound verb in Panjabi/English bilingual discourse*. Paper presented at the Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sridhar, K. (1996). Language in education: Minorities and multilingualism in India*. International Review of Education* 42(4), 327-347.

Sridhar, S. N & Kamal, K. S. (1980). The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-mixing. *Studies in the linguistic sciences*. No. 1, Vol. 10.

Stockwell, P. (2002). *Sociolinguistics: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge, Routledge English Introductions.

Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode & Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa, Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistis*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana Universit Press.

Toribio, A. (2004). Spanish-English speech practices: bringing chaos to order. *Bilingual education and bilingualism,* 7 (2 & 3): 133-154.

Toribio, A. (2009). Language attitudes and linguistic outcomes in reading, PA., in *Language allegiances and bilingualism in the US*, M.R, Salaberry (ed.), 24-41. Multilingual matters.

Tustin, D. H. et al. (2010). Marketing research in practice.

Virginia, Y. & Stephen, M. (2016). Code-mixing and mixed verbs in Cantonese-English bilingual children: Input and Innovation. *Languages, 1, 4.*

Wichmann, S. and Wohlgemuth, J. (2008). Loan verbs in typological perspective. In: Stolz T., Bakker, D., and Salas Palomo, R. eds. *Aspects of language contact. New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romanisation processes.*

Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 89-121.

Winford, (2003). "Code-switching: linguistic sspects." *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub. 126-167.

Woolford, E. (1993). Bilingual code-switching and syntactic theory*. Linguistic inquiry*. 14(3): 520-536.

Yusuf C. I. (2012). Hausa–English code-switching in kanywood films. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(2), 87-96.

Zahid, A. et al (2014). Tense and aspect in Hausa language. *Balochistan journal of Linguistics* Vol. 2, 52-63.

APPENDIX

1.

A. S6: *Su-naa*   *samun*   *kudi*   *fa*   *sosai*

    3PL-be   getPROG. money indeed a lot.

    They are really getting a lot of money.

B. S8: *Mhm.*

C. S6: Niger Delta Petroleum Resources

D. S8*: Mhm.*

E. S6: So *su* personnel *din*   *ba'a*   *biya-n*   *su* as much as shell and other companies.

        3PL   DEF. NEG. pay-DEF. 3PL

     So the personnel are not being paid as much those in shell and other companies.

F.   Na   ce,   "you should even be lucky"…

    1SG say-PAST,

    I said, "you should even be lucky"…

G. S6: *Ba'a* *biya-n*   *su* as much as shell *domin* *company-n*   *da*   *na* *yi* *aiki* was NDPR

    NEG. pay-DEF. 3PL   because company-DEF. INST. 1SG do work

    They are not being paid as much as shell, because the company I worked for was

    NDPR

H.   Salary *na-su*   per month I'm telling you is a lot of money.

        POSS-3PL

    Their salary per month I'm telling you is a lot of money.

I.   But they don't…

J.   S8: They don't appreciate it.

K.   S6: Yeah, they don't appreciate it, most of them.

L.   No, there are actually a few people that I saw that were actually quite appreciative of their work.

M.   *Amman saura-n   duka ahh   su   tashi su   ce,*
        But   CMPL-DEF   all   ahh   3PL   stand 3PL say
        But the rest would be complaining*,*

        "wallahi, I am tired of this job. I'm going to… I'm going to *ehn* resign from this job,
        (by God - a form of oath).
         and I am going to get another Job somewhere else."

N.   I was just looking at them.

O.   S8: *Wannan* mentality *din* is everywhere *indai* Nigerians ne.
        That   DEF   PART
        That mentality is everywhere with Nigerians

P.   S6: I can't, I can't.

Q.   S8: … *kullun mutum na* complaining *akan* his place of work.
        … always person be   about
        … person is always complaining of his place of work.

R.   S6: When I came I was very very impressed.

S.   *I-na   ta   kallo,*   everything was amazing, like the way *su-naa aiki,*

      1SG-be OBL lookPROG.   3PL-be work

      I was just looking, everything was amazing, like the way they work, how they work,

      yanda   su-naa aiki, yanda   su-naa taking care da equipment *na-su*.

