

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIO-PRAGMATIC MOTIVATIONS FOR
CODE-SWITCHING IN RWANDA**

by

HELI HABYARIMANA

submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the subject

SOCIOLINGUISTICS

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROF L A BARNES

CO-SUPERVISOR: PROF NTAKIRUTIMANA EVARISTE

SEPTEMBER 2017

DECLARATION

Student Number: 4194-153-5

I declare that **An analysis of the socio-pragmatic motivations for code-switching in Rwanda** is my own work. All the sources that have been used and quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.



Heli Habyarimana

28 August 2017

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed to the ultimate completion of this dissertation in different ways. However, a few of them deserve special mention.

I am grateful to my supervisor Prof. Lawrie Barnes for his invaluable guidance, insightful remarks, and distinct on-going expertise throughout this research journey. He patiently guided me and his wonderful comments provided solid ground on which this dissertation was founded and developed.

My sincere gratitude goes to my co-supervisor Prof. Ntakirutimana Evariste for his constructive suggestions. Under his tutelage, I have had the opportunity to know many things about the research on code-switching in Rwanda. I also acknowledge Mariette Harcombe for technical support including scanning and transmitting to me reviews of the dissertation.

Many thanks go to my respondents including Customer Care Officers, Public Relations Officers, Receptionists and Secretaries in different public and private institutions, as well as students of the University of Kibungo, who willingly participated in this study. This research could not have come to fruition without their contribution during the data collection process.

I owe so much to my wife Dévothe and our sons Devin and David for their love, support, encouragement and patience. They really gave me hope in my moments of despondency throughout this research.

Finally, to all people who contributed to the completion of this dissertation in one way or another, I say “Thank you”.

Heli Habyarimana

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my loving wife Dévothe and our sons Devin and David for prayers, patience and support throughout the research period.

ABSTRACT

The study examines the social motivations that prompt the Rwandan bilingual speakers to code-switch from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili in their casual conversations about real-life situations. Methodological techniques used for data collection are ethnographic non-participant observation, oral interviews, focus group discussions and shorthand notes techniques. Examples were examined and interpreted within Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model as the main theoretical framework for the study. The research findings align with Myers-Scotton's categories such as the sequential unmarked choice, code-switching itself as the unmarked choice, the marked choice and the exploratory choice respectively. The main social factors that influence code-switching among the Rwandan bilingual speakers were identified as signalling educated status, expressing different social identities, demonstrating measures of power, authority and prestige, narrowing or widening social distance, and maintaining relationships. These results support the hypothesis that code-switching is a strategy to maximise social benefits from the interlocutors in conversation.

Key words: Code-switching, English, French, Kinyarwanda, Kiswahili, Markedness Model, social motivations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	ix

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Overview of the sociolinguistic situation of Rwanda.....	2
1.2.1 Linguistic ecology of Rwanda	2
1.2.2 Historical background of the languages of Rwanda	5
1.2.3 Socio-economic factors linked with the sociolinguistic situation after 1994	9
1.3 Statement of the problem	11
1.4 The aim of the study	12
1.5 Research questions	12
1.6 Scope and limitations of the dissertation	13
1.7 Structure of the study	13

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 Definition of code-switching	15
2.3 Approaches to code-switching studies	17
2.3.1 Structural approaches.....	18
2.3.2 Socio-pragmatic approaches.....	21
2.4 Discussion of the Markedness Model for code-switching	23
2.4.1 Some principal notions	24
2.4.2 Maxims and types	26

2.5 Criticisms of the Markedness Model	28
2.6 Motivation for the selection of the Markedness Model.....	29
2.7 The status of code-switching research in Rwanda.....	30
2.8 Conclusion.....	36

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 Research type.....	37
3.3 Research setting and participants.....	38
3.4 Data collection methods	40
3.4.1 Ethnographic non-participant observation.....	40
3.4.2 Interviews.....	41
3.4.3 Focus group discussions.....	42
3.4.4 Shorthand notes technique	43
3.5 Data analysis methods	44
3.6 Ethical and quality considerations	45
3.7 Challenges faced during the field research.....	46
3.8 Conclusion.....	47

CHAPTER FOUR: SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING IN RWANDA

4.1 Introduction	48
4.2 Categories of code-switching among Rwandan bilingual speakers.....	50
4.2.1 Code-switching as the sequential unmarked choice	50
4.2.2 Code-switching itself as the unmarked choice	51
4.2.3 Code-switching as the marked choice	52
4.2.4 Code-switching as the exploratory choice	53
4.3 Analysis of socio-pragmatic motivations according to topics.....	55
4.3.1 Code-switching as an educated status marker	55
4.3.2 Code-switching and identity	59
4.3.3 Code-switching and authority, power or prestige	69
4.3.4 Code-switching and social distance	74
4.3.5 Code-switching and relationship maintenance	80

4.4 Conclusion	86
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION	
5.1 Introduction	87
5.2 Main findings of the study	87
5.3 Discussion of results.....	89
5.4 Impact of the study on sociolinguistic research	91
5.5 Recommendations for future research.....	92
5.6 Conclusion.....	93
REFERENCES	94
APPENDIX 1.....	103
APPENDIX 2.....	104
APPENDIX 4.....	112

LIST OF TABLES

4.1 Font styles used to represent code-switching to specific languages.....	49
4.2 Other conventions used in the examples.....	50

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CL	Noun class
DAO	Dossier d’Appel d’Offre [Call for tender]
EAC	East African Community
EL	Embedded Language
ID	Identity
MCA	Membership Categorisation Analytic
MINADEF	Ministry of Defence
MINEAC	Ministry of East African Community
MINEDUC	Ministry of Education
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MINICAAF	Ministry of Cabinet Affairs
ML	Matrix Language
MLF	Matrix Language Frame
MOP	Morpheme Order Principle
OCM	Original Constraints Model
PSF	Private Sector Federation
RAMA	La Rwandaise d’Assurance Maladie [Rwanda Medical Insurance Scheme]
RCA	Rwanda Cooperative Agency
RDB	Rwanda Development Board
RGB	Rwanda Governance Board
SMP	System Morpheme Principle
UNDP	United Nations Development Program

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Language choice is commonplace in many speech communities and its effects are seen in different parts of the world. Mesthrie et al. (2000, 148) explain that the language varieties “constitute a resource that may be drawn on” by the speakers for interaction with one another. This language choice is associated with certain contexts and purposes (Fishman, 1972). Wardhaugh (1986, 86) adds that code choice is an obligation that no speaker can avoid. In this regard, speakers choose an appropriate code influenced by some factors and these factors are specific to a particular occasion.

Linguistic phenomena resulting from that language choice are amongst others multilingualism and code-switching. Multilingualism involves the use of more than one language. In her analysis of multilingualism in Africa, Myers-Scotton (1993b, 36) maintains that the most common pattern of bilingualism is the use of “the speaker’s own mother tongue plus an indigenous lingua franca, or an alien official language”. Auer (1984, 1) further posits that a population which speaks at least two languages is likely to code-switch.

This study explores the choice of codes that is observed amongst Rwandan bilingual speakers who switch from Kinyarwanda to exoglossic languages, namely, English, French and Kiswahili. The research is guided by the Myers-Scotton’s (1993b) Markedness Model in its explanation of social motivations for code-switching. For the sake of a broader background, a brief overview of the general structural aspects of the codeswitches is also included, within the framework of the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model as posited by Myers-Scotton (1993a). The research is also inspired by other code-switching studies carried out in Africa, specifically the socio-pragmatic and structural analysis of code-switching among the Logoli speech community of Kangemi, Nairobi, Kenya done by Jescah Khadi Gimode in 2015.

The first chapter of the study focuses on the background aspects of the study which include the linguistic ecology of Rwanda, a brief historical background of the languages and subsequent language policies, and the socio-economic factors that have shaped the current sociolinguistic situation. It also states the problem under study, specifies the aim, states research questions, and sets the boundaries of the research.

Current sociolinguistic studies have been opposed to the Chomskyeen conception, which, according to Mesthrie et al. (2000, 4) takes language as an idealized and abstract entity which is unaffected by contexts in which it is spoken, and which serves limited ends. Rather, the interest is in “language use within human societies” and under a variety of social circumstances. Code-switching in Rwanda is therefore explained in reference to social and contextual forces that influence the formation of that linguistic phenomenon.

1.2 Overview of the sociolinguistic situation of Rwanda

1.2.1 Linguistic ecology of Rwanda

Rwanda is geographically located in Central Africa considered as a part of the large Bantu area. The linguistic map of Rwanda shows multiple languages and dialects spoken within the country and with different statuses. Kinyarwanda is the first language and mother tongue of most Rwandans. It is also the national and official language. Data from the Rwanda’s 2002 National Population Census stated that Kinyarwanda was the mother tongue of 99.4% of the population (MINECOFIN, 2005). According to the online Ethnologue (2016), the top down genealogical classification of Kinyarwanda is “Niger-Congo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu, Central, J, Ruanda-Rundi (D.61)”. This classification confers on Kinyarwanda a number of linguistic patterns commonly shared with other Bantu languages. According to Guthrie (1948, 11-12), languages of the Bantu family share a number of criteria such as common roots vocabulary, grammatical gender, and agglutinative affixes attached to invariable radicals to generate other words.

Kinyarwanda has a number of dialects used by individuals or groups in different parts of the country. According to Niyibizi (2014, 7), the main dialects spoken in Rwanda are, namely,

Ikinyanduga in the central and southern parts, *Kigoyi* and *Kirera* spoken in the northern part of Rwanda, *Oluciga* or *Igihima* in areas bordering with Uganda in the Northern Province, *Igihavu* or *Amahavu* spoken near the border with the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) along Kivu lake in the Western Province, *Amashi* also spoken in some areas bordering with the Democratic Republic of Congo in the Western Province, and *Ikirashi* or *Urunyambo* spoken in areas bordering with Tanzania in the Eastern Province of Rwanda.

Other languages spoken in Rwanda include, on the one hand, some local African languages that coexist with Kinyarwanda. These are respectively Kiswahili considered as the language with the largest number of speakers among the Bantu languages, *Ikirundi* spoken by people originating from or living near the border of Burundi in the Southern Province of Rwanda, and *Lingala* as well as *Luganda* brought in by the repatriation of Rwandan refugees from neighbouring countries (Uganda and Democratic Republic of Congo). The languages are used by individual families or groups especially in urban areas. On the other hand, two ex-colonial languages, namely French and English share the status of official languages but with unequal weight. According to Niyomugabo (2015), French was first introduced in Rwanda in 1900 by the Catholic Missionaries and then English came in 1963 as a subject taught in secondary schools. More details about these two exoglossic languages are given in the Section 1.2.2 below.

Rwanda, like other countries in the zone, is a multilingual country. This is supported by Nurse (2006, 679) who points out that many individuals in the Bantu zone are multilingual because of a variety of causes including but not limited to colonisation, education, trade and movements of people. More specifically, the Rwandan linguistic situation is described as a restricted type of multilingualism. With reference to Baker's (2006) definitions, Niyibizi (2014, 5) emphasises that the term restricted bilingualism means that "several languages coexist in Rwanda but very few Rwandan citizens master more than one". The figures from the 2012 National Population Census specify that more or less 10% of the Rwandan population may speak at least two languages (MINECOFIN 2014, 46).

In addition, Rwanda is a multilingual but essentially endoglossic country. According to Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 193), Kinyarwanda is spoken as a home language by 99.4% of

the population. Data from the 2012 National Population Census as published by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning-MINECOFIN (2014, 45-49) has revealed that English, French and Kiswahili are spoken as second languages by 14.7%, 11.4% and 3.7% of the Rwandan population respectively. Moreover, 6% of the population are trilingual in Kinyarwanda, English and French.

Furthermore, the Rwandan multilingualism is linked with a diglossic situation. According to Ferguson's (1959) definition as reported by Niyibizi (2014, 5), diglossia is a situation where "a highly codified variety is superposed to the primary dialects of the language and both coexist side to side in a society or within a particular geographical area". The high variety is labelled as "H" and the low variety as "L" respectively. Other scholars like Fishman (1967) extended the concept of diglossia to various situations found in many societies, but the study has limited itself to its generic formulation.

In fact, the Rwanda's diglossia is viewed at two different levels. The first level is between Kinyarwanda and the other official languages, namely, English and French. According to Niyomugabo (2008, 4), the latter are considered as 'High varieties' while the former is taken as a 'Lower variety'. He further notes that, from 2009 onward, the level of Rwanda's diglossia tends to be predominantly between English (high variety) and Kinyarwanda (lower variety) while French has been losing ground. The second level is explained by Niyibizi (2014, 6) as endocentric diglossia, which involves the standard Kinyarwanda considered as the 'higher variety' and its regiolects and sociolects like *Kigoyi* and *Kirera* spoken in the Northern part of Rwanda taken as 'lower varieties'. The standard Kinyarwanda is regarded by Niyomugabo (2008, 39) as the variety initially spoken in the central part of Rwanda, and it was standardized by the government for the whole territory of Rwanda.

Currently, there are four official languages in Rwanda: Kinyarwanda, French, English and Kiswahili. Kinyarwanda has an added value as the national language and the mother tongue of the majority of the population. The two ex-colonial languages, namely English and French, are also used in education as the medium of instruction for the first and the taught subject for the

second. As for Kiswahili, it acquired the status of official language in 2016 in addition to its use in education and business from long ago.

It suffices to point out that the use of languages in Rwanda is dictated by both the macro policy and micro policies. According to Baldauf (2006, 155), the macro language policy is recognised as the official language policy prescribed in official texts and micro policies refer to situations where local speakers “create what can be recognised as a language policy (...) as a response to their own needs and their own language problems”. The Rwandan Constitution (2003) is silent about how the four languages should actually be used on the ground. Gafaranga et al. (2013, 14) see this as a challenge, especially to the exoglossic languages and their status of official languages. Indeed, Kinyarwanda has the upper hand everywhere as both the official and national language; which makes it “the default choice” for most speakers and in different situations. On the other hand, the remaining official languages experience a certain inequality in their use.

1.2.2 Historical background of the languages of Rwanda

Looking at the dynamics of the languages (Kinyarwanda, English, French and Kiswahili) in the history of Rwanda, four important periods may be highlighted. These are (1) the pre-colonial period, (2) the colonial period, (3) the post-colonial period and (4) the post-genocide period respectively.

1.2.2.1 Pre-colonial period

The pre-colonial period coincides with the times from the earliest days up to the arrival of German colonizers in 1898. Rwanda was a linguistically homogeneous country with Kinyarwanda as the sole medium of communication among Rwandans and the language of administration (Kabanza, 2003, Mutwarasibo, 2003, Niyomugabo, 2008, Niyibizi, 2014). Since the written code was not introduced in Rwanda yet, Kinyarwanda was maintained through orality. According to Niyibizi (2014, 14), effective means of maintaining and enriching oral texts were namely “pastoral poetry, warrior poetry, exoteric dynastic code, myths, tales, fables and legends” kept by well-trained, institutionalised and specialised memorialists, poets and keepers of the exoteric code. The transcription of those oral texts was done later in the 1940s by some Rwandans who studied in the colonisers’ schools and universities overseas.

1.2.2.2 Colonial period

The colonisation of Rwanda can be divided into two phases, namely, the German period between 1898 and 1916 and then the Belgian period between 1916 and 1962. The German colonizers introduced Kiswahili and German. According to Niyibizi (2014, 15), Kiswahili was taken as the official language for European administration in German East African colonies. German was taught at school as a subject. As for Kinyarwanda, it moved from orality to writing between 1898 and 1916. Niyibizi (ibid) states that “the first written literature in Rwanda was purely religious”. This was motivated by the interest of the religious leaders for evangelism in the indigenous language.

The second colonial phase began when the Belgians took over the colony from the Germans in 1916. They introduced French as a new official language. According to Mutwarasibo (2003, 25), “French became the official language of government, law, civil service, army, education and international relations”. It coexisted with Kinyarwanda as a language of wider communication between Rwandans and a subject taught at school. German disappeared as the German colonisers had already been evicted from the country and the region, and Kiswahili underwent a negative transformation to the extent that it was no longer regarded as an important language of communication in Rwanda.

It is worth mentioning that French was highly promoted by the Belgian colonisers in collaboration with the Roman Catholic missionaries. Their education system aimed at training a small elitist group to serve later in the colonial administration. French was thus taken as a prestigious language likely to open the world to the speakers and to confer them a high social status. According to Ntakirutimana (2010, 21), these French bilingual Rwandans were called *évolués* (advanced people), on the one hand, and *clergé indigène* (indigenous clerical), on the other hand. The first group was composed of educated people employed as administrators in the Belgian regime. As for the second group, it was made of Rwandan clerics recruited by the Roman Catholic missionaries. This influenced people’s attitudes to the extent that everyone with a minimum proficiency in French was seen as highly valued compared to their co-citizens.

1.2.2.3 Post-colonial period

In the post-colonial period, after Rwanda's independence in 1962, French and Kinyarwanda were maintained by the Constitution (1962) as official languages and Kinyarwanda had a specific status as the national language. English was introduced in Rwanda in 1963. According to Niyibizi (2014, 14), "it was given a lower status" and it was taught as a subject only in secondary and higher education. This was the same for Kiswahili which remained only as a subject taught in some secondary schools and the university.

Moreover, the Rwandan post-colonial administration maintained the status of French as the language of instruction. This significantly boosted its prestige especially because of the subsequent high status allocated to a handful of educated people who were serving in administration and other white collar jobs. Ntakirutimana (2010, 23) notes that, in the 1990s, the value of French was accelerated by the enthusiasm to learn French as an international language giving access to scholarships especially in France, Switzerland and Canada.

1.2.2.4 Post-genocide period

The fourth phase is the post-genocide period from 1994 to date. Samuelson and Freedman (2010) explain that, after the triumph of the Rwandese Patriotic Front (RPF) and the end of genocide in 1994, the linguistic situation of Rwanda changed, especially with the repatriation of Rwandans from neighbouring countries. English was declared an official language in 1996, alongside Kinyarwanda and French. Later on in 2008, English was allocated the status of the language of instruction to the detriment of French. According to Niyomugabo (2015), currently French enjoys the prestigious status inherited from colonisation but it remains poorly accessible to the majority of Rwandans. As for Kiswahili, it has acquired the status of the fourth official language through the Organic Law passed by the Cabinet decision of October 12th, 2016. At the same time, it is the official language of the East African Community (EAC) and the African Union (AU) of which Rwanda is a member.

The rise of English in Rwanda is definitely a result of the aftermath of the 1994 genocide. The rapid shift from French to English was described by Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 192) as "a major factor in the success of Rwanda's post-genocide social, educational and economic

reforms”. In fact, English has been perceived as the language of the Rwandan elite, many of whom learned it during exile in Anglophone countries. This is associated with the socio-political context of the country after the war of Liberation of 1990. Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 197) maintain that English has been viewed as “a neutral language which may promote in group affiliation” and likely to help Rwandans to get rid of their historical divisions.

In education, Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 203) explain that the addition of English as an official language has been taken as “an important step towards greater opportunities for educational advancement.” This is linked to the popularity of English connected with the current trend of globalization headed by English-speaking countries and the educational opportunities that they offer. Therefore, Rwandans attribute the adoption of English as a way of integrating into global education. Besides, Haydon and Pinon (2010, 65) point out that the Government investment in English-led education is motivated by the “aim to create a high tech, knowledge-based future for the country” which will increase individuals’ employability.

As far as economic and political integration is concerned, Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 211) report that the adoption of English is “a key to economic development, business opportunities and knowledge transfer”. In the same vein, Steflja (2012) emphasises the adoption of English for the effective country integration into the East African Community and other economic relations tied with English speaking countries. Consequently, Sinclair and Kramer (2012, 7) characterise English as “a stepping-stone to trade and investment” between Rwanda and the English speaking world. Diplomatically speaking, McGreal (2008) views this political shift to English as a drive to reposition Rwanda in the English speaking world starting from the East African Community to the United States of America and the United Kingdom.

In a nutshell, the pre-colonial period was characterised by Kinyarwanda monolingualism. The German colony from 1899 to 1916 was characterised by a trilingual situation of Kiswahili as an official language, German as a taught subject and Kinyarwanda for mass communication. The Belgian colony from 1916 established the bilingual policy of French and Kinyarwanda. The post-colonial period from 1962 to 1993 was dominated by the bilingual policy of Kinyarwanda and French. Rwanda adopted the trilingual policy of English, Kinyarwanda and French during the

period from 1994 to 2016. Lastly, the quadrilingual policy of Kinyarwanda, English, French and Kiswahili as official languages was recently enforced from October 2016.

1.2.3 Socio-economic factors linked with the sociolinguistic situation after 1994

The post-genocide period has marked a significant change in all domains of life for the country in general. The current research may not ignore the socio-economic, historical and political factors especially because they have a closer link with the sociolinguistic situation of the country. This is the reason why it has been judged worth giving a brief overview of a number of factors that have contributed to the current usage of the languages involved in the study.

As stated above in Section 1.2.2, after the liberation war of 1994, Rwandans who had fled the country in 1959 and 1973 returned home from neighbouring countries. It is worth informing that those years were characterised by severe ethnic hatred, which expelled a part of the *Tutsi* ethnic group. The repatriation has brought with it a multiplicity of international and/or local languages to the country. Those expatriates had to adjust to using Kinyarwanda and French, and, according to Niyibizi (2014, 19), some of them “concentrated first of all on learning Kinyarwanda, which is the language of wider communication among Rwandan citizens”. As a result, the linguistic situation of Rwanda has been diversified by adding some languages and changing the status of others. This has contributed to the enrichment of multilingualism in the country.

The second factor that has shaped the sociolinguistic situation of Rwanda is the political and economic integration either regionally or globally. According to MINEAC (2012, 14), integration has been seen as “a key tool for Rwanda’s development and one of the pillars of the national long-term development strategy” known as Vision 2020. It is in this respect that the country has minimized barriers of all kinds in order to pursue an open, liberal and international trade regime and to encourage direct exoglossic investment. The reports of the Rwanda Development Board (2016) confirm that the regional integration process is at a high pitch at the moment, and it constitutes one of the major factors towards constructing a powerful and sustainable economic and political bloc.

The linguistic capital is among the enablers of the integration. This is emphasised by Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 203) who consider languages as “a valuable commodity” in the regional and global market and “a key to economic development, business opportunities, and knowledge transfer” (ibid, 211). That is where regional or international languages like English, French and Kiswahili play a significant role in connecting people from diverse backgrounds.

The third factor closely linked with the previous one is the free movement of goods and people. This is another stage of the regional and global integration process. According to MINEAC reports (2012), the East African Community (EAC) of which Rwanda is a partner state and the ‘Common Market’ entered into an agreement in 2010 to serve the purpose of making the region more productive and prosperous. Indeed, the treaty includes the right to free movement of persons, which entails the abolition of any discrimination based on nationality. Foreigners and citizens of member states are therefore guaranteed the same protection by every state as for their own citizens. The freedom extends to the free movement of goods, labour and services; and by implication, to the linguistic and cultural capital.