      OBL   3PL-be work, OBL   3PL-be   PART-3PL

      how they were taking care of their equipment

T.   Everything was you know…

U.   S8: In order.

V.   S6: Yeah, it was in order.

W.   And obviously it is really hard to see anywhere that such happens in Nigeria, you know

X.   So it was very different for me *da   na   ganii*, I was very impressed.

                                      when   1SG seePAST.

      So it was very different for me when I noticed that, I was very impressed.

Y.   *Sai   na   ce,*   "*wow*, this is amazing".

      then 1SG   sayPAST.

      Then I said "wow, this is amazing".

Z.   They must love their job to do such amazing work every day, you understand.

AA.   *Amman inaa, da   na   yi   maganaa da   su,* it was quite the opposite.
      But   INTRG. PART. 1SG CONT.be   speak   with 3PL
      But when I spoke with them, it was quite the opposite.

BB. S8: They don't talk about the huge amount they receive in their individual accounts.

CC. S6: No no no. When they get their… no, do you know what? I was there when they got
      their salary. The day that everyone…

DD.S8: *Baki-n   kowa   ya   yi   shiru.*
       mouth-POSS all   CMPL bePAST   silence.
       Everybody's mouth was shut.

EE. S6: Yeah.

FF. S8: No complaints.

GG.   S6: No complaints no complaints… *Ah, to   shikenan.*
                              Ah   well that's all.
                  No complaints no complaints… Ah, that's fine.

HH.   The next day *an   koma* complaint. *An   gama   biya-n   su,*
                     PART   return   PART finishPAST Pay-DEF. 3PL
      The next day they return to their complaints. They were just paid,

      jiya jiya   aka   gama   biya-n   su
      DEIC DEIC (literally yesterday) PART finishPAST. Pay-DEF 3PL
      they were paid just yesterday

      amman next day *su-n   koma* complaints.

but   3PL-DEF   return

but the next day they return to their complaints.

2.

A.   S1: *Akwai*   *kuma* another time *da*   *muka yi*   meeting *a*   Salford.

      thereEXST.   also   PART. 1PL   doPAST.   in

      There was another time we had a meeting in Salford.

B.   S4: *Su-n*   *ma fi*   *yawa a*   Salford *ai.*

      3PL-DEF   OBL   more   many   in   EXC

      They are more in Salford.

C.   S1:   Yeah, because of PTDF.

D.   S4: *Na taba zuwa can*   *salla-r*   *Magriba* sometimes last month.

       1SG ever   went   thereEXST.   prayer-DEF   sunset.

       I once went there to pray the sunset prayers sometimes last month.

E.   S1: *Eh, saboda* PTDF*. sannan mafiyawanci-n* PTDF scholars *su*   *na*   Salford.

      Yes, because   and   majority-DEF   3PL PART

      Yes, because of PTDF. And majority of PTDF scholars are in Salford.

F.   S4:   Yeah, *ina ganin* I met about ten at a time *lokaci-n*   *salla-r*   *Magriba.*

        1SG think   time-DEF. prayer-DEF   sunset.

       Yeah, I think I met about ten at a time during the sunset prayers session.

G.   S1: *Wannan* gathering *din*   *shima* which was *salla* celebration   *haka,*

      ThatDEIC .   DEF   also   prayer (festive period)   PART

      That gathering which was like Eid celebration also,

Ina gani-n we were like… *kai, ba zan iya tunawa   ba amman dai* we were many.

1SG see-DEF.   2SG NEG PART can remember NEG but   PART

I think we were like… oh, I can't remember but we were many.

H.   The expectations from you are really high.

I.   So *shiyasa*   sometimes *sai   ka   ga   wadansu* students

          that's why   PART   2SG.   see   some

        So that is why sometimes some students

         they rather go to *wadansu* Universities than come here.

                              some

         they rather go to other Universities than come here.

J.   For example in Chemistry as well, *na san   da   cewa* I have attended some lectures.

                                          1SG know INST that

        For example in Chemistry as well, I know that I have attended some lectures.

        So some of them are really very good.

K. S4: *Akwai   wannan   gaskiya, yeah.*

        thereEXST. that   truth

        That is true, yeah.

L.   S1: So in *wadan-nan* cases *din   zai   iya yiwuwa idan mutum baida*

            EXST-DEF   DEIC FUT.   can possible if   GEN   lack

        So in such cases, it is possible if one lacks

        background *sosai, ka   gane*, he may not be able to cope.

          a lot, 2SG   understand

good background, you understand, he may not be able to cope.

M.   Because *za   ka   isko* for you to really get the background and align with the system

         PART. 2SG discover

Because for you to really get the background and align with the system

       sai   ka   isko you don't have time.

       PART   2SG discover.

       you discover that you don't have time.

N. S4: *Lokaci ya   kure   ma-ka.*

      time   CMPL late   PART-2SG

      It is already too late for you.

O. S1: *Lokaci ya   kure   ma-ka.*

      time   CMPL late   PART-2SG

      It is already too late for you.

P. S4: It is true, yeah.

3.

A. S7: My immediate elder sister.

B. S8: Oh, that is interesting. *A* Abuja *ta   yi aure   ko a ina*?

                        in   3SG do marriage or in where

Oh, that is interesting. Did she marry in Abuja or where?

C. S7*: A'a*. *A* Yola.

No. In

No. In Yola

D. S8: Okay.

E. S7: *Amma miji-n-ta*   *ya   na   aiki   a Abuja.*

But   husband-DEF-POSS 3SG PART work in

But her husband works in Abuja.

F. S8: Okay.

G. S7: They will be going from Abuja to Yola, I think. *A* Jimeta.

                                                                    In

They will be going from Abuja to Yola, I think. In Jimeta.

H. S8: I know Jimeta *sosai.*

                       very well

I know Jimeta very well.

I.   S7: Hmm.

Hmm.

J.   S8: So *yaushe za   ki   koma gida*?

          when   FUT 2SG-F return home?

So when would you return back home?

K. S7: Erm… *sai   na   yi* graduating. So graduation *namu* is July.

          until 1SG do   our

I don't know when the specific date is.

Erm… until I graduated. So our graduation is July.

I don't know when the specific date is.

L. S8: July this year, *ko*?

         PART.

July this year, right?

M. S7: Eh.

Yes

N. S7: I wasn't very interested in my course, but my dad said, "just do it, you know, just do it", and then we had like these long conversations about it.

O. S8*: To me   ki   ka   so   ki   yi*?

So what 2SG-F PART. like 2SG-F do

So what did you intend to study?

P. S7: Bio-Medicine [laughs].

Q. S8: Bio-Medicine?

R. S7: Eh.

Yes.

S. S8: Oh.

T. S7: I know. My dad, my dad was like, "do Petroleum Engineering".

U.   No, actually, *erm*… he was like, "yeah, do Bio-Med if you want", but then…

4.

A. S2: *Akwai   waniabu   da   su ka   ce   mu-yi* submitting *wai*
        theirEXST. Something PART 3PL PART say-PAST 1PL-do   PART
        There is something they said we should submit

B. S5: Okay, *wai   a   can   Department?*
                PART in thereDEIC
        Okay, in the Department there?

C. S2: *Eh,   ba   ka gani ba   a* E-program *din-ka   ba*
        Yes, NEG 2SG see NEG.   in   DEF-2SG NEG.
        Yes, didn't you see it in your E-program

D. S2: *Wai* abstract *su-ke   son   a-yi*   submitting *wanda za'a yi* submitting *haka na*
        PART   3PL-PART want PART-do   which FUT. do   PARK DEF.
        They want abstract to be submitted, to be submitted to the

        academic division *da kuma wanda za'a yi* submitting *kamar irin za'a   ba* media *ne*
                           and also which FUT. do   seems PART FUT give   COP
        academic division and another one seems to be submitted to the media

E. S5: Okay, for publication *Kenan*
                                PART
         Okay, for publication, right

F. S2: *Eh,* so *wai* two format *su-ke   so,   daya kamar nan   makaranta ne*
            Yes,   PART   3PL-PART want one seems hereDEIC school   COP

Yes, they want two formats one seems to be for the school

daya Kuma kamar in za-ka yiwa layman *bayani   yanda zai   fuskanci   me*

one and   seems if FUT-2MSG   explanation how   FUT. Understand what

and the other one is what can be used when you want to explain to the understanding

kake   nufi.

2MSG-CONT. mean*.*

Of a layman.

G. S5: *To.*

  Okay.

H. S2: *Eh.*

  Yes.