The fourth factor is education. The UNDP report (2006, 8) states that “the Government of Rwanda considers education critical for achieving sustainable economic growth and development”. This justifies the reason why more efforts have been put into educating and training people at all levels; primary, secondary and tertiary. The same report states that Rwanda would like to achieve universal adult literacy by 2020, and one of the mechanisms to achieve it is the provision of free mandatory primary education for all children. In fact, Rwandans have understood the importance of education as vital capital in the current era of development. Thus, being illiterate is no longer tolerable in the Rwandan society. Figures from the Fourth Population and Housing Census of 2012 as published by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN) (2014) showed that 68% of Rwandan population aged 15 years and above were literate. A person qualified as literate is able to read, write and understand at least one language.

Despite the multiple origins of Rwandans and the free movement of citizens of the region, the post-genocide period has been characterised by the fostering of unity, mutual accommodation and the transcendence of ethnicity to the benefit of nationalism. This promotion of unity and

reconciliation of Rwandans has been a major concern at all levels of the country's life. Fawcett (2011, 106) describes this post-genocide endeavour as leading to "the symbolism of nationhood". This has been possible through inculcating among Rwandans the "increased feeling of connection to their fellow nationals" (Fawcett 2011, 111). Exoglossic languages (English and French) have been described by Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 199) as "neutral in contrast to indigenous languages". Therefore, they are considered as one of the triggers of that sense of connection despite as yet, having been mastered by only a small number of Rwandans.

1.3 Statement of the problem

The Rwandan speech community, like many others in Africa, uses multiple languages in communication because of various socio-historico-economic factors including colonisation, urbanisation, migration, free movement of people, and modernity amongst others. Commenting on this type of situation, Hurtado (2002, 6) argues that "in a heterogeneous speech community, speakers interact using speech varieties drawn from a repertoire of choices [and] these choices are not random; rather they are shaped by factors which come from the communicative system of the community itself". The current linguistic situation of Rwanda is complex as four official languages namely Kinyarwanda, English, French and Kiswahili are recognised according to the declared macro language policy.

Nevertheless, the language choice among Rwandan speakers follows certain micro language policies, which, according to Gafaranga et al. (2013, 1), direct the language use as "a response to their own needs" in real life situations. The reality on the ground influences the implementation of the macro language policy enacted in official texts depending on the speakers' intention to make their communication as socially efficient and purposeful as possible. From the available language repertoire, the Rwandan speech community has gradually developed language contact phenomena such as multilingualism, diglossia and code-switching amongst others.

The study concentrates on code-switching and strives to demonstrate that its manifestation is motivated by a number of social factors and that code choices are deliberately made by the Rwanda speakers. The study is based on data collected from the interactions of Rwandan bilingual speakers in Kigali, the capital city of Rwanda.

1.4 The aim of the study

The main aim of this study is to examine the phenomenon of code-switching in Rwanda. It investigates the social motivations for code-switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and Kiswahili by the Rwandan bilingual speakers when they interact with one another in an urban setting.

The study also aims to apply Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model to the interpretation of code-switching data collected from the Rwandan bilingual speakers in Kigali, the capital city of Rwanda. The same theory was successfully used by Gimode (2015) in her study of socio-pragmatic and structural analysis of code-switching among the Logoli speech community of Kangemi, Nairobi, Kenya. The data comprise speech variations which involve switches from Kinyarwanda to three exoglossic languages, namely, English, French and Kiswahili collected in institutional settings.

The study further aims to add to the understanding of the language dynamics in a community which adjusts its language behaviours in response to the speakers' expressed needs. Finally, the research aims to encourage on-going investigations on the language use and situations in Rwanda, especially because language is always affected by continuous transformations in the society.

1.5 Research questions

The main question underpinning this study is stated as follows:

- What are social motivations that influence Rwandan bilingual speakers to switch from Kinyarwanda to English, French and/or Kiswahili?

In order to properly examine the main research question, the following sub-questions were formulated:

- What are the social factors that prompt the Rwandan bilingual speakers to code-switch from Kinyarwanda to English, French and Kiswahili when they interact with fellow Rwandans?
- Does Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model adequately explain the social motivations for code-switching in Rwanda?

- How do the dynamics of the linguistic situation of Rwanda link with the socio-historical and economic transformations of the country?

1.6 Scope and limitations of the dissertation

The study is limited to Rwandan bilingual speakers in Kigali the capital city of Rwanda. The focus on Kigali City is motivated by its high prevalence of exoglossic languages and diversity of speakers. This has implications for the generation of rich data, which consequently allow in depth analysis of code-switching.

The research focuses on code-switching between four languages, namely Kinyarwanda, as the mother tongue, national and official language, and three exoglossic languages such as English, French and Kiswahili.

Finally, this study on Kinyarwanda-English, French and/or Kiswahili code-switching limits itself to the Markedness Model as the analytical framework. This approach was judged most suitable to the analysis of social motivations of code-switching among Rwandan bilingual speakers.

1.7 Structure of the study

This research is divided into five chapters. After this first chapter, Chapter 2 reviews the existing literature on code-switching with emphasis on its social motivations. It also identifies the adopted theoretical framework used to analyse data collected from the field namely; the Markedness Model. It then reviews code-switching research already done in Rwanda, and points out gaps that will be filled by the current study.

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used in undertaking the study. It highlights the qualitative approach including its major procedures and research tools used for data collection, analysis and interpretation of findings.

Chapter 4 is the core of the study since it analyses data, discusses and interprets the finding of the research. The analysis is mainly undertaken within the Markedness Model for the explanation of social aspects of Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching. A brief

explanation of the structural aspects used in the code-switching is added within the framework of the MLF Model for the purposes of clarifying the analysis and giving a broader background to the reader who is not familiar with Kinyarwanda.

Chapter 5 summarises and discusses the research findings. It also discusses the contribution of the study to the advancement of the code-switching research, and makes recommendations for further studies in the area.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The chapter presents an overall understanding of code-switching with a focus on definitions, main approaches to the study of this phenomenon and the analytical framework adopted for the current research. Myers-Scotton's (1993b) Markedness Model has been adopted as the main approach to explaining social motivations for switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and Kiswahili, while her (1993a) Matrix Language Framework (MLF) Model was adopted to examine the structure of switches, as made by Rwandan bilingual speakers.

The chapter also includes a brief review of code-switching research already done in Rwanda. It covers research activities carried out inside and outside the country, and serves as the background and justification for the study. It should be noticed that the current research focuses more on social motivations for code-switching than the structural theories which hold a supplementary position.

2. 2 Definition of code-switching

Code-switching studies emerged in the 1970s as a topic in sociolinguistics, and the concept has been defined in various ways. The current study is greatly inspired by Blom and Gumperz (1972), Fishman (1972), Kachru (1978), Poplack (1980) and Myers-Scotton (1993a and 1993b). The researchers' insights help to pave the way for the definition adopted for the investigation into the socio-pragmatic aspects of Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching.

Blom and Gumperz (1972) consider code-switching as a dynamic linguistic choice that is used to fulfil specific linguistic and social functions within a community. Kieswetter (1995, 10) reports that, from their study of code-switching between dialects with different social functions in a Norwegian fishing village, it was found that speakers "make linguistic choices according to the linguistic and social constraints of a particular society" To them, code-switching means a code choice motivated by linguistic and/or social constraints. These constraints may be a change in

situation or a change in the topic. On this basis they introduced the technical terms ‘situational switching’ for the first and ‘metaphorical switching’ for the second.

Kieswetter (1995, 11) cites Fishman (1972) who stated that, in code-switching, “different language varieties are associated with different domains or social situations and these reflect the different types of relationships and values that exist for a particular speech community”. He further supports Kachru’s (1978) definition of code-switching as “the complete switch of one language to another quite separate language, where the switch is determined by the situation, the participants and the function” (ibid, 12). Code-switching is not an accidental phenomenon, but rather a deliberate choice for well determined purposes. This is emphasised by the ‘sociolinguistic principle’ established by Hurtado (2002, 6) when he asserts that speech varieties that speakers chose and draw from their repertoire “are not random; rather, they are shaped by factors which come from the communicative system of the community itself”. Thus, speakers use code-switching with the aim of achieving specific goals.

Myers-Scotton (1993b, 132) emphasises social functions and defines code-switching as “negotiation regarding the rights and obligations balance between speakers”. This forms the basis of the Markedness Model discussed in Section 2.4. For her, code-switching offers linguistic opportunities in two languages and bilingual speakers select constituents from one and then integrate them in the other for specific socially motivated purposes.

Poplack’s (1980) definition of code-switching has a different focus from the preceding definitions. It is based on the integration of a language into the other language phonologically, morphologically and/or syntactically. Kieswetter (1995, 14) classifies “inter-sentential switching [that] occurs between sentences”, “intra-sentential switching” which involves grammatical constituents, and “emblematic or tag switching” which uses individual noun clauses, idiomatic expressions and interjections. The emphasis here is on the linguistic aspects of code-switching and techniques used to shape it. The definition, however, leaves behind the question of purpose for which the linguistic arrangements are made.

In the above definitions, three main components are taken into consideration when defining code-switching. These are the existence of two language varieties used by bilingual speakers, linguistic features, and reasons or motivations for switching. Therefore, the current study has adopted the definition of code-switching as the alternation of codes, namely Kinyarwanda and other languages like English, French and Kiswahili within one talking turn. The act is performed by Rwandan bilingual speakers among themselves, not randomly, but rather motivated by different linguistic and socially-related factors.

2.3 Approaches to code-switching studies

It is a daunting exercise to give a concise overview of the historical development of code-switching studies, because a large amount of research has been carried out in different parts of the world by various researchers. MacSwan (2004) proposes a synopsis of three main stages in the evolution of code-switching studies. The early research in code-switching was dominated by Blom and Gumperz in the 1960s and 1970s. Their target population was drawn from bidialectal communities. MacSwan (2004, 284) explains that, during that period, the data they analysed were made up of conversational events and the express purpose of their analysis was to outline “formal and informal functions dialect switching played in various social settings and events”. Dialects were thus the basis of code-switching studies.

The second stage of code-switching research focused the structural aspects and grammatical properties. MacSwan (2004, 285) states that eminent researchers like Timm (1975), Wentz and McClure (1976), Pfaff (1979) and Newmeyer (1986) maintained that code-switching is “rule-governed and not haphazard”. This prepared the way for contemporary linguistic analysis of code-switched utterances and conversations as described in the Section 2.3.1.

The third stage is characterised by the emergence of a variety of theoretical approaches to code-switching. MacSwan (2004, 296) specifies it as the period from Poplack (1980) to date where different proposals have been made with the purpose of “understanding the nature of bilingual code-switching”. Approaches that have dominated the period include Poplack’s (1980) Equivalence Constraint and the Free Morpheme Constraint, Myers-Scotton’s and colleagues’ (1993a) Matrix Language Frame Model and MacSwan’s (2005) Minimalist Approaches.

It is worth saying that there has been a sharp debate between proponents of the structural approaches of code-switching and their opponents who promote the sociolinguistic or socio-pragmatic approaches. On the one hand, scholars like Myers-Scotton (1990), Ramat (1995) and Alfonzetti (2005) emphasise the priority of the socio-pragmatic side over the structural side. In that way, code-switching is first “functionally motivated” and the structure is always influenced by those functional factors from outside the language system. On the other hand, researchers including Kootstra, Van Hell and Dijkstra (2009) deny the imbalance between the structural and the sociolinguistic sides of code-switching analyses, but rather advocate the interplay between the two.

2.3.1 Structural approaches

The structural approaches are concerned with the study of sentence structures and fragments involved in code-switching. Poplack’s (1980) Equivalence Constraint and Free Morpheme Constraint are reported by MacSwan (2004, 285) as follows: the former requires that, in code-switched utterances, the “word order of both languages is met at the surface structure”. The latter posits that “a switch may not occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical item unless the latter has been phonologically integrated into the language of the bound morpheme”. According to MacSwan (2004, 291), the two approaches have been criticised however because of their limited area of application.

Di Sciullo, Muysken and Singh (1986) introduced the Government Constraint, which, according to Belazi et al. (1994, 223), “disallows switching when a government relation holds between elements”. In fact, it does not permit a switch between verbs or prepositions and their complements. Later on, this approach was compromised by other research which shows that it is frequently violated. Among the opponents of the Government Constraint, there are Romaine (1995) who reveals the possibility of switching between V and its NP predicate in her Panjabi/English data and Myers-Scotton (1993a) who cites counter-examples in her Swahili/ English corpus.

Furthermore, the Minimalist Program was proposed by Chomsky (1995) as another perspective on analysing grammatical aspects of code-switching. Its underlying principle, as rephrased by

Gimode (2015, 57), is formulated as “switching is the union of two lexically encoded grammars with elements drawn from two or more lexicons”. Some scholars like MacSwan (2004) regard the Minimalist Program as a suitable model for studying code-switching.

Another significant structural approach is the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model which was developed by Myers-Scotton (1993a). It postulates that languages involved in code-switching are always in asymmetry and they have unequal roles to play in the realisation of utterances. The dominant language is designated as the Matrix Language (ML) also termed the base language/code or medium and the less dominant language is the Embedded Language (EL). Myers-Scotton (1993a, 36) predicts that “the matrix language defines the surface structure positions for content words and functional elements”. Thus, both language constituents and grammatical structures must follow the order and system prescribed by the dominant language rather than the embedded language except in cases of ‘EL islands’. Milroy and Muysken (1995, 237) posit that the ML is unmarked, easy for identification by participants in code-switching and with the highest frequency of morphemes among the involved languages.

Myers-Scotton (1993a, 77-78) identifies three different but interrelated types of constituents of code-switching data, namely, (i) the ML+EL constituents, (ii) the ML islands and (iii) the EL islands respectively. The first type consists of morphemes from both the ML and the EL. Then, both the ML islands and the EL islands are constituents consisting entirely of ML or EL morphemes, well-formed according to the ML or EL grammar and necessarily showing internal structural dependency relations. From the content and system morphemes, Myers-Scotton (1993a, 83) proposes two principles to identify the functioning of the ML in bilingual utterances. The first is the Morpheme Order Principle (MOP) where “morpheme order reflecting surface syntactic relations will be that of the ML”. The second is the System Morpheme Principle (SMP) which, according to Myers-Scotton (1993a, 98), postulates that “if system morphemes are required in ML+EL constituents to signal system relations, they will be ML system morphemes... [and] if there are EL system morphemes inflecting a stem, there also must be the ML version of the inflection”.

The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model contains a number of interrelated hypotheses which make predictions about the morphosyntactic frame adopted in code-switching. These are (i) the ML Hypothesis, (ii) the Blocking Hypothesis, (iii) the EL Island Trigger Hypothesis and (iv) the EL Implicational Hierarchy Hypothesis. Firstly, Myers-Scotton (1993a, 82) posits that the ML Hypothesis recommends total compliance with the morphosyntactic frame of the ML while constructing ML+EL constituents in code-switching. In other words, the surface word order and the syntactic relations of the ML govern the construction and the general structure of sentences.

Secondly, the Blocking Hypothesis corroborates the above ML Hypothesis in that, according to Myers-Scotton (1993a, 7), “the ML blocks the appearance of any EL content morphemes which do not meet certain congruency conditions with ML counterparts”. These congruence conditions are subcategorised in three levels, namely, grammatical category, thematic role assignment and pragmatic functions. Thirdly, the EL Island Trigger Hypothesis is explained by Myers-Scotton (1993a, 7) as the occurrence of an obligatory EL island where the constituent containing it “is not permitted either under the ML Hypothesis or the Blocking Hypothesis”. Finally, the EL Implicational Hierarchy Hypothesis is defined as optional EL islands which occur in the sentence in form of formulaic, idiomatic or peripheral constituents. Myers-Scotton (1993a, 7) notes that most of them are adverbial expressions or two-word expressions like ‘very fast’ or ‘next weekend’. This type of island occurs in extrasentential code-switching where a fully-fledged item is inserted in the matrix language.

The last structural approach is the 4-M Model, which was developed as a revision of the MLF Model, and taken as a model of morpheme classification. On the basis of the content-system opposition of the MLF Model, Myers-Scotton (2005, 20) posits that, apart from the content morphemes, system morphemes are categorised in three types namely; early system morphemes, bridge system morphemes and outsider system morphemes. Namba (2002, 4) specifies that early system morphemes “contribute to the mapping of the conceptual structure to the lemma” and they include determiners and some prepositions, while bridge system morphemes “integrate content morphemes into a larger constituent” like the example of possessive markers. As for the outsider system morphemes, they are “structurally assigned at the positional/surface level” and the examples are person, tense, or mood markers.

2.3.2 Socio-pragmatic approaches

The socio-pragmatic or sociolinguistic approaches are functional and they see social variables as factors that influence code-switching. They establish a compulsory relationship between language and society where code-switching serves social purposes. Among the socio-pragmatic approaches and paradigms already developed, this study briefly reviews Fishman's (1972) Allocation paradigm, Del Hymes' (1972) Interactional sociolinguistics, Blom and Gumperz's (1972) Situational and Metaphorical approaches, Auer's (1984, 1995, 1998) Conversational Approach and Myers-Scotton's (1993b) Markedness Model later recast in the Rational Choice Model.

In fact, the Allocation paradigm and the Interactional sociolinguistics are pioneer approaches developed to account for the relationship between social contexts and linguistic forms used. Fishman (1972, 437) explains that these relationship between language and social sets enable us to understand "who speaks what language, to whom and when" in a multilingual setting. For Hymes (1972), the social element is firmly grounded in the study of language, and any language choice should be looked at as a social phenomenon. The approaches however fall short when they promote a deterministic view of language and society and exclude the idea of choice. Myers-Scotton (1993b, 92) cautions that these approaches consider the speaker as "a passive participant and prisoner of the social sets". According to her (ibid), code choices are rather "modifiable or dynamic depending on the circumstances" where speakers are actors of their linguistic choices, and they have rights to operate a selection of codes in their conversation according to the social purposes pursued.

Blom and Gumperz (1972), within the conversational approach, introduced the situational and metaphorical approaches where parameters such as participant constellation, setting, topic, subject matter, and mode of interaction may allow speakers to predict their language choices. These were revealed through their study of code-switching between dialects in a Norwegian fishing village. According to Moodley (2003, 149, 151), the situational switching refers to the "co-occurrence of two (or more) interlocutors related to each other in a particular way, communicating about a particular topic, in a particular setting", while the metaphorical switching is concerned with "particular kinds of topics or subject matters". Myers-Scotton (1993b, 52)

criticises the approaches in the way that it is difficult to make a clear-cut distinction between “a change in strategies” and “a change in topical emphasis”. Besides, switching codes is not motivated by the topic change alone, but also “the participants’ shared experiences” or changes in relationships with one another.

Auer (1998, 162) developed the Conversational Approach which is in the first instance concerned with the “sequential implicativeness of language choice in conversation” where the first speaker’s choice influences the second speaker’s subsequent language and so on. These are ‘give and take’ relations among participants. Secondly, there is a limitation of the external interpretation of code-switching to the advantage of the “speakers’ mutual understanding of their utterances as manifest in their behaviour” (ibid). The focus is hereby put on interactional tasks rather than social variables most of the times from outside language behaviour.

The Markedness Model, as explained by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 92), ignores any motivation to code-switching seen as a result of the sequential interaction between speakers, constraint, norm or determination by any societal system. In addition, speakers are not passive but rather active actors. Furthermore, language choices are speaker-motivated in code-switching. Last but not least, code choices are not static but rather dynamic and dependant on the circumstances. Myers-Scotton’s intensive research in urban Africa evidenced the above premises on the basis of data collected from urban settings like Nairobi, Kenya and Harare, Zimbabwe on the alternation of Kiswahili and English, and Shona and English respectively. In other words, interactants are creative actors who are aware of the consequences of their linguistic choices. The costs and rewards of any alternative linguistic choices have implications for the speaker’s decision about which code to use, and this decision is made not randomly but after assessment of its suitability with regard to expectations. The model is discussed in depth in the Section 2.4.

Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001) recast the Markedness Model into the Rational Choice Model of which the overall assumption is that “the way speakers choose to speak reflects their cognitive calculations to present a specific persona that will give them the best "return" in their interactions with others, in whatever ways are important to them and are rationally grounded” (Ibid, 23). Wei (2016, 2) adds that the Rational Choice Model is characterised by “optimisation”

where “the actor will choose the action with the best outcome”. The action is considered as rational if “it appears to optimise outcomes, given the actor’s beliefs and values” (Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai 2001, 23). A number of code-switching researchers used the model. Among them, Muttabazi (2002) used it in the study of code-switching in political discourse in Tanzania, and Wei (2005) adopted it in the study on code-switching by Chinese–English bilinguals.

Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai (2001, 24) identified some limitations of the Rational Choice Model. The model does not necessarily produce quantitative evidence, and actors of the model may make rationally-based choices that others do not consider so. In addition, the best choices are not always made from an objective standpoint. Nevertheless, it suffices to highlight the fact that the Rational Choice Model and the Markedness Model, both initiated by Myers-Scotton, claim that social norms and rationality are mechanisms of linguistic choice.

2.4 Discussion of the Markedness Model for code-switching

The present study has adopted an analytical framework based on the Markedness Model, which enables the analysis and interpretation of data with regard to the social motivations of code-switching from Kinyarwanda to other languages. The model surpasses the Interactional Sociolinguistics, the Conversational Approach and the Rational Choice Model in different ways.

The Interactional Sociolinguistics together with the Allocation Paradigm give a lesser role to the speaker and societal norms in an interaction. In contrast, the Markedness Model views the linguistic variation and code choices as “speaker-motivated” and “directly linked with interpersonal relationships” (Myers-Scotton 1993b, 92). The Conversational Approach has given more weight to the interactional components including the setting, topic and subject matter rather than social variables. Concerning the Rational Choice Model, it does not fundamentally add anything new to the Markedness Model as its predecessor. Both of them converge on the fact that the speaker is a rational actor who is looking for the best outcomes of the interaction, and therefore engages all possible means for success. On this, Wei (2016, 10) stated that the Markedness Model is a rational choice model like others especially because it “claims that rationality provides the mechanisms necessary to explain choices from the available opportunity set, and such mechanisms are rationally-based desires and beliefs”.

As theorised by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 75), the Markedness Model posits that speakers do not make their linguistic choices randomly but rather “they know the consequences” of any choice made and they “assess the potential costs and rewards” of the alternative choice before making the decision to code-switch. This sums up her premise that linguistic choices are always motivated and this motivation is not static but rather dynamic and modifiable according to circumstances that arise when the conversation is taking place.