I. S5: *Jiya   naa je   naa-yi*   withdrawing *din kudi   a* ATM *sai   a   hankali*

  Yesterday 1SG go-PAST 1SG-do   DEF. money PART PART PART careful

  I went I withdrew money from the ATM yesterday, it was too bad

J. S2: *Sai a hankali*, they are charging…

  PART PART

  It is too bad, they are charging

K. S2: The last time I withdrew money day before yesterday *sun   cire   mani*

                                          3PL-DEF. remove   1SG.

  Four Hundred and Ten (Naira).

  The last time I withdrew money the day before yesterday and they charged me

Four Hundred and Ten (Naira).

L. S5: Four Hundred and Ten

M. S2: *Wallahi* Four Hundred and Ten (Naira) per pound sterling.

    By God

    I swear, Four Hundred and Ten (Naira) per pound sterling

N. S5: God!

O. S2: So it was quite disturbing, *gaskiya.*

                                    Truth

    So, it was quite disturbing, honestly.

P. S5: Exchange rate *sai   kara   hauhawa ya   kai.*

                PART increase PART   CMPL DEF.

    Exchange rate is just going high.

Q. S2*: Kuma su   sun   ce za   su   rika   ba* students *na* CBN,

    And   they   3PL-DEF. say PART They keep on give   PART.

    And they said that they will be giving students at the CBN rate,

    to   amma har   yanzu ni   ba-n   san   me   ke   faruwa   ba.

    PART but   still   now   1SG NEG-DEF.   know what COP happening NEG.

    but I still don't know what is happening.

R. S5: Okay, *wanda mutum zai   cika* Form A, *in ya   cika* Form A

              Which GEN.   OBL. Fill   if 3SG. Fill

    Okay, the one that one can sign Form A,

sai   ya   bada a bank din   shi,   then they process the payment.
PART 3SG give in   DEF 3SG-POSS

after which he submit it to his bank to process the payment.

S.   S2: *Eh, amman* it is not working, *gaskiya.*

    Yes, but   truth

    Yes, but it is not working, honestly

T.   S5: It is not working, *gaskiya…*

    Honestly, it is not working…

U.   S5: *Akwai   wani* friend *dina ma   da   ya   kira ni   shekaranjiya daga* Salford*,*

    thereEXST. 3SG.   my   PART. CMPL. 3SG dial 1SG DEIC.   from

    There is a friend of mine who dialed me the day before yesterday from Salford,

    abunda ya ce   cewa   ya-yi   ya yi   trying *ya biya kudi-n   shi* last installment

    what   3SG say sayPAST 3MSG-do3SG. beCONT. 3SG pay money-DEF. 3SG-POSS.

    he said that he has been trying to pay his last installment (tuition fee)

    ta   hanya-r cika Form A, but unfortunately *da   ya   biya   kudi*

    PART. way-DEF fill   whenDEIC 3SG payPAST money

    Through signing Form A, but unfortunately while he was making the payment,

    sai   a-yi   reversing transaction din.

    PART   PART-do   DEF.

    they would be reversing the transaction.

V.   *Da ya   yi sai a-yi* reversing transaction *din   wai saboda anje can wuri-n*

As 3SG do PART PART-do   CMPL PART because went DEIC wuri-DEF.

Each time he tried, the transaction was reversed simply because

bidding *a*   *can* CBN amman still *ba'a yi* succeeding *ba*.

             PART DEIC   but   NEG. do   NEG.

the bidding was still not successful

W.   So each time *aka*   *yi* bidding *aka*   *dawo in ba'a yi* succeeding *ba*,

                          NEUTR. do   NEUTR. return if NEG. do   NEG.

So each time the bidding was not successful, the money would return to the payer.

X.   S2: Okay. Okay, *mutum zai   iya   cika wanna-n abun* anywhere in the world?

                    GEN.   FUT can fill   that-DEF. PART

Okay. Okay, does that means one can fill in the form from anywhere in the world?

Y.   S5: Yeah. Yeah, you can do it.

Z.   You can fill in your Form A *ka   aika   masu*. *Daga can* they will process the payment

                          2SG send 3PL   from thereDEIC.

You can fill in your Form A and send it to them. They will process the payment there

and then they charge you exchange rate *din   da   ake   chaji   na* Nigeria.