2.4.1 Some principal notions

The principal notions of the Markedness Model involved in the study are, namely, (i) the concept of markedness itself, (ii) Rights-and-Obligations (RO), and (iii) premises of negotiation, cooperation, sequential enterprise and rationality. Borrowed from structural linguistics and then applied to language choice among bilingual speakers, the first concept of markedness is posited by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 81) as “a system of oppositions” in code choice where the unmarked choice is conventionalised and indexes “an expected relationship” while the marked choice is unexpected between the speakers.

To the question of how speakers may recognise if such a language choice is marked or unmarked, Myers-Scotton (1993b, 79) introduces the ‘markedness metric’ as the linguistic competence that conveys to the speakers’ capacity “to assess all code choices as more or less unmarked or marked for the exchange type in which they occur”. This ability is peculiar to “a particular code choice only in reference to a specific speech event in a specific community” (ibid). For instance, in a certain case, the past tense may be considered as marked while the present tense is unmarked since it is unspecified and may potentially be used in present, past or future (Myers-Scotton 1993b, 81).

The second notion of ‘Rights-and-Obligations’ (RO) is defined by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 85) as “an abstract construct, derived from situational factors, standing for the attitudes and expectations of participants towards one another”. The concept is similar to ‘costs and benefits’ developed by Social Exchange Theory. Being either material or symbolic, costs are always minimised and benefits maximised. Therefore, the Markedness Model posits that different code choices are made on the basis of the costs and benefits expected between the speaker and the

addressee. In this respect, “speakers weight the costs and rewards of alternative choices and make their decisions” (ibid). In other words, interactants make code choices that match their RO set in a given exchange.

Regarding the third notion, it highlights concepts important to the Markedness Model for the understanding of code-switching. They include negotiation, co-operation, sequential enterprise and rationality. In fact, interactional meaning is achieved through successive turns where the speaker needs the participation of the addressee through his/her response. Additionally, there is no stand-alone code choice since it may not have a sufficient communicative intention. Rather, Myers-Scotton (1993b, 95) posits that language choices are significant when they “contrast with choices of the others” in conversation. She (1993b, 101) also acknowledges that code choice is a purposeful act where a speaker has “the ability to assess the effects of code choices and act accordingly”. Speakers are thus rational actors of their language choices and a social interaction is far from being a simple exchange rather a rational act of language.

The above concepts may be grouped under the “negotiation principle” and its subsequent notion of implicatures. In fact, the negotiation principle was modelled from Grice (1975)’s ‘cooperative principle’ which determines the ways in which participants efficiently and effectively use language to achieve rational communication. Myers-Scotton (1993b, 113) takes the negotiation principle as underlying all code choices because “it indexes the set of rights and obligations [...wished...] to be into force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange”. The speaker’s motivations are hereby emphasised in the determination of all code choices made in an interaction. The cooperative principle is guided by four maxims of conversation namely; the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner.

It has been observed that, in conversations, ‘what is meant’ may have an additional, inferred and predictable meaning beyond ‘what is said’. This is what Grice (1975) calls “conversational implicature”. According to Ifechelobi (2015, 2), the conversational implicature “sees verbal exchanges or communication as a cooperative enterprise in which participants take the mutual knowledge of the extra linguistic variables from which they draw inferences and therefore the appropriate code, for granted”. It is thus meant to delineate elements of utterance content that,

despite being normally carried by the linguistic elements in question, fall outside the linguistically coded content. As far as code-switching and the Markedness Model are concerned, Myers-Scotton (1993b, 98) posits that “the addressee must be able not only to understand the utterance but also to recognise the speaker’s intention”. The Markedness Model thus rests on the negotiation principle as illustrated through the following related maxims.

2.4.2 Maxims and types

The maxims generated by Myers-Scotton (1993b) apply to any code-switching situation, and they constitute the central aspects of the Markedness Model. They cater for both types of code-switching and their social motivations. The maxims are: (i) the Unmarked Choice Maxim, (ii) the Marked Choice Maxim and (iii) the Exploratory Choice Maxim. Their application results in four types of code-switching, namely, code-switching as a sequence of unmarked choices, code-switching itself as the unmarked choice, code-switching as a marked choice and code-switching as an exploratory choice.

There are two variants of the Unmarked Choice Maxim. Myers-Scotton (1993b, 114) identifies the first variant as sequential unmarked choice which occurs when “situational factors change within the course of a conversation”. In case the unmarked RO set changes because of situational changes, a new unmarked RO set is negotiated by the speakers. In this case, as speakers have had earlier experience of the rewards of certain societal norms indexed by the unmarked choice, they change the current unmarked choice in order to potentially benefit more from the other code. Myers-Scotton (1993b, 115) illustrates the maxim with an example in Nairobi where an Executive (Edward) in a soft-drink bottling company used to speak English as unmarked choice to his higher-level staff members and Kiswahili to the subordinates. When he is visited by a relative (John), with whom they speak in both English and Kiswahili, he orders a soft-drink from the receptionist in Kiswahili. The guest then adopts the same behaviour and addresses the receptionist in Kiswahili.

John (calling the receptionist): *Letea mgeni soda anywe.*

‘Bring the guest a soda so that he may drink’

Receptionist (eo Edward): *Nikuletee soda gani?*

‘What kind of soda should I bring you?’

Edward: *Nipe pepsi*
'Give me a Pepsi'.

The second variant is code-switching itself as the unmarked choice. Myers-Scotton (1993b, 117) posits that it is the most used in multilingual communities where “switching between the alien official language and an indigenous language is the unmarked choice for many interaction types”. The case is most dominant among urban Africans where speakers normally engage in using multiple languages in their conversations. An illustration given by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 118) is that of three relatively well-educated young men who meet in a shopping mall and hold their conversation in Kiswahili as the matrix language and English as the embedded language. She (1993b, 119) highlights conditions to be met for this type of code-switching including being bilingual peers, the wish to symbolise dual memberships, and a wish to demonstrate familiarity in using the languages together.

The Marked Choice Maxim occurs when one or another speaker “dis-identifies with the expected RO set” and “takes a different path” which negotiates against the unmarked RO set (Myers-Scotton 1993b, 131). By implication, the speaker who makes a marked choice would like to compel his/her addressee to put aside unmarked social norms and to view him/her otherwise in terms of their relationships. A new RO set is therefore established and it is maintained as unmarked in the conversation taking place. One of the suitable examples from Myers-Scotton (1993b, 133) illustrates the switch from Kiswahili to English in a conversation between a passenger and a bus conductor in a dispute over change:

Passenger: *Nataka change yangu*

'I want my change'

Conductor: Change *utapata, Bwana*

'You'll get your change'

Passenger: I am nearing my destination.

Conductor: Do you think I could run away with your change?

Having started their conversation in Kiswahili as the unmarked choice, the passenger switches to English to express annoyance at not receiving his change and he reinforces his education and authority. On his side, the conductor asserts his equal authority by replying in English too.

The Exploratory Choice Maxim directs speakers to code-switch in cases of uncertainty and/or hesitation. Herbert (1992, 176) considers it as a speaker's strategy "to try first one code, assess the addressee's reaction, then try another code, and then decide which receives the more favourable response". As illustration, Herbert (1992, 177) presents a case of a young man (X) who asks a young woman (Y) to dance in Kiswahili as an unmarked choice between strangers. Y refuses the dance till X switches to English, which convinces her about the young man's high social status conveyed by his ability to produce a well-formed sentence in English. The trial-and-error code alternation made by the young man brings the addressee to reciprocate, and thus leads to success.

2.5 Criticisms of the Markedness Model

The Markedness Model, through its maxims and types, has been the most used approach in the study of social motivations for code-switching and Kamwangamalu (2010, 124), amongst other scholars, acknowledges that "the markedness approach has indeed contributed significantly to our understanding of why bilingual speakers use their languages the way they do in their communities". However, it has been criticised at different levels of its theoretical formulation.

Meeuwis and Blommaert (1994) challenged the Markedness Model about its universality and innateness premises. They put forward that social motivations of code-switching depend on general patterns and communicative behaviour of a particular community instead of being the same across the world. For them (1994, 417), social dimension of code-switching must be phrased in terms of the characteristics of the local social context. This is the reason why analyses of code-switching should not be based on the "assumption of commonness" but rather on "assumption of variability" since linguistic phenomena have meaning in their specific sociocultural contexts (Ibid). Besides, issues involved in code-switching are "community-specific matters subject to empirical observation". They (Ibid) urged for "the ethnographic approach" in the analysis of code-switching in contrast of the Myers-Scotton's "universalist ambitions" in order to maintain code-switching "a society-specific communicative phenomenon".

Li We (1998, 70) also criticized the Markedness Model in that it places emphasis on the analyst's interpretation of participants' intentions rather than on the crucial creation of meaning by participants within conversation. He raised the issue of the insufficient role of the speaker to the advantage of the role of the analyst.

Other criticisms came from Kamwangamalu (2010, 124) who maintained that the Markedness Model is "too static to account for the social motivations for code-switching across languages and cultures" and thus the code choice is less precise. He questioned the concept of 'marked' which becomes ambiguous in circumstances where one language choice may be at the same time marked and unmarked depending on the cultures of the languages used by speakers. Kamwangamalu's (2010, 125) example of switching from English to siSwati by a siSwati student talking to his siSwati colleagues and their English speaking lecturer showed that the code choice served to increase distance between the students and the lecturer who did not speak siSwati, on the one hand. On the other hand, it created solidarity among the students and was thus unmarked. In this regard, code-switching plays a double role where "it can simultaneously exclude and include".

Nevertheless, these criticisms do not outweigh the huge advantages of the explanatory power of the Markedness Model. The Section 2.6 below also adds more arguments in justification of the adoption of the model especially for the current analysis of the social motivations of code-switching in Rwanda.

2.6 Motivation for the selection of the Markedness Model

The current study has adopted the Markedness Model as the most suitable for the analysis of motivations of code-switching from Kinyarwanda to other languages by Rwandan bilingual speakers. Firstly, it has been extensively and successfully applied in the African context to the extent that Gimode (2015, 52) designates the model as "the African research experience" and the mirror of "the African linguistic realities". Evidences may be found in her research and fieldwork carried out during years in Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania Uganda, and Zimbabwe respectively. Secondly, functional social-oriented notions of the Markedness Model enable the processing of data with regard to motives that bring about code-switching in the Rwandan

society. Thirdly, the model matches the socio-pragmatic approach to code-switching since, according to Gimode (2015, 51), it contributes better than others to the provision of a framework “to address the key social questions of who, when, why, where and how in the conversations”.

It suffices to note that the Markedness Model was preferred to the newest Rational Choice Model because, as stated in the Section 2.3.2 above, both models explain the speakers’ code choices through social norms and rationality made effective in the interaction. Secondly, the Markedness Model has the merit of having greatly contributed to the understanding of “why bilingual speakers use their languages the way they do in their communities” (Kamwangamalu 2010, 124). Thirdly, it has been recognised that the Rational Choice Model does not fundamentally add anything new to the premises of the Markedness Model as applied in code-switching studies. Levine (2011, 55), among other scholars, maintains that the Rational Choice Model is an “expansion of the Markedness Model [which] asserts that marked choices are inherently potential sources of costs [...] and also a means of embracing new sets of values and negotiating new identities or multiplying existing ones”. Wei (2016, 3) also sees no significant difference between the two models as, in his opinion, both help the speakers to achieve their purposes in almost the same way.

The application of the Markedness Model fills a gap in the research which has been done on code-switching in Rwanda. Indeed, research activities which apply the Markedness Model to explain social motivations in Rwandan code-switching, have been totally neglected. The study therefore contributes significantly to filling the gaps in this specific area of research in Rwanda.

2.7 The status of code-switching research in Rwanda

Not many studies have been conducted on code-switching in Rwanda. There is clearly a lacuna in this field, as there are no significant publications, which clearly justifies the need for the present study.

Code-switching research based on Rwandan data comprises a hand-full of unpublished bachelor’s degree dissertations: Karekezi (1989), Ndikumwami (1998), Hakorimana (2003) and Munyazikwiye (2003). However, they deserve mention as they constitute a background to the

present study as part of a continuing tradition of research on code-switching in the country.

Karekezi (1989) analyses Kinyarwanda-English code-switching among educated bilingual social groups. From a linguistic and sociolinguistic point of view, he considers conversational interactions from six educated bilingual social groups located in different geographical areas of Rwanda. His expected aim is to understand the link between phenomena of social life and language choice. In his opinion, switching from Kinyarwanda to exoglossic languages such as English and French is a group-based phenomenon which serves to identify the Rwandan educated elite and to maintain social interactions among them.

Ndikumwami (1998) analyses the influence of English in the Rwandan military speech community. Like his colleagues in this group of Rwandan researchers, the target population is a specific group; in this case soldiers in the Rwanda Defence Forces. Through the analysis of the soldiers' everyday communication, it is revealed that the group uses a repertoire of Kinyarwanda, Kiswahili, *Kiganda*, *Lingala*, English and French. English is greatly mixed with Kinyarwanda to the extent that the resultant language is neither pure Kinyarwanda nor pure English. The researcher uses the Speech Accommodation Theory and the Conversational Approach as his analytical framework. This is closer to Myers-Scotton's (1993a, 148) virtuosity maxim where speakers "switch to whatever code is necessary in order to carry on the conversation/accommodate the participation of all speakers present". Therefore, code-switching serves the purpose of linguistic, psychological and social integration into the group. For this, linguistic adaptation plays a great role especially because the participants have different backgrounds and origins. He further adds that switching from Kinyarwanda to an exoglossic language, in some cases, is used to compensate for a linguistic deficiency in Kinyarwanda. His conclusion is that speakers accommodate to one another, and that code-switching is a response to the other speaker's choice of codes.

Hakorimana (2003) also considers code alternation among soldiers of the Rwanda Defence Forces. In addition to data from live stretches collected from some soldiers in their everyday activities, as Ndikumwami (1998) did, Hakorimana also gathers extracts from local newspapers quoted from military officials' speeches. Through the Speech Accommodation Theory and the

Conversational Approach, even though not clearly stated in his research report, research findings reiterate that code-switching is motivated by the historical background of the army itself, metalinguistic functions, compensation for linguistic deficiency and a limited number of social motivations including the expression of authority, showing-off and snobbery. The study focuses more on linguistic aspects of code-switching than on social motivations.

Munyazikwiye (2003) analyses code-switching to English and French in a small sample of Kinyarwanda political speeches. Data are extracted from a limited number of political speeches delivered in Kinyarwanda in 1999 and retrieved from the recorded archives of Radio Rwanda. The research is based on some premises of the Conversational Approach and Speech Accommodation Theory. He identifies the motive for code-switching as communicative, including overcoming linguistic deficiency and poor performance in Kinyarwanda, metalinguistic functions and the need for technical terms, and cultural borrowings to express new foreign realities coming into Rwandan culture. They relate to Auer's (1998, 186) self-repair technique which resolves "the performance error" in the matrix language and keeps on the flow of conversation. Some scholars have called this 'crutching'. Social motivations are limited to the expression of the speaker's feelings of anger, excitement or power.

The above few unpublished research reports put forward the view that code-switching in Rwanda mostly occurs between Kinyarwanda and at least two exoglossic languages. Hakorimana (2003, 45) characterises it as "multiple language switching" and Karekezi (1989, 88) specifies it as the "Kinyarwanda-French-English trilingual code-switching", especially associated with the speakers' level of education and proficiency in any of the exoglossic languages. Moreover, they agree on three linguistic structures dominant in code-switching utterances. These are, namely, the intrasentential code-switching which uses grammatical and semantic units like noun phrases, adjective phrases, and adverb phrases; the intersentential code-switching which uses longer clauses or parts of speech; and the extrasentential code-switching which uses fully fledged items like proverbs and idiomatic expressions.

Furthermore, all the scholars analyse the morpho-phonological integration and adaptation of English and French items in Kinyarwanda. Karekezi (1989, 63) gives an example where

Kinyarwanda infinitive morpheme *ku-/gu-* is followed by the English root + English gerund morpheme + Kinyarwanda infinitive ending morpheme – *a*; and the result in a verb such as *gucekinga* (from to check). Hakorimana (2003) also exemplifies the case of a French verb like *traverser* ‘to cross’ which is effected by the same Kinyarwanda infinitive morpheme *ku-/gu-* + French root + Kinyarwanda infinitive ending morpheme *-a* to generate an adapted verb *gutraversa* ‘to cross’.

It is worth mentioning that some significant Kinyarwanda code-switching research has been done outside of Rwanda. This research is dominated by Gafaranga’s (2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2007, 2010, 2012) published works and most of them involve Kinyarwanda-French language alternation among the Rwandan immigrant community in Belgium.

Gafaranga’s (2001a) findings indicate that Kinyarwanda-French language alternation is the medium used by participants. Besides, it is a practical social action and a marker of social identity since it is part and parcel of the routines of everyday life. He evokes the concept of “ordered collections” which are categories or identities to which a participant belongs in a society. They include nationalities like Rwandese or Burundian, gender groups like male and female, race like black and white, professional groups like students and researchers, etc. To each collection or category corresponds a set of rights and obligations as well as category bound activities. Thus, in a bilingual conversation, people may shift from membership of one collection to one or many other categories. The researcher concludes that language alternation is brought about by the participants’ negotiated linguistic identities, and for the interaction to be effective, bilingual speakers categorise themselves to adopt a variety of identities, which allow them to accomplish their talk activities in an orderly manner.

In addition, Gafaranga (2001c) is concerned with the question of the base language among the two codes used in language alternation, and whether code-switching constitutes a medium on its own. He mentions some cases where the speakers do not consider code-switching as the alternation of two distinct codes used together but another code in addition to the matrix language and the embedded language. They rather take it as one of the two languages they are speaking and this for practical purposes. This occurs especially when code-switching is frequent

among the speakers. Some Rwandese immigrants engaged in Kinyarwanda-French alternation, for instance, tend to think that they are using only Kinyarwanda while they ignore the presence of both distinct codes. Moreover, code-switching is taken as a conversational strategy, which should not be looked at as simple ‘juxtaposition of two languages’ within the same conversation, but rather as any talk which is oriented to by speakers themselves and an instance of functional deviance from the code they are using.

The functions of language alternation are tackled in different aspects. Gafaranga (2007) sees Kinyarwanda-French code-switching as a multi-faceted phenomenon. He identifies a number of motivations, such as the expression of the speakers’ identity and relationships, negotiation of the medium, conversational repair, metaphorical information, generation of a specific meaning, and above all, a conversational strategy among the speakers.

While specifying the function of code-switching as a conversational strategy, Gafaranga (2007) rejects negative attitudes towards language alternation, which allege it to be impure language behaviour or a random phenomenon. Rather, he insists on the orderliness of Kinyarwanda-French language alternation as a conversational strategy with a variety of functions including negotiation of topics, participants’ identities and relationships, negotiation of the medium, signalling repair, conveying metaphorical information, metalinguistic functions, and specific interactional tasks for speakers.

The functions of conversational repair and medium repair are analysed in Gafaranga’s (2012) analysis of language alternation and conversational repair in bilingual conversation. Code-switching is taken as a bilingual medium used to make the conversation productive and to enable speech organisation. In this respect, he specifies that Rwandan speakers in Belgium switch to French or English to compensate the inappropriateness of Kinyarwanda to express clearly the intended content. Language alternation is therefore considered as a ‘conversational repair’ associated with the medium negotiation.

Gafaranga’s (2000) research on medium repair and other languages repair deals with how speakers draw on other languages to overcome the difficulty of missing the *most juste* in one

language. The problem is signalled by repetition, hesitation markers and trouble markers which call upon participants' contribution for a solution on the spot. Taking into account the step by step organisational pattern of conversations and the location of the repairable problem, its solution may come from the speaker him/herself (self-repair) or it may be provided by other participants (other-repair). Three different ways to solve the problem of the *mot juste* are put forward. It can be solved (i) within the same language (without language alternation), (ii) by means of medium repair where speakers themselves use other language different from the code then used, and (iii) through other-language repair where the solving element comes from a language which is different from the preceding linguistic environment.

The issue of medium repair is related to the medium request and language shift also subsequent to language alternation. Gafaranga (2010), through the study on 'Medium request: Talking language shift into being', notes that medium negotiation may result in language displacement as in the case of the shift from bilingual Kinyarwanda-French to monolingual French among the adult Rwandan immigrants in Belgium and their children. Having observed the phenomenon of language shift taking place in the above mentioned community, the researcher considers interactional practices through which the shift is taking place and with the assumption that language shift is a community phenomenon, rather than an individual or familial one. As a result, it is revealed that children constantly request adult participants to medium-switch from Kinyarwanda to French.

It may also be noted that only children perform medium requests and adults respond either by switching to French or by holding onto Kinyarwanda. This leads to monolingual French medium, on the one hand, or to a Kinyarwanda-French parallel medium where one speaker consistently uses language A and the other consistently uses language B without any accommodation to the one or another's choice, on the other hand. The researcher definitely proposes some strategies to remedy the language shift including adopting the parallel medium and defeating children's medium requests, but there is a risk of a limited impact because of many challenges related to.

Lastly, Gafaranga's (2001b) investigations into Kinyarwanda-French language alternation are related to the issue of direct speech reporting. His research findings state that direct speech reporting of the embedded language utterances is an interactional accomplishment rather than a

simple reproduction of something ready-made. In this specific case, speakers revive a talk produced in earlier occasions for specific conversational purposes. In addition, direct reporting characterises social interaction especially because it relies on the property of trust between the speaker and the addressee. Interactional achievements brought about by the direct reporting include amongst others medium request and medium negotiation especially when the speakers belong to different communities.

2.8 Conclusion

This chapter was concerned with a review of relevant literature related to the phenomenon of code-choice in general and to Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching in particular. Key terms relating to code-switching were explained and a brief history of code-switching studies was sketched. An overview of the main approaches to code-switching was given, with an emphasis on the socio-pragmatic and structural approaches.

The content of the chapter focused mostly on the formulation of the Markedness Model as developed by Myers-Scotton. The approach was adopted for the investigation into the social motivations for code-switching in the Rwandan bilingual context. It was followed by a brief look at the structural approaches with special emphasis on the Matrix Language Frame Model. The chapter then reviewed the research already done on code-switching in Rwandan speech communities inside and outside the country.

It should be emphasised that there is virtually no published work on code-switching inside Rwanda. The current study is therefore expected to fill some of the the gaps in Rwandan code-switching research. The current study differs in its theoretical framework, target population, data and focus from the unpublished research mentioned above. It uses the Markedness Model to explain social motivations for code-switching in the current sociocultural context of Rwanda. The target population is composed of a wider group of Rwandan bilingual speakers in more extended social contexts. Data were collected from live interactions between speakers in institutional settings and will be analysed in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the methodological approaches used to carry out this research. It begins with a brief description of the type of the research and its setting. The second aspect under consideration is concerned with the research participants and research tools used to collect and analyse data. Thereafter, it looks at ethical and quality issues and how they were complied with by the research in order to achieve the expected objectives. Finally, it includes a short report on the challenges encountered in the study.