                                        CMPL PART. NEUTR   charge for

and then they charge you at the official exchange rate for Nigeria.

AA. S2: Okay. I thought *sai   na   koma   can.*

                        until 1SG return thereDEIC.

Okay. I thought I have to return there to do it.

BB. S5: Normal official exchange rate.

CC. S2: Okay, *to,* this is interesting. *Na   dauka   sai   ka   sake komawa can*

    PART   1SG thought PART 2SG again return   thereDEIC.

    Okay, this is interesting. I thought you would need to return back there

Za   ka   iya   wannan abun.

PART 2SG can that   CMPL.

before you can do all this.

DD.S5: *Ina.   Ba   sai   ka   koma ba.* Only fill in the form and scan it and send it to them.

PART NEG. PART 2MSG return NEG.

No. You don't need to go back. Only fill in the form and scan it and send it to them.

Daga   can   su   kuma they will get back to you.

from   thereDEIC 3PL   PART.

from there they will get back to you.

EE. S2: To CBN or to…?

FF. S5: To your bank. *Su   kuma* your bank will take it to Central Bank.

                3PL PART.

To your bank. Then from your bank they take it to Central Bank.

5.

A.   S6: Except with the falling oil prices and everything because

companies *ba   su   dauka-n   mutane sosai yanzu.*

          NEG. 3PL   carry-DEF. people   a lot now

Except with the falling oil prices and everything because companies no longer

employ people regularly.

B.   But you can go into other aspects, because *Baba   ya   ce   wai* if I want to do

                                     Father 3SG. said PART.

masters I can do masters, so I was thinking of doing it with business so that I can

widen my prospects.

But you can go into other aspects, because father said if I want to do masters I can do

masters, so I was thinking of doing it with business so that I can widen my prospects.

C.   Because *wata* she graduated last year. No, she graduated when I was in first year

          DET.

and she stayed back looking for jobs.

Because, one lady graduated last year. No, she graduated when I was in first year

and she stayed back looking for jobs.

D.   She spent like an entire year looking for jobs *ba-ta   samu ba.*

                                  NEG-3SG-F get   NEG.

 She spent like an entire year looking for jobs but she didn't get any.

E.   And then every time she would apply, she would get to the last stage before

they would say "no".

F.   One time she went there *su ka   ce   mata, ido-da- ido*

                       3PL PART say-PAST 3SG   eye-to-eye.

One time she went there and they told her face to face,

Su ka   ce   mata, "we can't take you".

3PL PART say-PAST 3SG

they told her, "we can't take you".

G.   I started my internship in Port Harcourt and then *na   zauna   wuri-n* for *wata   daya.*

                                                      1SG stayed DEIC-DEF   month one

I started my internship in Port Harcourt and then stayed there for one month.

H.   *Amman kuma ya   kamata da   sati   biyu ake yi   akan* field *a dawo gida;*

But   PART PART supposed PART week two PART bePAST on   return home

But it was supposed to be only two weeks on the field and then return back home;

    Sati biyu in*, sati biyu* out*.*

week two   week two

two weeks in, two weeks out*.*

I.   *Amman da   na-je   domin an   riga an   ba-ni* for one month,

But   when 1SG-go-PAST because-of already give-1SG

But when I got there I was already listed for one month,

    so *na   zauna   a* camp *din* for one month.

    1SG   stayed   in   DEF.

so I stayed in the camp for one whole month.

J.   *Kuma* you had to work every day, so no Saturday, no Sunday.

    And

And you had to work every day, so no Saturday, no Sunday.

K.   So it was Monday to Sunday, so I ended up working thirty one days straight.

L.   S8: Hmm.

M. S6: Which was very… unlike the twentieth day I was so tired. I was like sleeping…

6.

A.   S8: I bank with GTB *kuma* I bank with Zenith.

                              and

       I bank with GTB and I bank with Zenith.

B.   *Amman dai   inda   ake   turo man kudi   daga makaranta*

         but   PART where PART   send GEN. money from school

         But I receive my allowances from the school

         a account *dina ne   na*   Zenith Bank.

         in   my   COP PART

         through my Zenith Bank account.

C.   S3: Okay.

D.   S8: *Sannan   ni   ma* I came on TETFund (scholarship).

           And   1SG also

           And I also came on TETFund (scholarship).