3.2 Research type

This study is qualitative, exploratory, descriptive and empirical. In fact, a qualitative approach broadly aims to understand social phenomena through their meaning as perceived by people who are in contact with them. Boeije (2010, 11) identifies three key elements that make up the qualitative approach as “looking for meaning, using flexible methods that enable contact and providing qualitative findings”. Kothari (2004, 35) describes it as “the discovery of ideas and insights” about the phenomenon under consideration. Here, the phenomenon that takes place is switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and Kiswahili among the Rwandan bilingual speakers.

We follow the definition of empirical study proposed by Kothari (2004, 4) as “a data-based research, coming up with conclusions which are capable of being verified by observation or experiment”. Boeije (2010, 58) defines empirical data as composed of stories told by participants, quotes, observations by the researcher and case descriptions. These comprise the core of the data collected for the current study.

A qualitative research methodology has been selected as the main approach for the study because of its advantages and strengths. In fact, four main aspects have prompted the choice of the approach, namely, its use of natural data, holistic nature, flexibility and focus on participants. The argument is supported by Boeije (2010, 32) who posits that, in qualitative research, firstly

events are naturally observed as they are produced by speakers in real contexts of everyday life. Secondly, the contexts of data do not exclude any situation of real life, which explains its holistic nature. Thirdly, there is flexibility to adjust research tools according to the field and the progress of the study. Lastly, participants' perspectives and experiences are reflected in the research data and findings.

Furthermore, Gimode (2015, 72) reports Bogdan and Bilken's (1982) argument that "qualitative research takes place in a natural setting, enabling the researcher to study human behaviour through observation and one-on-one interaction". This emphasizes the fact that qualitative research always obtains data from a natural setting where a specific community displays its ways of life, attitudes and interactions. The current study applies the above to understand code-switching in the Rwandan context.

3.3 Research setting and participants

The research was carried out in Kigali City where 18 different institutions were selected. This means that data were collected in institutional settings. The selection of the research site was guided by the 'principle of maximization'. According to Morse and Field (1996) quoted in Boeije (2010, 34), the most suitable site for qualitative research is composed of locations "where the topic of study manifests itself most strongly". As the city offers more opportunities to practice multiple languages and it has the potential to be frequented by people of different social strata including bilinguals, it was selected as the most suitable research site.

The institutions selected for the research comprise 6 ministries in charge of infrastructure, governance and social protection, labour, security and disaster management respectively. There are also 10 government agencies which have responsibility for public service regulation, standards, cooperatives, good governance promotion, social security, housing, transport, natural resources, fighting against corruption and business promotion respectively. The remaining two institutions are local insurance companies. In addition to them, the University of Kibungo-UNIK, which offers a language program in English and French was selected as it is an institution which trains students to be trilingual speakers of English, French and Kinyarwanda.

The research participants included ordinary citizens, public servants, entrepreneurs and business people, applicants for jobs, members of cooperatives, soldiers, students and claimants of compensation. They differed in terms of age, gender and level of education, but shared the characteristics of being bilingual. They were intentionally and purposefully selected because they were judged important to the needs and interest of the study. According to Boeije (2010, 35), purposive sampling selects cases “because they can teach us a lot about the issues that are of importance to the research”. In addition, the multistage sampling was used where the respondents’ clusters were chosen at random and all members of the cluster selected. The selected cases were intensively studied in order to generate the large amount of information needed.

The participants were grouped in three clusters namely; (a) Visitors, (b) Receptionists and (c) University Students. The two first groups were observed in face to face interaction within the identified institutions. The third group of students was selected because of their good knowledge of different languages and code-switching. Data collected from them contributed to building a relevant background and a broader understanding of the practice of code-switching in the Rwandan context. The multistage sampling of clusters helped to select the adequate numbers of participants per each cluster. Indeed, 19 Receptionists, 20 Visitors and 16 students made the sample of the study. The population was judged suitable to provide relevant data about code-switching and its social motivations among the Rwandan bilingual speakers. Moreover, individual participants were identified from a cluster and on the basis of the topic discussed, which served to support the view that code-switching occurs within a wide range of topics, participants, contexts and real life situations.

The access to the participants was gained through crossing the selected services, one by one, where the researcher expected to meet them. Request letters were sent to the management of the institutions for authorization to conduct the research. Upon approval, appointments were fixed with the Receptionists individually and they were requested to give their consent before engaging in the research. In addition, they were always briefed about the purpose of the study and its procedures. As for focus group discussions, participants were contacted at the university and asked to be involved in the study. Groups were formed in collaboration with the Class

Representative who further helped in nominating assistant moderators in the respective groups.

3.4 Data collection methods

To achieve the objectives of the study, a mixed research strategy was used. This is what has been characterized as triangulation in research. According to Taylor et al. (2008, 29), it involves “a process of cross-checking whereby data relating to a particular aspect is gathered using more than one method and/or source”. Different methods are thus combined for effective data collection, analysis and validation. In the same vein, Muttabazi Bwenge (2002, 70) puts forward a “multimethod approach”, which helps to collect “complete and holistic” data as required in qualitative studies. Thus, the research used different approaches to generate data from the Rwandan bilingual speakers. These are, namely, ethnographic non-participant observations, interviews, focus group discussions and the review of archives. The application of the methods is justified by both the social and linguistic aspects of the study.

3.4.1 Ethnographic non-participant observation

This technique enabled the researcher to see live and record events as they were happening in the field. According to Boeije (2010, 59), it is a field method that enables the researcher “to describe what happens, who or what are involved, when and where things happen, how they occur, and why things happen as they do from the point of view of the participants”. The field study was carried out at the receptions of the identified institutions, where conversations between Visitors and Receptionists were followed and jotted down in a notebook. Switches from Kinyarwanda to English, French and/or Kiswahili were mainly identified for further analysis. Upon their consent to participate in the research, the Receptionists were informed about the researcher’s exercise. The latter was sitting down at a reasonable distance from the reception desk where he was able to fully hear what was said.

With a notebook and a pen, the researcher recorded 68 conversations involving Kinyarwanda, English, French and/or Kiswahili in different institutional settings in the study area. The conversations covered various topics that seemed to represent the day to day linguistic behaviour of the Rwandan speakers. Nonetheless, some conversations tended to overlap in content and form, and it was necessary to disaggregate them. There were also some cases where less

interesting examples were deleted from the data. In the end, only 23 conversations were selected for analysis, and each of them lasted between two and five minutes depending on the subject matter discussed.

It is worth noting that the audio recording was not used during the ethnographic non-participant observation. Even though the technique is currently taken as a standard in sociolinguistic research, it was not practical for this study. In fact, the researcher had planned to tape-record the interactions between Visitors and Receptionists, but the majority of the Receptionists categorically declined to be audio-recorded. They insisted that they were not sure of where I would take their voices and for which purpose. I realised that they were much worried despite having explained to them that the records would be used for research purposes only. Thus, I opted for taking notes, which, I believe, helped to capture all the data as expected by the study. It suffices to mention that some other well-known sociolinguistic studies succeeded without using the tape-recording in data collection. The examples are like Labov's American Language Survey (1966) and his studies in New York department stores (1972) which used telephone interviews and short notes respectively (See Section 3.4.4).

The researcher did not interfere with the speech interactions between participants. In fact, the ordinary institutional setting and customs observed between the Receptionists and Visitors were maintained as much as possible. Thus, the observer's paradox as pointed out by Mesthrie et al. (2000, 93) was effectively overcome during the observation exercise.

3.4.2 Interviews

The interviews were conducted orally on a one-to-one basis, where one Receptionist at a time was engaged in face-to-face encounters with the researcher. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003, 84), the advantages brought about by the method are that it enables the provision of in-depth data, excludes any kind of confusion, allows flexibility in questions and answers, and offers the possibility of getting background information about the respondents' answers and attitudes. In this regard, the interviews were arranged with 23 Receptionists. They were done immediately after a conversation with a Visitor or some minutes later when the Receptionist was free. Permission to interrupt the work of the Receptionist for about five minutes

was always negotiated. Visitors were not interviewed because they were leaving as soon as their business was over.

An interview guide was developed, administered and responses recorded in a notebook. In addition, depending on the nature of the observed conversations between the interviewed Receptionist and his/her Visitor, comments on the language behavior were collected and more questions were sometimes asked for the sake of clarity. Furthermore, some interviewees brought in new interesting issues or useful additional information, which triggered supplementary questions from the researcher. It suffices to note that some of the interviewees went beyond the planned questions in giving their opinions on code-switching practices encountered in their everyday life, which greatly enriched the research. The interviews have proved to be an effective way of ascertaining details about social motivations towards code-switching among the Rwandan bilingual speakers.

3.4.3 Focus group discussions

A group of university students was engaged in discussions about code-switching and its social motivations. The objective was to generate more background ideas about the linguistic phenomenon. As indicated by Boeije (2010, 64), the focus group “seeks to generate primarily qualitative data, by capitalizing on the interaction that occurs within the group setting”. The researcher was the moderator and assistants were elected among the classmates. The role of the moderator was twofold (a) eliciting information to prompt discussions and (b) taking notes together with the assistant moderators. At completion of the sessions, all drafts were consolidated by the researcher himself.

In fact, the whole class of Level V of the French and English Option participated in the discussions. After authorization from the university management, students were informed about the research topic, and then requested to give their consent to contribute to it. They were divided into four small groups of four people each for active participation and easy monitoring. The researcher introduced the participants to some examples of Kinyarwanda-English, French and/or Kiswahili code-switching collected from the observations and conducted interviews in order to elicit their views. Thereafter, the participants shared their experience about examples of code-

switching from Kinyarwanda to exoglossic languages encountered in real life situations. The discussions lasted between 30 and 45 minutes for each group, and about one more hour was always taken by the researcher to properly transcribe the raw data.

Data collected from the focus group discussions corroborated information obtained from non-participant observations and interviews. They gave a broader background to the practice of code-switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and/or Kiswahili as currently followed by Rwandan bilingual speakers. They also helped to broadly understand the socio-pragmatic motivations associated with code-switching in the Rwanda context, and gain deeper insights into social motivations for code-switching.

It is worth adding that secondary data from other researchers were obtained from various publications and reports related to the focus of the study. They were collected by means of the ‘content-analysis’ approach. For that, the researcher consulted books, articles and dissertations that contained relevant and useful information on code-switching in general and Kinyarwanda-English, French and/or Kiswahili code-switching in particular.

3.4.4 Shorthand notes technique

This tool was used to collect data on code-switching by transcribing the spoken words. During observations and interviews, the researcher used BakerWrite (Heather Baker, 2009) and semi-script shorthands, where ellipses, abbreviations and self-developed symbols for frequently-used phrases allowed the researcher to write as quickly as respondents were speaking. The brief notes were immediately deciphered and transcribed into longhand at the end of a session before starting another. The researcher managed to effectively use the technique thanks to trainings he received in Advanced Communication skills in undergraduate studies and additional in service trainings in Special writing skills organised for Administrative Assistants to Heads of public and private institutions.

According to Baker (2009), in order to succeed in shorthand, a page is divided into two columns, and larger ideas are jotted in the left column while the right serves to take down as much information as possible, with a mixture of abbreviations, contracted forms, schemas, ellipses,

pictures and tables, which are not organized. The researcher visited the research sites with a notebook designed in that way to facilitate the fast recording of drafts, which were later fine-tuned in a more readable text. The technique eased and speeded handwriting and enabled him to capture as much information as possible during observations, interviews and focus group discussions.

3.5 Data analysis methods

The process of data analysis involves data reduction, data display and conclusions being drawn. According to Silverman (2005, 178), data reduction includes “selecting, focusing and simplifying the data” and data display is done through ‘data coding’ which leads to the formulation of main themes of the study. Boeije (2010, 72-3) further adds that data must be prepared through their organization, transcription and manipulation before analysis. The analysis then comes into effect through the data segmentation and reassembling, constant comparison, and theorizing of data towards results.

For this study, the raw qualitative data were composed of selected conversations, participants’ responses to the interview questions and responses of the focus group discussions. There were also some nonverbal elements captured by the researcher as field notes that accompanied the turns in conversations. After their collection and transcription, conversation segments were selected from the corpus, transcribed and then translated into English. The selected segments were those with most instances of code-switching. Languages switched to such as English, French and/or Kiswahili and the topic per conversation were also taken into consideration especially in order to avoid unnecessary duplication.

By applying the Myers-Scotton’s (1993b) Markedness Model, the study looked for the answers and explanations of the questions of ‘why, where, when and how’ in relation to the phenomenon of code-switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and/or Kiswahili. Code-switched elements were analysed in line with the maxims and principles set within the framework of Myers-Scotton’s (1993a) Markedness Model. Therefore, major themes of the research were identified through the processed data, and inferences were drawn in consideration of the research objectives as well as existing theories on code-switching.

It suffices to point out that the methodological framework adopted by the current research is closely comparable with the methods used by Myers-Scotton in her research on social motivations of code-switching. Most of her field work in Kenya, Uganda and Zimbabwe between 1968 and 1988 generated data based on naturally occurring conversations especially in urban settings. The languages involved were English and African languages like Kiswahili, Shona and other languages spoken by specific ethnic groups. The main tool used in data collection was audio-recording applied to large or small groups and individuals. The data contributed to generating a theoretical explanation of the social motivations underlying code-switching as well as its different structural aspects. The results contributed to the development of the Markedness Model and the MLF Model of code-switching. The current study remains however limited in scope.

3.6 Ethical and quality considerations

Before the researcher went to the field, the Research Ethical Clearance was obtained from the University of South Africa (UNISA), and letters requesting permission to carry out the study were then sent to the targeted institutions. They were accompanied by the recommendations from the university and a copy of the research proposal. Responses were thereafter collected, and field visits started. In addition, a consent form was submitted to individual Receptionists and university students who filled it in and signed it in terms of their approval to willingly participate to the research.

It should be noted that the Visitors were not requested to give their consent for research. The researcher wanted to avoid “the Hawthorne Effect” where his presence could alter the behaviour of research subjects. According to Spicker (2007, 4), among ways to overcome the problem, “the research requires the researcher to minimise the impact of the research process on behaviour” and therefore, “the research needs to be minimally obtrusive and may be covert”. He further adds that this is frequently done in public settings, because they are most exposed to the risk “where both the possibility of generalisation and accountability may be compromised”. The visitors were thus not informed about the research, but this should not be understood as surreptitious recording.

During data collection, concerns of reliability and validity were given due attention. According to Labov (1978, 353), reliability involves consistency of results obtained using the identical instrument, and validity is concerned with the degree of accuracy of the data. He (1978, 354) maintains that “any theory of language must be consistent with the language used by ordinary people in the course of their daily business”, that is to say “the language speakers actually use when the linguist is not present”. As far as the study is concerned, data were collected live from the ordinary world of participants. Portions of Kinyarwanda-English, French and/or Kiswahili code-switching were gathered as they were produced by participants in their everyday life without the researcher influencing the conversations. Besides, the researcher avoided biases and distortion of facts as he carefully captured all required data without omitting anything.

The qualitative approach adopted in the study guarantees that the research instruments, namely, observation, interview, focus group discussions and the documentary technique are reliable and valid. In fact, those instruments allowed collecting data naturally since they obliged the researcher to be in the field and to jointly work with the participants. Thus, there is no doubt that the language behaviours observed and the speakers’ views gathered through interviews and focus group discussions are accurate.

3.7 Challenges faced during the field research

This field-research encountered a number of challenges. Apart from being a student, the researcher is also employed at the University of Kibungo, which complicated the compliance with appointments fixed with the respondents. In fact, it was an obligation to visit the selected institutions only during business days. The researcher had to struggle with his few days-off so as to visit as many institutions as possible. Consequently, the exercise of data collection took about nine months while it had been planned for four months.

Another major challenge was the respondents’ perception about the audio and video recording. In fact, this method is preferred in other sociolinguistic studies. However, Rwandans have been reluctant to it because of a wrong bias developed around it. Indeed, it is very difficult for them to believe that the information collected through audio or video recordings will be used for research purposes only. Thus, a very high risk to miss the relevant information or to have it distorted is

associated to the method because of the respondents' fear for their privacy. As an alternative, the researcher adopted the shorthand notes technique in order to record the conversations between the Receptionists and the Visitors, interviews and discussions in groups.

3.8 Conclusion

This chapter focused on the methodological tools employed to carry out the study. It described the choice of the research type, setting, participants and instruments in relation to qualitative approaches. Moreover, it demonstrated their application to the research for the achievement of the expected objectives. Finally, it addressed the issues of ethics and quality of the study as well as measures taken by the researcher to overcome some challenges encountered in the field.

CHAPTER FOUR

SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING IN RWANDA

4.1 Introduction

The chapter presents an analysis of the corpus. It discusses data from non-participant observation, interviews and focus group discussions. The aim of this part is to identify social motivations for switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili by Rwandan bilingual speakers. The sociolinguistic analysis of data is undertaken within the theoretical framework of the study, namely the Markedness Model (See Section 3.5). It was adopted because it has been judged to match the purpose of the study (see Section 2.6).

This chapter provides an insight into different social motivations of code-switching phenomena identified in the data set. Following the Markedness Model types and maxims set out in Section 2.4.2, it will also attempt to show how switching from Kinyarwanda to other languages is marked or unmarked following the speakers' intentions towards one another or what Myers-Scotton (1993a) terms as Rights and Obligations. Empirical evidence, in the form of examples selected from the recorded interactions, will be provided to support the socio-pragmatic motivations of code-switching. For the purposes of this section, switches to specific languages will be indicated through a change in font style. Table 4.1 presents a summary of different font styles associated with each language operating in the current multilingual matrix:

Table 4.1: Font styles used to represent code-switching to specific languages

Language	Base or Embedded Language	Font Style
Kinyarwanda	Base	Normal style
English	Embedded	<i>Italics</i>
French	Embedded	Bold
Kiswahili	Embedded	<u>Single underline</u>

For greater clarity, the following conventions will also be used in the formatted examples:

Table 4.2: Other conventions used in the examples

Designation	Convention used	Sample demonstration
Speakers	Visitor, Receptionist	Visitor A, B, C... Receptionist A, B, C...
Translation	Single inverted commas ‘ ’	Murakoze ‘Thank you’
Stage directions	Square brackets []	Yes [laughter]
Examples	Arabic numerals in brackets	(1), (2), (3).....

Referring to the linguistic ecology of Rwanda as earlier detailed in Section 1.2.1, Kinyarwanda, English, French and Kiswahili are recognised as official languages. All the languages are spoken by Rwandans to varying degrees, under different circumstances and in different contexts. Kinyarwanda is the main language of Rwanda, which is used in almost all facets and sectors of the life of the country. Fawcett (2003, 111) states that “every Rwandese shares ownership of the language and access to it does not depend on ethnicity, social status or occupation”. In addition, “it is a language of business, government and home-life”. Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 192-193) emphasise that Kinyarwanda is considered as “a critical element in the essence of Rwandan-ness”. This brings about the common belief that “all Rwandans should speak Kinyarwanda” in any setting. As the data analysed in this study is derived from language use in institutional contexts, it is worth specifying that Kinyarwanda is generally the unmarked and default choice in most of these contexts.

The analysis is subsumed within the Markedness Model as formulated by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 100) that the utmost motivation of any code choice is “the extent to which this choice minimizes costs and maximizes rewards for the speakers”. Therefore, code choice is not a random exercise but rather it is governed by specific motivations speakers would like to make effective through the language variety they have adopted. Besides, code-switching is a strategy for achieving the maximisation of benefits within a specific interaction and by specified interlocutors.

4.2 Categories of code-switching among Rwandan bilingual speakers

The following sections are organised according to Myers-Scotton's categories as set out in Section 2.4.2. After each category has been described, the examples extracted from the corpus are analysed according to respective category. The following categories are (i) the Unmarked Choice Maxim, (ii) the Marked Choice Maxim and (iii) the Exploratory Choice Maxim.

4.2.1 Code-switching as the sequential unmarked choice

Myers-Scotton (1993b, 114) explains that this first variant of the Unmarked Choice Maxim occurs when a conversation in progress encounters "situational factors changes", which prompt the speakers to negotiate a new unmarked RO set in line with the earlier experience of the rewards indexed by the unmarked choice. One or both of them hereby expect to potentially benefit from the other selected code.

The example (1) below is a conversation between Visitor A who is requesting orientation to the office of somebody he knows in a Ministry in charge of disaster management and Receptionist A. Visitor A asks his question in Kinyarwanda then shifts to an English word *office*. This motivates Receptionist A to respond in Kinyarwanda, French and English as shown by the lexemes *étage*, *rescue and post-disaster management*. In consideration of the clear response given to him, Visitor A prefers to explain the purpose of his visit to Mr. Fidèle in Kinyarwanda with English switches such as *support*, *challenge*, and *budget*. This code-switching is done in line with the previous success in orientation, and Visitor A probably expects to maintain his relationships with Receptionist A.

The conversation goes as follows:

- (1) Visitor A:
Mwatuyobora aho *office* ikoreramo wa mugabo Fidèle iba?
'Could you please direct us to the office where that man Mr. Fidèle works?'
- Receptionist A:
Ni muri *étage* ya gatatu, muri *rescue and post-disaster management*.
'It's on the third floor, Department of rescue and post-disaster management.'

Visitor A:

Turacyakurikirana *support* batwemereye. Twagombaga kubakirwa, ariko ngo hajemo *challenge ya budget* y'akarere itaranzwe kugeza ubu. Turacyari muri *shitingi*, ntituzi icyo twakora.

'We are still following-up the support they promised us. We were entitled to be provided with houses, but there was a challenge of the district budget not yet disbursed. We are still living under sheeting, and we are wondering wht to do'.

Myers-Scotton (1993b, 117) also classifies the codes used in reported speech as sequential unmarked code-switching. In this regard, the reported speech remains "unmarked for the RO set for the earlier conversation, while the code preceding and following the quoting is unmarked for the RO set of the present conversation". The conversation (2) below supports the argument:

(2) Receptionist B :

Standards nyine! Erega ubuziranenge bugomba kugera hose.

'Standards exactly! Standards must be everywhere.'

Visitor B:

Ntiwibuka ko ubushize *DG* yavuze ngo "Ni *standards* cyangwa *out of business*". Ibyo mu Rwanda byabaye *serious*.

'Don't you remember that last time the DG said "Standards or getting out of business". Everything has become serious in Rwanda.'

In the example above, two gentlemen are talking about the standards applied in making cement bricks. Visitor B tries to convince his colleague by repeating an emphatic statement of the Director General of the local standards bureau. The phrases *standards* and *out of business* are used to emphasise the need to comply with the standards.

4.2.2 Code-switching itself as the unmarked choice

The second variant of the Unmarked Choice Maxim is code-switching itself as the unmarked choice, which occurs as a result of the language mixing within multilingual communities. In this case, an exoglossic and official language is used together with an indigenous language. Myers-Scotton (1993b, 119) identifies the conditions to be met for this type of code-switching are that speakers should be bilingual peers, who wish to symbolise dual memberships, and to demonstrate familiarity in using both languages.

The conversation (3) below took place between two employees of the same institution, when they were discussing the issue of procurement of goods and related bureaucratic procedures. Kinyarwanda is the base language and English switches are made because the speakers are familiar with one another, and they are talking about a topic of common concern.

The conversation goes as follows:

(3) Receptionist C:

Ese buriya ntibakora *addendum* kwa *supplier* kuko tugiye muri *procurement* byatinda?

‘Can’t they negotiate an addendum to the contract with the supplier because, if we engage in procurement procedures, it will delay the process?’

Visitor C:

DF cyangwa *PS* batanga uburyo bwo kubona nk’iz’ibihumbi ijana. Uzi ko izo batanze *last time* zamaze ibyumweru bibiri gusa! *Two weeks* nawe mbwira!

‘The DF (Director of Finance) or the PS (Permanent Secretary) may authorise them to purchase at least a small quantity for one hundred thousand francs. Can you imagine that those supplied last time served for two weeks only? Two weeks imagine!’

4.2.3 Code-switching as the marked choice

The Marked Choice Maxim of code-switching implies the categorical change of the RO set. According to Myers-Scotton (1993b, 131), one speaker “takes a different path” against the unmarked RO set. The addressee is therefore compelled to abandon the ordinary social norms and to engage in different relationships with the addressor.

In the conversation (4) below, a lady, Receptionist D, takes time to explain to a gentleman, Visitor D, the reason why his request for a copy of an insurance agreement with a third party, who was his father, should not receive a positive response. As a matter of fact, the insurance company had compensated the family for the property it had lost, but the claimant had been excluded although he is a member of the family. Since the agreement is a confidential matter between the contracting parties, nobody else could get a copy of it. The visitor is thus denied

information about the terms of the agreement, and he insists on his rights while the Receptionist D resists stating that he has to follow due procedures.

The closing part of the conversation goes as follows:

(4) Visitor D:

Ubwo koko ntacyo mwabikoraho, **dosiye** yanjye izaburiremo?

‘Really you cannot do anything to this case; and would you like my file to fail?’

Receptionist D:

Nta kundi keretse ukoze **dans ce sens**, ugasaba urukiko akaba ari rwo ruza gusaba iyo *information*. **C’est tout!**

‘There is not any other alternative except proceeding in that way; you must request the court to ask for the information. That’s all’.

The negotiations are held in Kinyarwanda with a few switches to French. This is supported by the level of education of the visitor, whose appearance shows that he is a modest gentleman. At the end of the conversation, Receptionist D gets a bit angry and develops a mechanism to end it. She makes a clear statement in French to emphasise compulsory compliance with official procedures. The EL segment *dans ce sens* (in that way) is intended to put an end to the debate. In order to defeat the claimant completely, Receptionist D adds another French phrase *c’est tout!* (That’s all!), which ends the conversation finally. The code is highly marked to the extent that it disempowers the interlocutor and prevents him from making any further proposal.

4.2.4 Code-switching as the exploratory choice

The Exploratory Choice Maxim of code-switching is explained by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 142) as when “speakers may use CS when they themselves are not sure of the expected or optimal communicative intent or at least not sure which one will help achieve their social goals”. This is definitely a case of proceeding by trial and error.

In the next example (5), Visitor E, who also works for a district office located out of the city, delivers the District Mayor’s letter to Receptionist E. The letter is requesting authorization to go outside the country and it is addressed to the Ministry of Local Government. In the absence of someone who registers incoming files, Visitor E redirects the letter to another receptionist, called

Emma, (Receptionist F) in the same office. Their conversation is held in Kinyarwanda with switches to French and English.

(5) Visitor E:

Hari **courrier** nari nzanye yo mu Karere ka Nyanza.
'There is a file I bring from Nyanza District.'

Receptionist E:

Uwakira arasohotse. Ntiwamufasha Emma?
'The one who records files went out. Emma, could you assist?'

Receptionist F (Emma):

With pleasure. [Talking to the visitor] Yizane!
'With pleasure. Bring it please!'

Visitor E:

[Handing the letter to Emma] Ni iyi *letter* na *file* zivuye mu karere ka Nyanza.
'There are the letter and a file from Nyanza District.'

Receptionist F (Emma):

Kuki se mwagombye gusinyisha kwa *Governor*? Meya we ntiyemerewe gusaba *mission*? [Reading the letter carefully]. Ndabona n'impamvu ifatika.
'Why through the Governor? Isn't the Mayor entitled to a mission abroad? Even the reason is relevant.'

Visitor E:

Reka, babanje kuzana *issues and issues*.
'There were many issues about it.'

In the above conversation (5), the visitor first tries a French switch with the first receptionist. The addressee's reaction is assessed, then he tries another code in English with Receptionist F. The decision is then taken about which code receives the most favourable response. The lady Visitor E starts the greeting in Kinyarwanda as the unmarked choice and switches to a French phrase *courier* (letter). However, when she is redirected to Receptionist F, the situation changes. In fact, the latter accepts her assistance in English 'with pleasure', which prompts Visitor E to try English, and she receives a favourable response. The conversation continues in two codes, namely, Kinyarwanda and English.

The evidences given in this Section 4.2 served as samples to demonstrate that the corpus of the current study fit the Myers-Scotton's categories of code-switching as detailed in the Markedness Model. Further examples will be given in the following Section 4.3 where the main topics of social motivations expressed within every category are discussed. It suffices to bring to the attention of the reader that reiterating the occurrence of any category in any topic discussed should not be regarded as tautology, but rather it will be taken as a point to reinforce the link between code-switching categories and associated social motivations.

4.3 Analysis of socio-pragmatic motivations according to topics

The sections are organised according to topics. As it was done in the Section 4.2, some references to the literature and cross references to the earlier content are given, according the specific topics. Further, general trends and information about the topic under discussion as extracted from the focus group discussions and interviews are displayed. They aid in interpreting the examples that the study has collected. Lastly, examples are analysed according to the Markedness Model but the interpretation is enriched by insights gained from the focus group discussions and interviews and other observations. It also suffices to note that a number of the examples tended to overlap in both content and form. Thus, it was necessary to disaggregate them in order to enable meaningful analysis of the social motivations.

4.3.1 Code-switching as an educated status marker

School education is the formal channel of acquisition of languages, sciences and civilisation. Education is highly valued in Rwanda to the extent that it can be regarded as an important component of identity. In Rwanda, according to Karekezi (1989, 88), educated people are socially more highly regarded than illiterates. Therefore, everybody struggles to show that he/she is educated to a certain level. In addition, proficiency in foreign languages has been taken as an indicator of knowledge and formal education. This is justified by the fact that, as detailed in Section 1.2.2, from the colonial period, formal education has been carried out in foreign languages; French from 1916 to 2008 and English from 2008 to date (Habyarimana, 2014).

Results of interviews and focus group discussions carried out in this research confirmed the link between code-switching and educated status. In fact, education has become an asset and a

commodity, which everyone aspires to. Being illiterate is seen as not only a shame but also a sort of malicious fate to which uneducated people are doomed. Some examples were given by focus groups where people in villages tend to learn, memorise and imitate some English, French or Kiswahili words and then use them in conversations to give an impression that they are educated. These exoglossic words and phrases are imitated from local leaders at the grassroots levels and other professionals in their speech community, such as teachers of primary and secondary schools. Therefore, speaking even a little English, French or Kiswahili is an indicator that the speaker has or aspires to a certain level of education that should be noticed by his/her audience.

In extract (6) below, a university student, referred to as Visitor F, brings a letter to the reception of an insurance company requesting internship. After a short discussion with the Receptionist G, he is recommended to redirect the letter to the main reception which deals with all incoming files.

(6) Visitor F:
[Handing the letter] Ni iyo gusaba *industrial attachment* cyangwa *internship*.
'It's a request for industrial attachment or internship.'

Receptionist G:
[Reading the letter] **Donc**, ntirebana na *insurance*?
'It's not related to insurance?'

Visitor F:
No, ni **stage**.
'No, it's about internship.'

Receptionist G:
Ni ukuyitanga kuri **réception centrale** hasi.
'You'd rather submit it to the main reception downstairs.'

The conversation starts in Kinyarwanda as the unmarked choice, and the student (Visitor F) switches to English when he hands the letter to Receptionist G. It could be argued that the switching is done in order to establish a superior identity as an educated person. Such phrases as 'industrial attachment' and 'internship' are uttered to indicate the status of a university student and the purpose of the request letter and thus to make a change in the unmarked social consideration. This could be described as a case of Myers-Scotton's (1993b, 131) Marked

Choice Maxim where Visitor F would like to prompt Receptionist G to put aside unmarked social norms and to view him as educated. There is a change in relationships between the two speakers, after Receptionist G has recognised the kind of visitor she is dealing with.

As a result, taking into consideration the new revealed status of Visitor F, Receptionist G explains to him the normal channel observed in the company for incoming letters. Receptionist F picks up on the English code-switching in the visitor's initial statement and starts her clarifications in French. The French EL singly occurring lexeme *donc* (in fact) is triggered by the use of English, both exoglossic languages used in education and administration. In the following turns, the Visitor F picks up on the French and shifts to French *stage* (internship), rather than continuing in English. The conversation then continues in Kinyarwanda with switching to French *réception centrale* (central reception). This is a good illustration of the negotiated code, where the speakers try to maximize benefits from their interaction through the selected language behaviour. Besides, the success in code negotiation means that the relationships between the speakers have shifted from unknown to known. These instances fall in the category of sequential unmarked code-switching, which, according to Myers-Scotton (1993b, 114) allows the speakers to continue benefiting more from the rewards of the unmarked RO set already negotiated.

The next example (7) is a similar instance where the speaker wants to claim an educated status through the use of an ex-colonial language. The conversation is held at the reception of a ministry in charge of local governance, where a lady, Visitor G, seeks orientation from Receptionist H who is actually a security guard. The most interesting part of the conversation is the use of French in greetings. Visitor G greets the receptionist in French *bonjour* (good morning), which is unusual in first relationships between two people not familiar with one another. It deviates from the commonly used pattern in such circumstances.

The conversation goes as follows:

- (7) Visitor G:
Bonjour!
'Good day!'

Receptionist H:
Bonjour [pause] *mwaramutse!*
'Good day!'

Visitor G:
Ubwo ahubwo ni muraho, kuko ndabona n'izuba ryatse.
'It is rather good morning, because I see the sun is shining.'

Receptionist H:
Mugiye mu yihe **service**?
'To which department are you going?'

Visitor G:
Ngiye kwa *corporate*.
'I'd like to go to corporate service.'

The greeting in French is an example of the Marked Choice Maxim where Visitor G negotiates against the unmarked RO set. The newly established RO is then acknowledged by Receptionist H who also replies in French. However, Receptionist H immediately decides to return the conversation back to the unmarked choice, which is Kinyarwanda. He translates the French lexeme *bonjour* to Kinyarwanda *mwaramutse*. The French lexeme *bonjour* literally means 'good day' and it is also used as a greeting form which means 'good morning'. It has two equivalents in Kinyarwanda such as *mwaramutse* literally translated as 'how are you this morning' and *muraho* literally translated as 'how are you'. The first form is the most frequent and commonly used during morning times (before 12:00 pm); while the second applies either in morning or afternoon times. In addition, the second meaning is used when people have not seen each other for a long time. Receptionist H prefers to translate the French greeting with the most frequent Kinyarwanda form regardless of time, and Visitor G, aware of the appropriate use of *mwaramutse*, corrects him by the term *muraho* because it is around noon; and it is her first time to meet the receptionist. The conversation continues with the French singly occurring lexeme *service* (department) and the English singly occurring lexeme 'corporate'. The latter is popular in the local administration, and no alternative in French or Kinyarwanda is ever used. In this case, it can be regarded as a loan word and not a switch per se.

As explored in Section 1.2.2, French in Rwandan society is taken as the language of ‘instructed or advanced people’. This is emphasised by Ntakirutimana (2010) and Niyomugabo (2015) who also note that French has been less popularised than English, less accessible to the majority of the Rwandan population and less used in everyday interactions between the Rwandan speakers (see Section 1.2.2.3). Consequently, it has been the language of a small elite especially made of educated people. By using French, Visitor G indicates that she belongs to the Francophone elite, and she would like to be considered as an educated person. This is done regardless of the fact that, considering the linguistic situation in Rwanda, French has been gradually losing its value as stated by Ntakirutimana (2010, 30) who states that the place of French “s’amenuise sensiblement aux dépens de l’anglais dont le rôle est manifestement sans équivalent” [has been diminishing to the advantage of English of which role is unequalled].

The data collected from the field and analysed through the examples in this section corroborate the findings from other scholars such as Karekezi (1989), Herbert (1992), Myers-Scotton (1993b), Ntakirutimana (2010) and Niyomugabo (2015) that code-switching may be an indicator of the educated status. Social achievements related to education may be expressed through the purposeful use of languages available in the Rwandan speakers’ repertoire.

4.3.2 Code-switching and identity

Various scholars have said that languages used by the speakers are associated with social identities (see Section 2.7). According to Chung (2008, 6), “bilinguals choose one or the other language in order to be recognized with the corresponding identity”. Indeed, the type of language combination used among speakers may depend on how the speakers see themselves or their interlocutors. Thus, languages offer opportunities to the speakers and the potential to redefine themselves and define their interlocutors vis-à-vis the values and considerations assigned to the languages used.

Inspired by the socio-historical background of Rwanda especially after the recent liberation war of 1994 as stated in Section 1.2.3, Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 195) consider English as the “language of the victor” and both English and French speakers are characterised as “Anglophone elites”, on the one hand, and “Francophone elites”, on the other hand. This is linked with the

socio-political context of the returnees from English speaking countries like Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania and those from French speaking countries like the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Burundi and others. Code-switching from Kinyarwanda to exoglossic languages constitutes the speaker's wish to be perceived differently and hence conferred a specific consideration by the interlocutor. This is further emphasised by Coulmas (2005, 173) who demonstrates that the language people speak contributes to revealing who they are, where they grew up, their situation in life and the group they would like to belong to.

The results of interviews and focus group discussions indicated that, through code-switching, Rwandan bilingual speakers identify themselves as people of high status, up-to-date, modern and knowledgeable, with a trans-border citizenship, and having different linguistic and socio-historical backgrounds. Most of the respondents used the Kinyarwanda terms of *gusobanuka* (a neologism to mean that a person is up-to-date and knowledgeable) or *umuntu usobanutse* (an up-to-date and knowledgeable person) as umbrella terms to describe a person's image which implies being modern, educated, knowledgeable, smart, advanced, well-informed, etc. Therefore, switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili serves that purpose of prompting the positive social values leading to making the Rwandan somebody who is modern and knowledgeable.

Other examples were given where ordinary citizens switch to English single words and short phrases in order to sound like their local leaders known as Anglophone or having an English background like those repatriated from English speaking countries. This is given more strength by the fact that most of top leaders of the countries have the English background, and always switch to English in their speeches or meetings with nationals.

Furthermore, Rwandan speakers switch to English, French or Kiswahili for the purpose of showing that they are open to their co-citizens of the region more specifically the East African Community. This is the result of regional integration where people from one nation feel citizens of the region beyond their nation. As international languages, English, French and Kiswahili index international identity. Speakers generally aspire to being open to a wider environment rather than confined to their home country and mother tongue. Besides, in focus groups, cases

were pointed out where Rwandan speakers switch to exoglossic languages in order to sound like foreigners (Kenyan, Ugandan, Congolese, etc) who are sometimes given much more consideration, customer care and attention than fellow nationals especially regarding service delivery.

In the following example (8), a junior soldier, Visitor H, not in a military uniform, is requesting the transfer of ownership of land which he has recently bought. The exchange with a lady, Receptionist I, is held in Kinyarwanda as the unmarked choice. However, having realised that it could take longer than it was expected, and considering that he is in hurry, the soldier switches to English in order to give detailed explanations, which contain self-identification, motivations and the request to the land bureau. The interaction is characterised as the Myers-Scotton's (1993b, 131) marked choice where the speaker negotiates a favourable RO set against the ordinary unmarked RO set. Receptionist I realises that she has been dealing with a soldier even though he is not in uniform, and thus the context triggers a change, which prompts her to direct him to the specific officer who should handle the matter of concern.

The conversation goes as follows:

(8) Visitor H:

Nagira ngo mumfashe kandi munyobore [kindly and simply].
'I'd like you to help me and guide me.'

Receptionist I:

Yeee, turabikora.
'Yes, we shall do it.'

Visitor H:

Mfite *issue* hano yihutirwa. Ndi umusirikare nkorera hano kwa *His Excellency* [showing the direction], ubu ndi umuntu woherejwe muri *mission South Sudan* na *MINADEF*-Ministeri y'ingabo. So, mfite inzu nari naguze twashakaga gukora **mutation**. Byavuye mu karere, *already* ngo byageze hano ejo, none nagira ngo byihute ngende birangiye.

'I have an urgent issue here. I'm a soldier and I work there at his Excellency's house, I have been deployed by MINADEF-the Ministry of Defence to a mission to South Sudan. So, I purchased a house and we'd like to proceed with the transfer of land title

deed. The application has already left the district, it was deposited here yesterday. I'd like to speed it up so that it may be completed before I leave'.

Receptionist I:

Reka mbereke umuntu wabafasha kuri icyo **dosiy**e [stands and makes a step forward].
'Let me direct you to somebody who may help you.'

The English switch 'His Excellency' made by the soldier aims at clarifying his special status as a member of the Republican Guards Unit. The unit is more respected than other units of the army because of the responsibilities of assuring the President's security. Thus, the soldier perceives himself as an important person and he is so perceived by the receptionist who pays much more attention to his request. In addition, the following switch 'mission South Sudan' explains the reason why the issue needs much more attention. In fact, Visitor H will not have time to follow-up on this matter since he will be travelling outside the country for a certain time. Furthermore, the acronym of the Ministry of Defence (MINADEF) as one of the most important ministries adds value to the consideration of Visitor H by Receptionist I. Finally, switching to English as the marked choice also highlights the importance of the issue of land title transfer.

It suffices to note that the request itself is expressed in French *mutation* (transfer of land title). The French lexeme is generally accepted in Rwanda even though there is an equivalent term in Kinyarwanda. After self-presentation, the soldier Visitor H judges it is the right moment to submit the query since Receptionist I is prepared by now to receive it probably in a positive way. Definitely, the expected reward is given since the request is directed to the appropriate department for attention. The marked choice made while switching to English and French brings about a change in the relationships between the speaker and the receptionist who is compelled to "view him otherwise", in Myers-Scotton's (1993b, 131) terms.

In another example (9) below, the speaker's self-perception extends to a broader physical space, which associates him with a region or global area. It is normally believed that international languages like English, French and Kiswahili indicate an association with trans-border issues and realities better than Kinyarwanda as the national and local language. The conversation is held between Receptionist J in the ministry in charge of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO) and

two representatives of an International NGO. The topic under discussion is the renewal of the operating license.

(9) Visitor I:

Twari tuzanye izi *documents*.

‘We bring these documents.’

Receptionist J:

Reka tuzakire [taking the files].

‘Let us receive them.’

Visitor I:

Ni *International NGO*, twandikiye *Minister of Local Government*.

‘It is an International NGO, we wrote to the Minister of Local Government.’

Receptionist J:

[Turning pages of the file] *International NGO!* Ibaruwa se iri he?

‘International NGO! Where is the letter?’

Visitor I:

Ni iya mbere, izo uriho ni *amattachments*.

‘It’s the first one, those you see are attachments.’

Receptionist J:

Aaah, ni byo. [reading for seconds]

Mwashakaga *kurennyuwinga Operating Licence?*

‘It’s true.’

‘You’d like to renew the Operating Licence?’

Visitor I:

Yes [with confidence].

While coming to the ministry, the visitors are aware that Receptionist J probably speaks both Kinyarwanda and English. This is explained by the fact that receptionists have at least undergraduate level of education and the languages of administration are Kinyarwanda, English and French. Their conversation starts in Kinyarwanda and they switch to English to demonstrate familiarity in using the languages together. The singly occurring English lexeme ‘documents’

serves as a warm-up to the receptionist about the codes that will be used in the upcoming segments of the conversation. In accordance with the international status of their organisation, Visitor I uses Kinyarwanda as the base language and English as the embedded language and so does Receptionist J after having realised that the code is suitable to both of them. The speakers identify themselves in a global setting and they speak English as the universal code.

When they describe the potential of exoglossic languages especially English to promote globalisation, Samuelson and Freedman (2010, 192) portray English as a global language because of its “global and regional growth as the leading language of science, commerce and economic development”. Therefore, its adoption is connected to the socio-economic development factors to be taken into consideration. The phrase ‘International NGO’ links up with the international languages and a broader area of operating. This is what Agundiade et al (2013, 43) put forward when they explain that the type of personality people wish to portray to others is moulded “by summing up all the factors that have come to define [them]” and in this case the factors include language.

In the conversation, other English expressions like ‘Minister of Local Government’ are used. The singly occurring adapted form *amattachments* is a combination of Kinyarwanda affixes and an English stem. This emphasises the double belonging of the code and the speakers. Furthermore, the following utterance contains another English-Kinyarwanda adapted infinitive *kureniyuwinda* from the verb ‘to renew’ and then the main purpose of the request, which is the ‘operating licence’. All the switches to English confirm the visitor’s wish to match the code used with the international status of the organisation.

This case is in line with code-switching itself as the unmarked choice. In fact, it fulfils conditions set by Myers-Scotton’s (1993b, 119) in that the speakers are bilingual, wish to symbolise the dual membership, and positively evaluate their identities.

The ways in which speakers see their interlocutors influence the choice of codes they use in their conversation. The following example (10) is a conversation carried out in an agency in charge of natural resources. Receptionist K, who is passing through the corridor, meets a gentleman,

Visitor J, also an entrepreneur who bid for a tender in the agency but, unfortunately, he was not shortlisted. He is complaining and by chance gets an opportunity to explain the problem in detail to the receptionist. The conversation is held in Kinyarwanda with switches to English and French.

It goes as follows:

(10) Visitor J:

Madam, [very humble] dufite *issue* y'uko bataduhagayeho mu ipiganwa. Ni ukuvugako tutabayeho **selectionné**.