E.   S3: Eh.

           Yes.

F.   S8: *Daman tun kafin   in   zo   na yi* applying *a   bani* CAS statement

           Already since before PART come   1SG do   PART.   give

           as a sponsored student.

Before I came, I already applied for CAS statement as a sponsored student.

G. S3: Okay.

H. S8: So *su   kuma   abunda su   ke   yi nan   idan ka   zo* as a sponsored student
        3PL PART.   what   3PL CMPL do hereDEIC if   2SG come
    So what they do here is, when you come as a sponsored student,

    ba   ka   biya-n   kudi-n CAS, one thousand pounds *da   ake   biya.*
    NEG. 2SG pay-DEF. Kudi-DEF.   CMPL. PART. pay
    you don't need to pay the one thousand pounds before getting CAS statement.

I. *Sai   in   ka zo   a-yi   ma-ka*   registration, then they will send the invoice*,*
    Until when 2SG come PART-do PART-2SG
    You will be registered when you come*,* then they will send the invoice

    to your sponsor *ka   gane*.
                   2SG understand.
    to your sponsor*,* you understand.

J. *Su   kuma   daga can*   they process your payment.
    3PL   PART.   from thereDEIC.
    From there they process your payment.

K. *Su   can* my friends *da   ke* Cardiff,   *kowa daki daya daya gareshi.*
    3PL thereDEIC.   CMPL PART   all   room one   one PART
    My friends in Cardiff, have one room each

L. *Amman abunda su   ke   biya* every month *da   su   ka   yi*

But   what   3PL PART pay   when 3PL CMPL do

But what they pay at the end of every month after they

dividing *din* total sum *din*   *kudi-n…*
               DEF.   DEF. money-DEF.

divided the total sum of the money…

M. S3: *Eh.*

Yes.

N. S8: *Su   na   biya-n* five hundred and seventy five (pound sterling).
    3PL PART   pay-DEF.

They pay five hundred and seventy five (pound sterling).

O. S3: *Da a-ce*   GT Bank *a-nan*   *din   za-su*   *iya* processing *min.*
    If   PART-say   PART-here DEF. PART-3PL can   GEN.
    Had it been GT Bank can process my payment here*…*

P. S8: The best thing *yanzu ka   bincika idan akwai* GTB *a* London.
                      now   2SG inquire if   thereEXST.
    The best thing to do now is to inquire if there is GTB in London.

Q. S3: *Eh, i-na   ganin   su-na   da   shi. Su-na   da* branch *a* London.
    Yes, 1SG-PART see-DEF 3PL-PART. POSS. it. 3PL-PART. POSS.   in
    Yes, I think they have it. They have a branch in London.

R. *Yau   dai na yi magana   da mahaifi-na a   can,   cewa   ya yi*
    today PART 1SG do   speakPAST   with father-DEF PART thereDEIC. sayPROG. 3SG do
    Today I spoke with my father back home that he should

contacting *din   banki-n   shi in   za-su   iya* processing *din*

               DEF. bank-DEF. GEN if   PART.3PL can   DEF.

contact his bank if they can process the

payment *din* through his bank.

         DEF.

payment through his own bank.

S.   Then *sai   in   tura ma-shi   kudi-n   sai   ya   yi* processing.

           then PART send PART-GEN money-DEF then 3SG   do

       Then I send him the money to do the process.

T.   *Saboda   su-n   fara,   da   su ka   yi na   farko ya tafi   a* official rate.

       because   3PL-DEF. startPAST, when 3PL PART. do PART first   it goPAST PART.

       Because they tried it, the first one they did was at the official rate.

U.   *Akwai   dan kari   kadan.*

       thereEXST PART increase little

       There was little increase.

V. S8: Okay.

W. S3: *Don   lokaci-n* pound was 30… something, I think 8 *ne* or something like that.

        because time-DEF.   COP

         because that time pound was 30… something, I think it was 8 or something like that.

X.   *Kuma ni   sun   caje   ni   akan kamar* 314 (Naira) *haka.*

       And   1SG 3PL-DEF. chargePAST 1SG PART like

And they charged me like 314 (Naira).

Y.   S8*: Eh, wanna   da   sauki.*

Yes, thatDEIC PART. easy.

Yes, that is easier*.*