'Madam, we have a problem that we have not been called for tender competition. It means that we were not shortlisted.'

Receptionist K:

Ibyangombwa byose byasabwaga muri *tender* mwarabitanze? [Stops and listens].

'Did you fulfill all the requirements for the tender?'

Visitor J:

Muri **DAO** harimo ko upiganwa yaba ari *company*, **ONG** cyangwa **Coopérative**.

'In the Tender Offer, it was specified that the competitor should be a company, an NGO or a Cooperative.'

Receptionist K:

Ubwu mugashyiramo ibyangombwa bya *RCA* cyangwa *RDB*, cyangwa *RGB*.

'Thus you were required to attach registration certificates from RCA or RDB or RGB.'

Visitor J:

Twe twashyizemo iya **ONG**, nk'uko byari biri muri *invitation*.

'From our side, we attached the NGO Certificate as it had been prescribed in the invitation.'

Receptionist K:

None *procurement* **yaraberiminnye** ngo ntibyuzuye?

'Now, you have been rejected by the procurement office just because of incomplete file?'

Visitor J:

Gute se ko niba utari *company* uri **ONG** cyangwa **coopérative**! Ntibashobora kudasaba *company registration* tutari *company*?

‘How can that be? If you are not a company, you are an NGO or a Cooperative! They cannot ask us a company registration certificate when we are not a company?’

Visitor J is frustrated to the level of making an appeal. Meeting with Receptionist K is a chance for him and he tries to explain as somebody well-informed about tender procedures. The first turn combines three languages namely; Kinyarwanda, English and French. The singly occurring exoglossic morphemes are ‘madam’, ‘issue’ and *selectionné* (selected). The use of both English and French is an attempt to find which of them should be most suitable to the interlocutor. This is an example of exploratory code-switching as a means to overcome uncertainty, as posited by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 142). Then, both Visitor J and Receptionist K switch to English and French technical terms as suitable codes to explain tender procedures. This is a case where code-switching itself could be regarded as the unmarked choice to demonstrate to level of familiarity already achieved by the speakers.

Receptionist K has recognised that the visitor has knowledge of English and French and tender procedures, that is the reason why she feels free to address her questions using Kinyarwanda with switches to either English or French. The same applies to the responses given by Visitor J. There is proliferation of terms in the embedded languages like *DAO: Dossier d’Appel d’Offre* (call for tender), ‘invitation’ to bidding, types of potential bidders including ‘company’, *coopérative* (cooperative) or *ONG: Organisation Non-Gouvernementale* (Non-Governmental Organisation), respective registration testimonials from authorised government agencies like the Rwanda Cooperative Agency (RCA), Rwanda Development Board (RDB) and Rwanda Governance Board (RGB) and the procurement institution. Code-switching, in this case, indicates the level of knowledgeability of Visitor J, who wants the interlocutor to treat him as a knowledgeable person.

The speaker’s perception of the interlocutor is also expressed in the following example (11). It is an extract from a conversation held at the reception of an agency in charge of public service and labour. People are queuing at the waiting desk while the receptionist calls them one by one. Visitor K, who has files to submit to the receptionist, is reading the *Daily Nation*, a Kenyan newspaper which is among the most popular in Rwanda. Reading the Kenyan newspaper makes the lady, Receptionist L, think that Visitor K could probably be Kenyan. This is the reason why

she welcomes him in Kiswahili, *karibu* (welcome), as an exploratory choice. The introductory form is followed by a Kinyarwanda phrase which also serves the purpose of welcoming Visitor K to the reception desk.

The subject of discussion between the visitor and the receptionist focuses the content of the extract from the newspaper about the career of journalists.

(11) Receptionist L:

Karibu namwe muze tubakire.

‘Welcome to the next.’

Visitor K:

Mwiriwe? Narebaga inkuru y’umunyamakuru hano muri iyi **journal**.

‘Good afternoon. I was reading an extract about a journalist in this newspaper.’

Receptionist L:

Ushaka se kuzaba **umujournaliste**?

‘Would you like to be a journalist?’

Visitor K:

Reka ndashaje! Ibyo ni iby’**abajeunes**.

‘No, I’m too old! This is for young people’.

Receptionist L:

Oya, wenda icyo utashobora ni ukuba **animateur**, ariko wajya ukora nka **commentaires, amacritiques**....

‘No, perhaps you may not be a presenter, but rather maybe a commentator, a critic...’

Visitor K:

Uzanye iby’abasaza rero nibwo ubabuze! **Abajeunes** bakunda **chaud chaud**!

‘If you focus on old people’s interest, you miss the youth. They like hot news!’

Receptionist L:

Yego ni *generations* zitandukanye, ariko iyo **majorité** yawe ibaye **jeunesse** ugomba gushaka ibyo bakunda.

‘Yes, generations are different, but when your majority audience is the youth, you must meet their interest’.

Visitor K:

Aaah, ibyo tubireke [with gesture of rejection], ni izi **couriers** nari nzanye.

‘Okay, that’s enough; I’d like to submit these files’.

The conversation is in Kinyarwanda as the base language, and most of the switches are to French. English is only switched to in one turn, where Receptionist L brings in the term ‘generations’ as a response to the challenge presumed by Visitor K. The visitor’s summary of the subject read in the *journal* (newspaper) demonstrates his ability to speak French. It also constitutes the second instance of the exploratory choice towards the lady, Receptionist L, which, in return, prompts her to freely switch to French in the remaining part of the conversation. At this stage, it is an instance of the Myers-Scotton’s (1993b, 114) sequential unmarked code-switching, where the new unmarked RO set is negotiated because of situational changes. The singly occurring French lexemes used by Visitor K include, namely, *abajeunes* (youth) and *chaud chaud* (hot news) related to the subject under discussion, and later *couriers* (files) related to the real purpose of the visit to the agency. As for Receptionist L, she uses a large number of French content morphemes like *umujournaliste* (journalist), *animateur* (presenter), *commentaires* (comments), *amacritiques* (critics), *majorité* (majority) and *jeunesse* (youth) in different turns, most of them being questions and explanations.

Both switching to Kiswahili by Receptionist L and to French by Visitor K signify the perceptions they have towards one another. Visitor K is thought to be of another nationality, and thus Receptionist L prefers to be careful in addressing him in Kiswahili judged understandable to Rwandans and most Africans especially East Africans. On his side, Visitor K attempts to reverse the trend by switching to French because of his French background, which is successfully recognised by the interlocutor. Moreover, French is judged more prestigious than Kiswahili, and thus, for Visitor K, identification with French is more advantageous than Kiswahili.

Briefly, the analysed data in this subsection confirms that code-switching may serve as an identity marker. Findings from the examples explored in this section align with many of the ideas put forward by other scholars, such as Coulmas (2005), Chung (2008), Samuelson and Freedman (2010) and more especially Myers-Scotton (1993b). They are also supported by the results from the focus group discussions and interviews. All of them converge around the fact that the language behaviour adopted by speakers may be a marker of who they are, their real life situation and their expected affiliation to a certain group.

4.3.3 Code-switching and authority, power or prestige

The code-switching discussed in this section involves switches from Kinyarwanda to English and French, where the embedded languages connote measures of power, authority and expression of prestige. According to Myers-Scotton (1993b, 126), speakers switch languages in order to index among others the speaker's power relations and these relations are then presented, understood, accepted or rejected in the process of interaction. It is therefore commonplace for speakers switching to English, French or Kiswahili in their statements to convey and emphasise power and authority to their interlocutors. In Rwanda as in other African countries, the power of these exoglossic languages is invoked by the colonial heritage. Besides, as mentioned in Section 1.2.2 of this research, a special place is accorded to English in Rwanda because of its politically sensitive nature associated with both its elite speakers, powerful English-speaking countries such as the United States of America and the United Kingdom, globalisation trends and the current technology divide.

This motivation for code-switching as a strategy to express power, authority and prestige was confirmed by the respondents during interviews. In fact, receptionists revealed that in their work places, sometimes senior staff use code-switching as an indicator of their powers and authority during meetings or when giving orders. They also stated that some visitors switch to English or French with the purpose of showing their prestigious position when they are seeking services, and thus negotiating favourable consideration by the service providers. This supports Munyazikwiye's (2003, 53) findings in the analysis political speeches which revealed that authorities switched to English or French when the conversation was tough and highly sensitive, or when they wanted to criticize or to express power and superiority.

The focus groups further gave examples of teachers who give orders to their students in English or French rather than in Kinyarwanda. This emphasises the power aspect allocated to the exoglossic languages. Moreover, other examples were discussed where low status speakers want to imitate people of high status like businessmen and opinion leaders in their localities. The imitators think that they have already taken the role of the ones they have imitated and they would like to be considered accordingly. Ndikumwami (1998, 29), in his sociolinguistic analysis of the influence of English in the Rwandan military speech community, cites examples where

junior soldiers switch to English in order to sound like their senior officers. Initially he takes it as a simple show-off but this study has noted that the motivation goes further because of the results associated with it.

Example (12) below is an instance of how English is used to signal power. The setting is an office of the government agency in charge of housing. Visitor L, also former District Mayor, addresses the receptionist in an authoritative tone. Only the greeting form is pronounced in Kinyarwanda as the base medium, and immediately he switches to English. The force given to English is brought about by the positions of authority held by Visitor L, on the one hand, and the person he is looking for, on the other hand. In this case, English is definitely the marked choice where the speaker “dis-identifies with the expected RO set” and negotiates against the unmarked RO set (Myers-Scotton 1993b, 131). While it was expected that Receptionist M should introduce the visitor to the senior staff with whom he had an appointment, the latter could not wait for the former’s feedback. Rather, he rushes straight to the director’s office assuming the authority associated with English and his powerful position.

The conversation goes as follows:

(12) Visitor L:

Mwiriwe, [With great confidence and a bit of arrogance] *Director wa housing arimo?*
‘Good afternoon, is the Director of housing in?’

Receptionist M:

Housing...?

Visitor L:

Yes, housing and master plan.

Receptionist M:

Arimo, ni muri kabiri. Mubabarize se?
He is in, it is in room two. May I contact him for you?’

Visitor L:

Ok, reka murebe [takes a step forward].
‘Ok, let me see him’.

It is known that the routine language in administration is Kinyarwanda. It is also the receptionist's responsibility to introduce people in the senior staff's offices after fulfilment of necessary formalities. However, Visitor L introduces his request in English 'director...housing', which implies great self-confidence and justifies the reason why he should not wait for the receptionist's formalities with regard to appointments. With a short hesitation 'housing..?' of the Receptionist M, who pretends not to have got the message clearly, Visitor L reinforces his authority in stating the title of the director in full, 'housing and master plan'. This is meant to convince Receptionist M about the visitor's familiarity with the director and, by implication, her obligation to let him go and see the director. The last turn contains an 'ok' which is not a form of gratitude to the receptionist, but rather it signifies that there is no problem with going to the director's office without the receptionist's authorisation.

Power and authority may be indexed indirectly through code-switching linked with social domains such as occupations and/or professions with which people are identified in different ways. The argument is supported by the following example (13). The setting is the reception of a ministry in charge of infrastructure. The ministry is organising a Video Conference and hence there is a giant flat screen waiting to be installed in the meeting room. The provider of the technical service is a local company called EDO Ltd. Two technicians of the company are sent by their boss to do the job, but they find the person in charge is out of office. The interaction between one of them and the receptionist takes place in Kinyarwanda as the unmarked choice, but the visitor identifies himself through the prestigious name of their company. In addition, on behalf of the group, the technician emphasises the fact that they have been sent by their boss who is familiar with the senior officer of the ministry they are directed to.

The conversation goes as follows:

- (13) Visitor M:
Twari tuje kureba Kayitaba.
'We'd like to see Mr. Kayitaba'.

Receptionist N:
Mu biki?
'What about?'

Visitor M:

Ni *company* yitwa *EDO Ltd*, twari tuje kumanika *flat screen*.

‘We are coming from EDO Company Ltd, we have to install the flat screen’.

Receptionist N:

Ya yindi nini cyane, wagira ngo abantu bose bakwirwamo? Nta we nabonye ubanza adahari.

‘That very big one, you could imagine a hundred people could fit in it? I did not see him, perhaps he is not around’.

Visitor M:

Mwamuduhamagarira? Nta *phone* ye *boss* yaduhaye ariko we bavuganye.

‘Could you please call him for us? Our boss did not give us his number but they talked’.

The most important marked choices are the English switches in turn 3 ‘company ...EDO Ltd’ and in turn 5 ‘boss’. Visitor M, on behalf of the technicians, is well aware of his lower status, but he borrows the company name with its higher status in order to convince the receptionist about the reason why they should be allowed to get in. Another embedded lexeme with a deeper significance is ‘boss’. In fact, it indicates an economic differential between the lower status group of the technicians and the receptionist, on the one hand, and the higher status group of the company Manager and the senior officer of the ministry on the other hand. Even though none of the latter group is present, it is mentioned that they talked and agreed on the activity to be accomplished by the technicians. Thus, referring to their higher status marks a change which results in the authorisation to continue the job. The switches to English serve to reinforce and highlight the technicians’ indirect power. Thus, code-switching enables them to appeal to the authority of a higher group. It is an instance of indirect power where the marked choices inform Receptionist N that the visitors should not be treated as simple technicians but rather as representatives of the company and its manager.

In another quite similar example (14), a business man and company owner inquires about procedures for his company registration in the Private Sector Federation (PSF). This is a national forum of business people. The conversation is carried out in Kinyarwanda as the unmarked choice with some switches to English as the marked choice:

(14) Visitor N:
Nashakaga gusaba *membership ya company* yange muri *PSF*.
'I'd like to apply for membership of my company in PSF'.

Receptionist O:
Ni ukwandika [pause with attention and care] maze bakazabyiga.
'You should write and they will consider it'.

Visitor N:
Harya ubwo si ukwandikira *CEO, Chief Executive Officer?*
'Do we write to the CEO, Chief Executive Officer?'

Receptionist O:
Yego. Ahubwo wongeraho na *kopi ya cash flow ya company* yawe.
'Yes, you also attach a copy of the cash flow of your company.'

Knowing that not all companies are members of the PSF, except the big ones, the businessman, Visitor N, feels he will add status to his company by requesting membership of the PSF. In fact, owning a company eligible for membership of the federation confers a kind of prestige and thus it is important to express it in English rather than Kinyarwanda. The expressions 'membership' and 'company' are marked choices to demonstrate the change against the ordinary RO set. Moreover, the English morphemes have implications for the businessman's self-esteem and the consideration he should deserve from Receptionist O.

The requirement of a letter addressed to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) makes another point in favour of the prestige. While Receptionist O mentions writing a letter, the businessman adds details about the addressee as the 'CEO, Chief Executive Officer'. This signals prestigious relationships with the CEO through writing to him. In view of the Visitor N's level of knowledge, Receptionist O judges it better to add further details for the application to be complete as attaching a 'copy of cash flow' of the company. She makes this marked code-switch after realising that her visitor has a certain level of proficiency in English.

The data analysed through the examples given in this section has proved to be linked with focus group discussions and other researchers' findings as far as code-switching and power relations

are concerned. This corroborates Fairclough's (1989, 17) idea that language is a social practice and thus is "centrally involved in power, and struggles for power". In addition, he (1989, 35) adds that "those who exercise power through language must constantly be involved in struggle with others to defend (or lose) their position". Therefore, individual language choices and code-switching inclusively among the Rwandan bilingual speakers are done for socially determined power-related purposes.

4.3.4 Code-switching and social distance

Depending on circumstances, code-switching may narrow or widen the social distance between speakers. This is supported by Kamwangamalu (2010, 125) who, through the switching from English to siSwati by a siSwati student talking to his siSwati colleagues and their English speaking lecturer, shows that the student's code choice served to increase distance between the students and the lecturer, on the one hand; and it created solidarity among the students, on the other hand. Thus, code-switching may play the role to exclude and/or include.

Results from the focus group discussions confirmed that switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and/or Kiswahili serves among others to make deference and secrecy, and to exclude outsiders. Examples were given where school teachers and managers switch to English in order to exclude their students from professional debates and secrets. Moreover, code-switching has been characterised as the typical speech of the "New generation". These young people use code alternation to tighten their in-group relationships with fellows. On the other side, examples were stated where code-switching is criticised as arrogance, especially by old people. They take it as an indecent speech to exclude uneducated people. This motivation adds social value to Ndikumwami's (1998, 29) argument that takes code-switching as a communicative strategy to exclude intruders only.

The conversation in the following example (15) is held in an office of an institution in charge of agriculture promotion. The lady receptionist has a gentleman visitor who is asking her for a favour to make a photocopy for him, which is probably against the institutional policy. Their conversation is in Kinyarwanda as the base language and unmarked choice with some switches to English as the embedded language and marked choice.

(15) Visitor O:
Mwaramutse abo muri iyi *office* [shaking hand]?
'Good morning to you in this office'.

Receptionist P:
Mwaramutse.
'Good morning.'

Visitor O:
Mumeze neza se *my sister*?
'How are you doing my sister?'

Receptionist P:
Nta kibazo.
'Fine.'

Visitor O:
Ubu rero nje gusaba *service* [very humble and submissive]: Mwankoreramo *kopi*
imwe only?
'I'd request a service: Could you make for me only one copy?'

The marked choices made in turn 1 and turn 3 have the purpose of requesting Receptionist P to put aside unmarked social and institutional norms and to engage in a new relationship with Visitor O. This is the principle of the marked choice maxim as posited out by Myers-Scotton (1993b, 131). Indeed, the visitor shows a respectful attitude towards the receptionist through the plural polite form *mu-* (you). The English switch 'office' is constructed with a Kinyarwanda demonstrative *iyi* (this) to specify it as a single unit occupied by one person. Visitor O recognises the authority of Receptionist P as the chief manager of her office. She is considered as the last decision maker with regard to the management of the office. The second high marked phrase 'my sister' in English introduces an unexpected 'kinship' relationship where Visitor O would like his addressee to see him as a brother. The reason for using the English lexeme 'my sister' rather than its Kinyarwanda equivalent *mushiki wange* (my sister) is that the English lexeme sounds more significant than the Kinyarwanda equivalent, which is very rarely used in ordinary conversations and especially when addressing girls or women. In this case, the English phrase does not have the same dynamics as it would in an English speaking world.

The request of the service itself comes later after Visitor O has realised that Receptionist P is potentially ready to respond positively. In fact, it is also done in English through the lexeme 'service' rather than in Kinyarwanda to maintain the visitor's deference, on the one hand; and the receptionist's capacity to offer it, on the other hand. Therefore, making the marked choices in English indicates the attempt to establish sociability and reduce the social distance between the interlocutors.

The decrease of social distance may be also brought about by the speaker's attempt to win the interlocutor's empathy or attract his/her attention by switching codes. In the next example (16), a gentleman, Visitor P, would like to submit a claim to the lady receptionist of an insurance company. However, she is overwhelmed by a queue of customers at the desk and she is working alone for the moment. Visitor P is frustrated by the queue, and he starts asking if there may be another reception desk working. The receptionist's answer does not satisfy him, and he decides to go to the next step, which is begging the lady to kindly receive his file.

Visitor P speaks in Kinyarwanda as the unmarked choice first, and then switches to French and English as exploratory choices. According to Myers-Scotton's (1993b, 142) Exploratory Choice Maxim, the speaker tries to use more than one code with the hope of identifying one that will become the favourable choice and the index of a favourable RO set. In this case, Visitor P unsatisfactorily uses the French phrase *réception* (reception) in turn 1 and then goes to the English phrase 'excuse me madam' in turn 3. The switching from one code to another indexes the exploration of possibilities of gaining sympathy and attracting the receptionist's attention for quick assistance. Code-switching ignites the particular consideration of the visitor by Receptionist Q despite the queue of other customers in front of her desk. Her positive response 'Ok' indicates that she has acknowledged Visitor P's request. Moreover, uttering it in English also serves to maintain a kind of secrecy between the concerned interlocutors, especially in case it may potentially exclude other non-English speakers in the queue. The overall motivation is thus to win empathy and special attention.

The conversation goes as follows:

(16) Visitor P:

Ese iyi ni yo **réception** yonyine iri gukora?

‘This is the only reception working?’

Receptionist Q:

Oya, hari indi ariko bagiye mu nama [receiving different customers’ files and giving back stamped copies].

‘No, there is another, but they are in a meeting.’

Visitor P:

[After waiting a bit] *Excuse me madam*, mwanyakirira iyi **dossier** [raising hand and showing the file]?

‘Excuse me madam, could you receive this file?’

Receptionist Q:

Ok, zana ngusinyire.

‘Ok, bring it here and I will acknowledge reception.’

Nonetheless, the marked code-switching may serve in other cases to increase social distance between the interlocutors. The next example (17) portrays a short conversation held between a young lady, Visitor Q, and Receptionist R, who is also a Front Desk Assistant in a ministry in charge of internal security.

The conversation goes as follows:

(17) Visitor Q:

Hello!

Receptionist R:

Mwaramutse.

‘Good morning.’

Visitor Q:

Dushaka kujya muri *Department ya Legal*....[suspension].

‘We’d like to go to the Department of Legal’

Receptionist R:

Murambwira telefoni, umpe na *ID*.

‘Spell your phone number and give me your ID.’

Visitor Q:

Oooh! Zero seven eight eight.....[Spelling in English].

‘Oooh! Zero seven eight eight... .’

Despite the fact that Kinyarwanda is the unmarked code, which effectively facilitates the interaction, Visitor Q prefers to make a marked choice of English in her greeting form ‘hello’. This indicates her dis-identification with the expected RO set as explained by the Myers-Scotton’s (1993b) Marked Choice Maxim. The turns 3 and 5 contain switches to English namely; ‘department...legal...’ and the phone number ‘zero seven eight eight...’ spelt out in English as the marked choices. They result in widening the distance between the interlocutors with probable lack of cooperation.

Rather, Receptionist R’s responses remain in Kinyarwanda, the unmarked choice, trying to bring Visitor Q back to the expected RO set. This type of code-switching is similar to Gafaranga’s (2006, 2) ‘Parallel model’ where one speaker consistently uses language A (English) and the other consistently uses language B (Kinyarwanda) without any accommodation to the other party’s choice. Definitely, the use of the marked English is motivated by the visitor’s desire to frustrate the receptionist and to possibly prevent any interference in her agenda.

Code-switching further increases the social distance through the exclusion of outsiders for the purpose of confidentiality or secrecy. In this respect, speakers deliberately choose a code that excludes the out-group. It is the case in example (18) below where a demoted employee, Visitor R, after collecting his dismissal letter, inquires about formalities to meet the minister. Since there are cleaners around and they are considered as less proficient in English, the visitor intentionally switches to the exoglossic language, especially when he talks about important matters. Receptionist S, in return, tries to cooperate in order to prevent the people around drifting into the situation. The conversation is in Kinyarwanda as the base language and several switches to English and a little in French as the embedded languages.

(18) Visitor R:

Merci. Eeeh....*Minister* aboneka ryari se? *Appointment*, ko nshaka kuvugana na we? Ni ku mpamvu z'akazi, *service purposes*, uretse ko mubonye nakongeramo na ka *private*. Erega ubu nabaye *demoted* ntibyoro shyeye!

'Thanks. Eeeh... when does the Minister receive people? I'd like to talk to him. It's for service purposes but if I meet him, I shall add my private business. Indeed, it is hard, I was demoted.'

Receptionist S:

Sinabimenya, ariko nakwereka *Admin. Assistant* we ukamubaza. Hari igihe bandika cyangwa akaguha *phone number* ze ukamuhamagara [moving towards the door]. Ni hariya muri *one zero five*.

'I do not know, but I may direct you to his Administrative Assistant for details. Sometimes they write or you are given his number to call him. It's there in one zero five.'

Visitor R:

Ndamushaka *urgently* naho ubundi [suspension].

'I'd like to meet him urgently, otherwise....'

The French phrase *merci* (thanks) is uttered in recognition of the call for the letter made to him the previous day. The following switches to English, namely, 'minister', 'appointment', 'service purposes', 'private' and 'demoted' serve the purpose to try to hide the visitor's demotion and his plan to see the minister for deeper discussions which may also include begging his mercy. On his side, Receptionist S cooperates in keeping the secret, and this is the reason why he is not totally open while directing Visitor R to the 'Admin. Assistant' in room 'one zero five'. The highly marked choice of English for the sensitive contents serves the function of emphasising the gravity of the matter under discussion and then the need to keep it secret from the outsiders.

Definitely, the data analysed in this section and in conjunction with ideas from the focus group discussions relate to some of the findings from Myers-Scotton (1993b), Kamwangamalu (2010) and Gafaranga (2006), amongst other scholars. They testify that code-switching may express social distance between the speakers, and that function may be accomplished in the form of either inclusion or exclusion of a social group. This involves code-switching as a strategy for the creation of in-group, on the one hand, and out-group relationships, on the other hand.

4.3.5 Code-switching and relationship maintenance

Code-switching serves the purpose of maintaining good relationships and a rapport between the speakers. This happens especially when the speakers have become familiar with one another. Most times, this code-switching illustrates the Unmarked Choice Maxim where the speakers use multiple languages in their conversation. According to Myers-Scotton (1993b, 119), the maxim is effectively used in situations where the speakers, as bilingual peers, wish to symbolise dual memberships and the willingness to engage in code-switching. This mixing of codes may be felt by the speakers as a medium, which, according to Gafaranga (2001c, 508), is “an instance of monolingual talk from which speakers switch for functional effects” or “an instance of bilingual talk in which the alternate use of two languages is itself a norm”. Furthermore, the same motivation was confirmed by Gimode (2015, 131) when she referred to the code used by the teenagers among themselves in the Kangemi speech community.

The results from interviews and focus group discussions confirmed and exemplified the potential of code-switching to maintain relationships and rapport between speakers. The respondents highlighted examples from the youths’ and students’ conversations among themselves which are always full of switches from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili. The main purpose pointed out by many of them is the need to feel closer to one another and to exclude out-group people. As for code-switching encountered between colleagues, especially at workplaces, the respondents revealed the functional and professional relationships purposes. It suffices to note that this type of code-switching may reach the point where the speakers are not aware of the use of multiple codes but rather think of it as one code. The case is explained by Gafaranga (2001c, 508) through examples of code-switching from Kinyarwanda to French which, to a certain extent, is taken as a medium used by bilinguals. It is sometimes difficult to draw the line between code-switching as switching between two codes or as ‘one’ code i.e a type of mixed dialect in its own right.

The example (19) is taken from a conversation between two colleagues held at the reception of a ministry in charge of infrastructure. Receptionist T interacts with Visitor S who comes late to work because she left the office late the previous night. Their short talk, as colleagues, is in Kinyarwanda with switches to Kiswahili and English as unmarked choices.

(19) Visitor S:
Salama?
'How are you?'

Receptionist T:
'Salama. Aaah, waraye uvuye hano ryari?'
'Fine.When did you leave this place last evening?'

Visitor S:
Bugorobye, *around 6 o'clock*.
'Late in night, around 6 o'clock'.

Receptionist T:
Oooh ! Sorry my dear! None ugiye he?
'Oooh! Sorry my dear! Where are you going now?'

The greeting form *salama* (how are you) and the response *salama* (fine) in Kiswahili indicate that Visitor S and Receptionist T are familiar with one another. In turn 3 and turn 4, the respective English switches 'around 6 o'clock' and 'sorry my dear' indicate the level of friendship between the two speakers. Their interaction in Kinyarwanda and two exoglossic languages indicates that they know each other's proficiency in the languages. Socially speaking, the speakers' agreement on the languages used in their conversation has implications for signalling and maintaining their good relationships as bilingual peers and colleagues. This type of unmarked code-switching serves the purpose of symbolising dual membership and demonstrating the speakers' familiarity over a relatively long time.

In the next example (20), a gentleman, Visitor T, is looking for a staff member in charge of maintenance in the government department for social security. Unfortunately, the employee on duty was out of office. The lady, Receptionist U, takes time to explain to him the reason for her colleague's absence. Once satisfied, Visitor T takes the opportunity to ask additional questions related to formalities for registering his wife with the medical insurance scheme. The conversation is in Kinyarwanda and there are successive switches to French. Indeed, the speakers have become familiar with one another that they feel free to switch from a language to another as the unmarked choices.

The conversation goes as follows:

(20) Visitor T:

Pardon, reka noneho mbaze ibya **RAMA**.

‘Excuse me, let me ask now about medical insurance RAMA.’

Receptionist U:

Yeee.

‘Yes.’

Visitor T:

Harya iyo wari **célibataire** noneho ukaba **marié**, ntugomba kwandikisha na **madame**?

‘When you were single and then you get married, don’t you have to register your wife?’

Receptionist U:

Bien sûr, witwaza ifoto na **certificat de mariage** yo ku murenge.

‘Sure, you bring a photo and a marriage certificate from the Sector authority.’

In fact, Visitor T introduces his query by using a French singly occurring lexeme *pardon* (Excuse me) to indicate that he is bringing up another topic. The acronym *RAMA* stands for *La Rwandaise d’Assurance Maladie* (The Rwandan Medical Insurance Scheme) which is a branch of the Rwanda Social Security Board. The query itself is concerned with formalities related to the shift from the status of *célibataire* (single) to *marié* (married) and the subsequent registration of the *madame* (wife) in the medical insurance scheme. Receptionist U confirms that the visitor’s statement is true by using a French phrase *bien sûr* (sure). Further explanations are given to Visitor T with regard to the only requirement to bring a *certificat de mariage* (marriage certificate) issued by the local authority.

The multiple unmarked code-switching serves to signal professional relationships already tied between the speakers. This is demonstrated in the next example (21) where Receptionist V in an insurance company interacts with a gentleman, Visitor U, who submits a claim. Their conversation is held in Kinyarwanda as the unmarked choice with switches to English and French.

The conversation goes as follows:

- (21) Receptionist V:
Number za dosiye ni izihe ?
'What is the file number?'

Visitor U:
Ngizo [Showing the file registration number on top of the letter]. *Nishyuzaga trois millions.*
'Here there is. I claim three million.'

Receptionist V:
Reka nkurebere muri system [Checking on the computer].
'Let me check from the system.'

Visitor U:
Bari bambwiye ngo nzazane n'iyi accusé de réception.
'They told me to bring this copy with together with the acknowledgement of reception.'

The speakers have reached an agreement to check the progress of the file in the system, and Visitor U provides the necessary supporting information such as the file number, the amount claimed, which is *trois millions* (three million), and the *accusé de réception* (proof of file reception). As for Receptionist V, she fulfils her role of checking the status of the claim in the company Management Information System. The switching between the two codes is general practice and a sort of in-house jargon for professional purposes and it is another instance of what Myers-Scotton calls code-switching as an unmarked choice.

Another instance of code-switching between colleagues is given in the example (22) below. Two employees of a government agency for housing development discuss helping one another to accomplish an assignment. The conversation is in Kinyarwanda with switches to English and French as the embedded languages with some adapted words formed from the combination of English lexemes and Kinyarwanda morphemes.

The conversation goes as follows:

(22) Visitor V:

Ndaje umfashe *gusendinga* ya **dossier** ya **Sénat**.

‘I am coming and you will help me to send that file to the Senate.’

Receptionist W:

Iyihe?

‘Which one?’

Visitor V:

Ntiwibuka imwe waraye ukoreye *scanning* nimugoroba mbere yo gutaha?

‘Don’t you remember the one you scanned yesterday evening before leaving?’

Receptionist W:

Aaah, ndumva ikiri kuri *desktop*, ariko nayishyize no kuri *flash*.

‘Aaah, I think it is still on the desktop, but I have it also on a flash disk.’

Visitor V:

Turakoresha *outlook* ni yo ihita ikubwira ko yagezeyo

‘We will use outlook since it confirms delivery immediately.’

Particular attention should be paid to the English-Kinyarwanda adapted form *gusendinga* (sending) and other forms taken verbatim such as ‘scanning’, ‘desktop’, ‘flash’, ‘outlook’, *dosiye* (file) and *Sénat* (Senate). The embedded language singly occurring forms are commonly used in secretariat and public administration in general. The employees use the two codes as the unmarked choices and it is their typical code in the workplace and among themselves. The code mixing serves functional and familiarity purposes while it remains unmarked.

The final example (23) demonstrates that the expression of rapport through code-switching is especially made at the end of conversations where the speakers mix codes to show their satisfaction or gratitude. In fact, a gentleman, Visitor W, has submitted important correspondence to a government agency in charge of transport infrastructure, and there is a need for closer follow-up and feedback. Receptionist Y assures him that, within a short period of time, the response will be available. Moreover, she guarantees her assistance and cooperation any time it is needed. In return, the visitor expresses his anticipated gratitude using multiple codes.

The conversation is concluded as follows:

(23) Visitor W:
Okay, ubwo nzaza mbaze.
'Okay, I will come back later and ask.'

Receptionist Y:
Tuzagufasha rwose.
'We will help you.'

Visitor W:
Sawa, merci, mwirirwe.
'Fine, thanks, bye.'

The English phrase 'okay' in the first turn expresses the visitor's satisfaction of the good service rendered to him. This has also resulted into good relationships being established between the visitor and Receptionist Y. By the end of the conversation in turn 3, there is a proliferation of thanking forms including the Kiswahili *sawa* (fine) and the French *merci* (thanks). The particular case is the unmarked code-switching which emphasises the visitor's familiarity or sense of rapport with the interlocutor. The different codes are used here to emphasise his gratitude.

This section (4.3) focused on socio-pragmatic motivations for switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili among Rwandan bilingual speakers, and it constitutes the main thrust of the study. These motives are expressed through linguistic materials, which, according to Auer (1998, 169), constitute "a linguistic resource available to conversation participants" in order to engage, contextualise, adjust, keep on or stop their conversations for the purposes required.

The structural aspects of the examples examined in the Section 4.3 justify the fact that code-switching is of the insertional type with Kinyarwanda as the ML. The structural realisation of Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching is generally determined by the morphosyntax of Kinyarwanda as the base language. This may be tested through both the order and system relations between code-switching constituents that are realised according to the framework dictated by the ML and as explained by Myers-Scotton (1993a, 83) through the

Morpheme Order Principle and the System Morpheme Principle (see Appendix 3 for more details).

4.4 Conclusion

The chapter focused on the analysis of the corpus according to the theoretical framework adopted. The major part was concerned with the socio-pragmatic aspects of switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and Kiswahili among Rwanda bilingual speakers. Examples of code switched utterances were analysed with regard to their social motivations.

The analysis of individual examples demonstrated that switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and/or Kiswahili is not done at random, but rather serves as a strategy to maximize the benefits expected by the speakers. This is in line with Myers-Scotton's argument that code-switching enables the speakers to exploit the rights and obligations associated with the codes used.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 is the final part of this dissertation. The main aim of this chapter is to discuss the research findings presented in Chapter 4 and to evaluate the contributions made by the research to the field of sociolinguistics in general and code-switching in Rwanda in particular. This chapter also offers insights into potential directions for further research in code-switching.

5.2 Main findings of the study

The study aimed to bring to the fore social-based factors that influence the switching from Kinyarwanda to exoglossic languages such as English, French and Kiswahili as well as the structural features of these phenomena.

In the first chapter, a background to the study was provided so that the sociolinguistic factors that shape the sociolinguistic situation of Rwanda could be identified. A sociolinguistic profile of Rwanda was given where Kinyarwanda as a Bantu language coexists with other African languages and two ex-colonial languages which enjoy a prestigious status. The language policy and language dynamics in Rwanda were briefly reviewed from the pre-colonial period to the post-genocide times. Much more emphasis was given to the period after 1994 because of many changes that occurred in the socio-economic life of the country which have implications for the current sociolinguistic situation.

The literature reviewed in Chapter 2 presented different views about code-switching and its motivations. An overview of various theories that were put forward to explain the socio-pragmatic and structural aspects of code-switching was given. A significant part of this chapter was devoted to the work of Myers-cotton (1993b) on social motivations for code-switching. Her Markedness Model is based on the premise that linguistic choices are always motivated, dynamic and modifiable according to circumstances that arise during the conversation. In addition, code choices are made on the basis of costs and benefits, that she technically names Rights-and-Obligations (RO) sets between participants. Myers-Scotton further developed a series of

principles and notions applicable to different types of code-switching. These are the Unmarked Choice Maxim, the Marked Choice Maxim and the Exploratory Choice Maxim. They result in four subsequent types of code-switching such as code-switching as a sequence of unmarked choices, code-switching itself as the unmarked choice, code-switching as a marked choice and code-switching as an exploratory choice. This model was chosen as the principal framework within which the data, in this dissertation, was analysed.

The other theoretical approach developed by Myers-Scotton (1993a) is the MLF Model. It is concerned with the analysis of structural or grammatical patterns of code-switching. The model claims an asymmetrical relationship between languages involved in code-switching. There is the ML as the dominant language, on the one hand, and the EL as the less dominant language, on the other hand. From this dichotomy, Myers-Scotton identifies three interrelated types of constituents of code-switching such as the ML+EL constituents, the ML islands and the EL islands respectively.

A succinct summary of various studies on code-switching in Rwanda was given in order to point out what has been covered in the literature and then show its shortcomings. The study revealed that a small number of unpublished works tackled a few isolated aspects of code-switching, which evidenced that there is no real body of code-switching research in Rwanda. Another portion of code-switching research based on expatriate Rwandan speech community data was also considered. It is dominated by Gafaranga ((2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2007, 2010, 2012), whose research focuses especially on language alternation among Rwandan immigrants in Europe (see Section 2.7). Gafaranga's published works have some relevance, but do not address the situation in Rwanda itself.

The Rwandan researchers maintained that the motives for code-switching were more linguistic, interactional and communicative than socially-related. They also pointed out dominant linguistic structures in code-switching from Kinyarwanda to exoglossic languages such as the intrasentential, the intersentential and the extrasentential constructions. Their use depends on the speakers' level of proficiency in one or another EL (see Section 2.7). The current study

highlighted the gaps in the previous Rwandan code-switching research, especially in terms of the theoretical framework, types of data and socio-pragmatic aspects of code-switching.

The researcher in this study chose to adopt the Markedness Model as the main approach to explain socio-pragmatic motivations for code-switching among Rwandan bilingual speakers. A brief overview of the MLF Model was also added to help explain the structural aspects in which the social motivations are expressed.

The data were collected through ethnographic non-participant observation, oral interviews, focus group discussions and shorthand notes techniques. The research participants included Receptionists and Visitors in different public and private institutions located in Kigali City. They were observed in their casual interactions, and some of them responded to interview questions. Moreover, a group of university students were involved in focus group discussions which gave more background insights about social motivations for code-switching based on real life experiences.

Twenty three selected examples were extracted from the conversations recorded in different settings of the study area for the analysis of social motivations for code-switching among the Rwandan bilingual speakers. They were grouped in five main clusters, namely, educated status; expression of different social identities; demonstration of measures of power, authority and prestige; narrow or wide social distance; and maintenance of relationships (see Section 4.3).

5.3 Discussion of results

The explanatory framework of the socio-pragmatic aspects of the study was directed by the Markedness Model. The study adds to a large body of literature in the area of code-switching. The results indicated that code-switching is often an indicator of the educated status. It is taken as a marker of social achievements related to education which is expressed through the purposeful use of Kinyarwanda with English, French or Kiswahili. Through the history of Rwanda, the exoglossic languages have been at the same time the languages of education and prestige. Thus, speaking even a little of one of these exoglossic languages is an indicator that the speaker has or aspires to a certain level of education.

The speakers' code-switching is also seen as a marker of identity. People have different social experiences and languages offer to them opportunities and the potential to redefine themselves and define their interlocutors vis-à-vis the values assigned to the languages used. Code-switching is seen as a tool for the Rwandan bilingual speakers to identify themselves as people of high status, up-to-date, modern and knowledgeable, with a trans-border citizenship, and having different linguistic and socio-historical backgrounds. This has led to the creation of “an identity of successful achiever”, as posited by Agundiade et al. (2013, 47).

Another major motivation for code-switching is the expression of authority, power or prestige. This is supported by Fairclough (1989, 17), who put forward the idea that language is a social practice and thus is “centrally involved in power”. In Rwanda, the exoglossic languages have been perceived to hold a position of power as a result of the colonial heritage. The study showed that speakers signal the allegiance to different aspects of power and authority when they switch from the mother tongue Kinyarwanda. Special attention is currently drawn to the switching to English because of its politically sensitive nature associated with both its elite speakers, powerful English-speaking countries, globalisation trend and the current technology divide.

It was seen, in this study, that code-switching is often used for the purposes of increasing or decreasing social distance. This type of code-switching depends on how the speakers consider one another in terms of social networks engaged in or to be created. Code-switching is thus taken as a strategy for the creation of in-group relationships, on the one hand, and out-group relationships, on the other hand. The languages, thus, play the role in excluding and/or including one or all the interlocutors. This is often observed when the speakers want to keep a secret, discuss restricted issues, or simply exclude outsiders (see Section 4.3.3).

Within the multilingual community, Rwandan bilingual speakers also use unmarked code-switching to maintain relationships and rapport among them. The speakers, as bilingual peers, resort to exoglossic languages when they wish to symbolise dual memberships, to effectively respond to the needs to feel closer to one another, or to signal functional and professional relationships.

It is important to highlight that, throughout the analysis and interpretation of the findings, the Markedness Model as the adopted analytical framework enabled the researcher to confirm the assumption that, from a repertoire of choices, the Rwandan bilingual speakers use Kinyarwanda, English, French and Kiswahili as a response to their own needs in real life situations.

5.4 Impact of the study on sociolinguistic research

The main achievement of this study is the identification of the social motivations that prompt the Rwandan bilingual speakers to code-switch from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili in their casual conversations in real-life situations. In the light of Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model, switching of codes signals that Rwandan bilingual speakers resort to the use of exoglossic languages to indicate social statuses and identities. These code-switches were also identified as measures of power and authority, and social relationship-based dimensions aspired to.

Considering the status of code-switching research in Rwanda as earlier explained in Section 2.7, and from where it was revealed that little has been covered; it could be argued that, in a sense, the current study is really ground-breaking research. It has come to fill the gap and to add to other scholars' insights about code-switching in Rwanda. In fact, most research activities focused on interactional and communicative motives of code-switching while they gave less consideration of the socio-pragmatic aspects. The present study has therefore adopted an orientation in line with Trudgill's (1974, 32) assertion that "a study of language totally without [or with less] reference to its social context inevitably leads to the omission of some of the more complex and interesting aspects of language and to the loss of opportunities for further theoretical progress".

This study has presented evidence to confirm that the Myers-Scotton's analytical framework is appropriate for the analysis of the Rwandan corpus. On the one hand, the Markedness Model, extensively applied in the African context, enabled the processing of data with regard to social motives that bring about code-switching in the Rwandan society.

5.5 Recommendations for future research

The study focused on the analysis of social motivations for code-switching among the Rwandan bilingual speakers. Its scope was limited to code-switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French and Kiswahili in different institutional settings of Kigali, the capital city of Rwanda. Besides, its data was analysed in one particular framework. Other researchers could build on this work in order to extend the scope to a larger sample, on a broader scale, or even consider other language contact phenomena such as speech accommodation, language shift and maintenance.

In addition, in the process of research, different observations and attitudes towards code-switching in Rwanda have been mentioned here and there. Some respondents pointed out the potential negative impact of code-switching especially to the integrity of Kinyarwanda. These respondents' observations align with the prescriptive point of view as reported by Ndikumwami (1998, 34) in considering code-switching as “uprooting, drying and burning the roots of Rwandan crops” and a “hybrid plant” assimilated to the language variety resulting from switching from Kinyarwanda to exoglossic languages. Further cases of this view were reported by Gafaranga (2007), who refers to the use of biased labels, such as ‘Kinyenglish’ and ‘Kinyafrançais’. This is another area which researchers could explore since no proper scientific research on attitudes towards code-switching in Rwanda has been done yet.

Lastly, in a multilingual environment like Rwanda, it is not surprising to come across the code-switching phenomenon in education. During focus group discussions, some respondents indicated that the use of code-switching in classrooms is a common phenomenon. On the one hand, the phenomenon is taken as normal and natural when teaching in multilingual settings. On the other hand, it is looked at as a breach of the policy on the language of instruction, especially as far as English is concerned. Stakeholders in education diverge on whether code-switching should be frowned upon or encouraged in classroom. This is another debate which calls for the attention of researchers. This problem could be examined from the perspective of policies and better intergroup communication.

5.6 Conclusion

On the whole, this study has presented some interesting examples of code-switching and revealed a range of social motivations for code-switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili among the Rwandan bilingual speakers in their casual conversations in real-life situations. It is hoped that the findings of this research will be useful to researchers concerned with code-switching in Rwanda and will encourage further research on this topic.

REFERENCES

- Agundiade, O.M., Obiyan, M.O. and Sogbaike, G.B. 2013. Identity construction and gender involvement in alien social networks among undergraduates in 2 universities, Southwest Nigeria. *Inkanyiso: The Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 5(1): 41-52.
- Auer, J.C.P. 1984. *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Baker, H. 2009. Speed Writing, the 21st century alternative to Shorthand, a training course with easy exercises for faster writing in just 6 hours with the innovative BakerWrite™ system and internet links published by Universe of Learning Ltd, reg number 6485477, Lancashire, UK. www.UoLearn.com (accessed 15 August 2016).
- Baldauf Jr., R. B. 2006. Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7: 147-170.
- Belazi, H.M., Rubin, E.J. and Toribio, A.J. 1994. Code Switching and X-Bar Theory: The Functional Head Constraint. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25 (2): 221-237.
- Blom, J.P. and J.J. Gumperz. 1972. Social meaning in structure: Code-switching in Norway. In *Direction of sociolinguistics*, ed. J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, 402-434. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Boeije, A. 2010. *Analysis in qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Chung, S. 2008. Language Preference, Use, and Ethnic Identities of Korean-English Bilinguals. <http://pocketknowledge.tc.columbia.edu/home.php/viewfile/download/111428>. (accessed 12 September 2016).

Coulmas, F. (2005). *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ethnologue. <http://www.ethnologue.com/country/RW/Languages> (accessed 20 October 2016).

Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and power*. London: Longman.

Fawcett, A. 2011. *Becoming Rwandan: A dialogue of national identity*. Oxford University. <http://www.rsq.oxfordjournals.org> (accessed 25 January 2011).

Ferguson, C.A. 1972. *Language structure and language use*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Fishman, J.A. 1972. *Language in sociocultural change*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gafaranga, J. 2000. Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 4 (3): 327–350.

Gafaranga, J. 2001a. Linguistic identities in talk-in-interaction: Order in bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1901-1925.

Gafaranga, J. 2001b. Direct speech reporting and code-switching in bilingual conversation: Kinyarwanda-French language alternation. *Actas Do i Simposio Internacional Sobre o Bilingualismo*. 515-527.

Gafaranga, J. 2001c. Code-switching, code-mixing or Kinyarwanda for all practical purposes: The base language issue. *Actas Do i Simposio Internacional Sobre o Bilingualismo*. 504-514.

Gafaranga, J. 2007. Code-switching as a conversational strategy. In *Handbook of multilingualism and multilingual communication*, ed. P. Auer and Li Wei, 279-313. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gafaranga, J. 2007. *Talk in Two Languages*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gafaranga, J. 2010. Medium request: Talking language shift into being. *Language in Society* 39 (2): 241-270.

Gafaranga, J. 2012. Language alternation and conversational repair in bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16 (4): 501-527.

Gafaranga, J., Niyomugabo, C and V. Uwizeyimana. 2013. Micro declared language policy or not: language policy-like statements in the rules of procedure of the Rwandan Parliament. *Language Policy* 21(4): 313-332.

Gal, S. 1979. *Language shift*. New York: Academic Press.

Gimode, J.K. 2015. A socio-pragmatic and structural analysis of code-switching among the Logoli speech community of Kangemi, Nairobi, Kenya. PhD dissertation, University of South Africa, Pretoria.

Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech arts*. Ed. Cole et al. 41-58. London: Elsevier.

Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D. 1972. *Direction in sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Guthrie, M. 1948. *The classification of the Bantu languages*. London, New York & Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Habyarimana, H. 2014. Investigation of attitudes and classroom practices of educators and learners in relation to English as the medium of instruction at four primary schools in Rwanda. PhD dissertation. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

- Hakorimana, J. P. 2003. Etude sociolinguistique de l'alternance de codes chez les militaires des Forces Rwandaises de Défense [A sociolinguistic analysis of code alternation among soldiers of the Rwanda Defence Forces]. BA dissertation, National University of Rwanda, Butare.
- Haydon, J. and Pinon, R. 2010. Language for Individuals and Societies: Quantitative Indicators from Cameroon, Nigeria, Rwanda, Bangladesh and Pakistan. Report compiled by Euromonitor International for the British Council, London, UK.
- Heine, B. and Nurse, D. eds. 2000. *African languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herbert, R.K. 1992. *Language and society in Africa: The theory and practice of sociolinguistics*. Cape Town: WUP.
- Hurtado, N. M. 2002. Code-switching as a communicative and conceptual tool in the classroom discourse of bilingual students. PhD thesis, University of California.
- Hymes, D. 1972. On communication competence. In *Sociolinguistics*, ed. J.R. Pride and D. Holmes, 269-293. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ifechelobi, J. 2015. Code switching: a variation in language use. *Mgbakoigba: Journal of African Studies* 4:1-7.
- Juchem, M. 2003. "W. Labov: Case Study Martha's Vineyard and New York". https://www.google.rw/?gws_rd=cr&ei=9ktnWdOHL4LeUdmqnegL#q=%E2%80%9CW.+Labov:+Case+Study+Martha%E2%80%99s+Vineyard+and+New+York%E2%80%9D. (accessed 13 June 2017).
- Kabanza, F. 2003. Redynamisation du bilinguisme précoce au Rwanda [Revitalisation of early bilingualism in Rwanda]. MA dissertation, Université de Rouen, Rouen.

- Kamwangamalu, N. M. 2010. Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. In *Sociolinguistics and language education*, ed. Hornbeger, N. H. and S. Lee McKay, 116-142. Salisbury: UK.
- Karekezi, E. 1989. Code-switching among Kinyarwanda-English bilingual social groups in Rwanda: A sociolinguistic perspective. BA dissertation, National University of Rwanda, Ruhengeri.
- Kieswetter, A. 1995. *Code-switching amongst African High School pupils*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Kothari, C.R. 2004. *Research methodology: Methods and techniques (2nd edition)*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- Labov, W. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. 1978. Crossing the gulf between sociology and sociolinguistics. *The American Sociologist* 13: 93-103.
- Levine, G.S. 2011. *Code choices in the language classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- MacSwan, J. 2004. Code-switching and grammatical theory. In *The handbook of bilingualism*, eds. T. Bhatia and W. Ritchie, 283-303. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- MacSwan, J. 2005. Codeswitching and generative grammar: A critique of the MLF model and some remarks on “modified minimalism”. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 8 (1):1-22.

- MacSwan, J. 2005. Précis of minimalist approach to intrasentential code-switching. *Rivista di Linguistica* 17 (1): 55-92.
- McGreal, C. 2008. Rwanda to switch from French to English in schools. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/oct/14/rwanda-france>. (accessed 12 September 2016).
- Meeuwis, M. and Blommaert, J. 1994. The 'Markedness Model' and the absence of society: Remarks on codeswitching. *Multilingua* 13-4: 387-423.
- Mesthrie, R., J. Swan, A. Deumert and W.L. Leap., eds. 2000. *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Milroy, P. and P. Muysken., eds. 1995. *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MINEAC. 2012. *Annual report 2011-12*. Kigali.
- MINECOFIN. 2014. *Fourth Population and Housing Census, Rwanda, 2012: Thematic Report Education characteristics of the population*. Kigali: National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda.
- MINEDUC. 1996. *Report of Workshop Seminar on Revising and Harmonizing the Teaching Programmes for Primary Schools*. Kigali.
- MINICAAF. 2016. Decisions of Cabinet Meeting held on 12th October 2016. <http://www.primature.gov.rw>. (accessed 2 November 2016).
- Moodley, V. 2003. Language attitudes and code-switching behaviour of facilitators and learners in Language, literacy and communication senior phase outcomes-based education classrooms. PhD dissertation. University of Natal, Durban.

- Mugenda, O.M. and Mugenda, A.G. 2003. *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi: ACTS Press.
- Munyazikwiye, M. 2003. A sociolinguistic analysis of code-switching in some Kinyarwanda political speeches. BA dissertation, National University of Rwanda, Butare.
- Muttabazi, C.B. 2002. Codeswitching in political discourse in Tanzania: A case study of parliamentary proceedings. PhD dissertation. University of Virginia.
- Mutwarasibo, F. 2003. Dual-Medium Language of Instruction Policy and Practices in Rwandan Higher Education: A Case study of the National University of Rwanda. MA dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993a. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993b. *Social motivations for code-switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. and Bolonyai, A. 2001. Calculating Speakers: Code switching in a Rational Choice Model. *Language in Society* 30 (1):1-28.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 2002. *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Namba, K. 2002. An overview of Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model. Tokai University. <http://www.yayoi.senri.ed.jp/research/re09/namba.pdf>. (accessed 5 September 2016).
- Ndikumwami, J. D. 1998. The influence of English in the Rwandan military speech community. A sociolinguistic approach. BA dissertation, National University of Rwanda, Butare.

- Niyibizi, E. 2010. An Evaluation of the Rwandan Trilingual Policy in some Nursery and primary Schools in Kigali City. MA dissertation. University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Niyibizi, E. 2014. Foundation phase learners' and teachers' attitudes and experiences with the Rwandan language-in-education policy shifts. PhD dissertation. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Niyomugabo, C. 2008. La Glottopolitique du KIE/Rwanda: Contribution à une Sociolinguistique Educative [Glottopolitics of KIE/Rwanda: contribution to an educational sociolinguistics]. PhD thesis. Université de Lome, Rouen.
- Niyomugabo, C. 2015. Dynamique des langues au Rwanda [Dynamics of languages in Rwanda]. *Séminaire sur le plurilinguisme : pluralité des enjeux, pluralité des approches* [Seminar on multilingualism : plurality of issues, plurality of approaches]. Kigali.
- Ntakirutimana, E. 2010. Le français au Rwanda [French in Rwanda]. *Revue du Réseau des Observatoires du Français Contemporain en Afrique* 25: 19-31.
- Nurse, D. 2006. Bantu Languages. In *Concise Encyclopaedia of Languages of the World*. ed. K. Brown and S. Oglivie, 679-685. St. John's: Elsevier Ltd.
- Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.
- Republic of Rwanda. 2015. The constitution of the Republic of Rwanda of 2003 revised in 2015. Kigali: Government Printer.
- Samuelson, B. L. and Freedman, S. W. 2010. Language Policy, Multilingual Education, and Power in Rwanda. *Language Policy* 9: 191-215.
- Silverman, D. 2005. *Doing qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.

- Sinclair, J.K. and Kramer, C. 2012. English in Rwanda: Inevitability meets obstacles on the ground.http://www.academia.edu/4739064/English_in_Rwanda_Inevitability_meets_obstacles_on_the_ground. (accessed 12 September 2016).
- Spicker, P. 2007. Research without consent. *Social research UPDATE* 51:1-4.
- Steflja, I. 2012. The High Costs and Consequences of Rwanda's Shift in Language Policy from French to English. *The Africa Portal backgrounder series* 30:1-10.
- Trudgill, P. 1974. *Sociolinguistics: an introduction to language and society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- UNDP. 2006. *UNDP Rwanda annual report 2006*. Kigali.
- Wardhaugh, R. 1986. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Wei, L. 1998. The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In P. Auer (ed.). *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. 156-76. London: Routledge.
- Wei, L. 2005. "How can you tell?" Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37:375-389.
- Wei, L. 2016. Bilingual Cognitive Faculty and Pragmatic Markedness in Code-switching. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 3(1): 1-11.

APPENDIX 1

Interview protocol

1. Twagiye twumva abantu baza hano bavuga Ikinyarwanda ariko bakavanga n'indimi z'amahanga nk' icyongereza, Igifaransa n'Igiswahili; ubona ari ukubera izihe mpamvu?
'We have been hearing people here mix Kinyarwanda with exoglossic languages like English, French or Kiswahili. According to you, what could be reasons behind this?'
2. Uko mujya mubibona, hari *category* y'abantu runaka bakunda kuvanga indimi?
'As per your experience, is there any category of people who mostly mix languages?'
3. Uretse kuvuga icyo umuntu ashaka, hari inyungu idasanzwe mubona yaba iri mu kuvanga Ikinyarwanda n'indimi z'amahanga?
'Apart from communication, could be there any other special purpose pursued in mixing Kinyarwanda with exoglossic languages?'
4. Ni ibisanzwe ko ababagana bavuga Ikinyarwanda. Ariko se icyo umuntu aje avuga ashyiramo indimi z'amahanga, hari icyo bihindura ku myifatire yawe kuri we ?
'It is commonplace for your customers to speak in Kinyarwanda. Could be there any change of attitudes, on your behalf, when visitors switch to exoglossic languages?'
5. Ubu hariho ibintu byo kwagura amarembo nka East African Community, regional integration na globalization. Ese hari aho bihuriye n'ibi tuvuga byo kuvanga indimi?
'We are currently experiencing these matters of free movement, East African community, regional integration and globalization. Do they have any relationship with mixing languages?'
6. Ese mubona kuvanga indimi z'amahanga hari aho bihuriye n'ibi bita kuba Umunyarwanda usobanutse?
'Do you find any relationship between mixing languages and being an up-to-date or knowledgeable Rwandan?'
7. Mubona kuvanga indimi z'amahanga ari byiza ku buryo byaba promoted cyangwa ni bibi ku buryo twabirwanya?
'Do you think mixing languages is good so that it may be promoted or bad and should be banned?'

APPENDIX 2

Focus group discussion protocol

1. What do participants understand by code alternation and code-switching?
2. Are there any examples of Kinyarwanda-English, French or Kiswahili code-switching the participants have encountered in their everyday life situations (at workplace, in the classroom, at home, in meetings, etc)?
3. Do speakers code-switch consciously or unconsciously? Give examples.
4. In cases where code-switching is done willingly and consciously, what could be the motivation? Give examples.
5. Through switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili; what kind of image do Rwandan bilingual speakers portray to their interlocutors?
6. Is there any relationship between code-switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili with regional integration, internationalisation, or globalisation?
7. What types of code-switching (intersentential, intrasentential, emblematic) are mostly used by the speakers? Give examples.
8. What are the audience's attitudes (negative or positive) towards Kinyarwanda-English, French or Kiswahili code-switching?
9. Focus group additional input regarding motivations for Kinyarwanda-English, French or Kiswahili code-switching with a focus on socially-related motives.

APPENDIX 3

Some structural analyses of Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching

This appendix gives some examples of the structural aspects of the Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching. The purpose is to help readers not so familiar with Kinyarwanda to understand the forms which mould the socio-pragmatic motivations analysed in the Section 4.3. The data is analysed according to the MLF Model posited by Myers-Scotton's work (1993a), as it was earlier discussed in Section 2.3.1.

1.1 Matrix Language and Embedded Language:

In the following examples (24), (25) and (26), Kinyarwanda is the ML and the ELs are English, French and Kiswahili respectively:

- (24) Visitor H:
Mwiriwe [very confident], *Director wa housing* arimo?
'Good afternoon, is the Director of housing in?'
- (25) Receptionist H:
Oya, wenda icyo utashobora ni ukuba **animateur**, ariko wajya ukora nka **commentaires, amaritiques**....
'No, perhaps you may not be a presenter, but rather may be a commentator, a critic...'
- (26) Receptionist H:
Karibu namwe muze tubakire.
'Welcome to the next.'

Example (24) contains two English singly occurring EL elements, 'director' and 'housing'. Both are content morphemes which are used to name the person of high status. In (25), there are three singly occurring EL elements, *animateur* (presenter), *commentaires* (comments) and *critiques* (critiques) in French. In (26), the EL element is in Kiswahili, namely *karibu* (welcome), and it is a content morpheme used by the receptionist to welcome the visitor.

1.2 EL islands

In examples (27), (28) and (29), EL islands are constructed according to the grammar of the original languages. According to Myers-Scotton (1993a, 491), such EL islands are “well-formed constituents made entirely of EL morphemes”.

(27) Receptionist J:

Nta kundi keretse ukoze **dans ce sens**, ugasaba urukiko akaba ari rwo ruza gusaba iyo *information*. **C'est tout!**

‘There is not any other alternative except proceeding in that way; you shall request the court to ask the information. That’s all.’

(28) Receptionist C:

With pleasure. [Talking to the visitor] Yizane!

‘With pleasure. Bring it please!’

(29) Receptionist Q:

Sawa, karibuni tena.

‘Fine, welcome again.’

The French segments *dans ce sens* (in that way) and *c'est tout* (that’s all) in (27) are well-formed expressions embedded in the ML, Kinyarwanda, as EL islands. Example (28) contains an English phrase ‘with pleasure’. The well-formed expression is an EL island since it is taken from English and integrated verbatim in Kinyarwanda. In (29), the whole structure is in Kiswahili as the EL island. At the beginning of the clause, there is *sawa* (fine) which expresses satisfaction. The polite invitation *karibuni tena* (welcome again) follows and, then, puts an end to the utterance.

1.3 Inflectional morphology and noun & verb adaptation

In inflectional morphology, noun adaptation and verb adaptation, agreement relations between the system morpheme and the content morpheme come from the ML.

a. Noun adaptation

Examples (30), (31) and (32) are indicative of adapted nouns:

(30) Visitor I:

Ni iya mbere, izo uriho ni *amattachments*.
 ‘It’s the first one, those you see are attachments.’

(31) Receptionist L:
 Ushaka se kuzaba **umujournaliste**?
 ‘Would you like to be a journalist?’

(32) Visitor K:
 Uzanye iby’abasaza rero nibwo ubabuze! **Abajeunes** bakunda **chaud chaud**!
 ‘If you focus on old people’s interest, you miss the youth. They like hot news!’

The table below gives a detailed analysis of the adaptations:

Original noun	Augment	Class marker	Base/root	Number marker	Adapted noun
Attachments	<i>a-</i> (plural)	<i>-ma-</i> (CL 6)	-attachment-	-s (plural)	<i>Amattachments</i> (Vowel coalescence applied)
<i>Journaliste</i> ‘Journalist’	<i>u-</i> (singular)	<i>-mu-</i> (CL 1)	<i>-journaliste-</i>	-∅ (absence/ singular)	<i>Umujournaliste</i>
<i>Jeunes</i> ‘Youth’	<i>a-</i> (plural)	<i>-ba-</i> (CL 2)	<i>-jeune-</i>	-s (plural)	<i>Abajeunes</i>

b. Conjugated verb adaptation

Examples (33), (34) and (35) are indicative of conjugated verb adaptations:

(33) Receptionist K:
 None *procurement* **yaraberiminnye** ngo ntibyuzuye?
 ‘Now, you were have been rejected by the procurement because it is not complete?’

(34) Visitor J:
 No, **turareklama** natwe twagombaga kuba *shortlisted* ... tugapiganwa.
 ‘No, we appeal as we should have been shortlisted....for competition.’

(35) Visitor Y:
 Murakoze, ubwo turategereje, ariko mudusayidire kabisa.
 ‘Thanks, we shall wait, but please help us.’

The table below gives a detailed analysis of the adaptations:

No	Original verb in infinitive	Subject pronoun/Infinitive marker	Tense marker	Object marker/Reflexive pronoun	Verb stem	Object marker	Aspect marker	Adapted verb
1	<i>Eliminer</i> (To reject)	<i>a-</i> (3 rd person singular)	<i>-a-ra-</i> (Past)	<i>-ba-</i> (3 rd person plural)	<i>-élimin-</i>	-	<i>-ye</i> (Perfective)	<i>yaraberiminye</i> (Vowel harmony applied)
2	<i>Réclamer</i> (To claim)	<i>tu-</i> (1 st person plural)	<i>-ra-</i> (Present)	-	<i>-réclam-</i>	-	<i>-a</i> (Imperfective)	<i>turareklama</i>
3	<i>Kusaidia</i> (To help)	<i>mu-</i> (2 nd person plural)	-	<i>-tu-</i> (1 st person plural)	<i>-saidi-</i>	<i>-ir-</i> (Applicative)	<i>-e</i> (Imperative)	<i>mudusayidire</i> (Vowel harmony applied)

c. Infinitive verb adaptation

Examples (36) and (37) are indicative of infinitive verbal form adaptations:

(36) Receptionist J:

Aaah, ni byo [reading for seconds].

Mwashakaga *kurennyuwinga Operating Licence?*

‘It’s true’.

‘You’d like to renew the Operating Licence?’

(37) Visitor Z:

Kera nigeze kujya muri *workshop*, nkorera i Butare njyewe, noneho abantu bakora *presentation-kwiprezanta*.

‘Long time ago I went to a workshop, I currently work at Butare, and the participants had to introduce to one another.’

The table below gives a detailed analysis of the adaptations:

No	Original verb in infinitive	Infinitive marker	Object marker/Reflexive pronoun	Verb stem	Suffix	Aspect marker	Adapted verb
4	To renew	<i>ku-</i>	-	<i>-renew-</i>	<i>-ing-</i> (Gerund form)	<i>-a</i>	<i>kureniyuwinga</i> (Vowel harmony applied)
5	<i>Présenter</i> (To present)	<i>ku-</i>	<i>-i-</i>	<i>-present-</i>	-	<i>-a</i>	<i>kwiprezanta</i> (Vowel harmony applied)

1.4 Double morphology

The case of ‘Double morphology’ is very important in the System Morpheme Principle. Bokamba (1988) defines it out as “double plural” with double plural affixes, where there are both the prefix marking the ML plural and the suffix marking the EL plural, the noun stem being in the EL. The lexeme *abajeunes* (young people) in (38) illustrates double morphology very well. Kinyarwanda is the ML and French is the EL in this example.

- (38) Visitor K:
 Reka ndashaje! Ibyo ni iby’**abajeunes**.
 ‘No, I’m too old! This is for Young people.’

System morphemes come from both languages to construct the content morpheme *abajeunes* (youth) as follows: *a-* is the Kinyarwanda plural noun prefix, *-ba-* is the Kinyarwanda plural class prefix for CL 2, *-jeune-* is the French stem and *-s* is the French plural suffix.

1.5 Application of the MLF hypotheses

In Section 2.3.1, four interrelated hypotheses, namely the ML Hypothesis, (the Blocking Hypothesis, the EL Island Trigger Hypothesis and the EL Implicational Hierarchy Hypothesis were discussed with reference to Myers-Scotton (1993a, 7). They make predictions of how code-switching materials are built in utterances.

Example (39) illustrates the ML Hypothesis:

(39) Receptionist L:

Yego ni *generations* zitandukanye, ariko iyo **majorité** yawe ibaye **jeunesse** ugomba gushaka ibyo bakunda.

‘Yes, generations are different, but when the majority of your audience is the youth, you must meet their interest.’

The singly occurring switches, namely the English lexeme ‘generations’, the French *majorité* (majority) and *jeunesse* (youth) are constructed like the ML content morphemes. They are therefore assigned roles and noun classes, CL 10 and CL 9, respectively. The agreement relationships between the EL morphemes, the verb and modifiers follow the structural frame of Kinyarwanda.

Example (40) illustrates the Blocking hypothesis:

(40) Receptionist S:

Sinabimenya, ariko nakwereka *Admin. Assistant* we ukamubaza. Hari igihe bandika cyangwa akaguha *phone number ze* ukamuhamagara [moving towards the door]. Ni hariya muri *one zero five*.

‘I do not know, but I may direct you to his Administrative Assistant for details. Sometimes they write or you are given his number to call him. It’s there in one zero five.’

According to Myers-Scotton (1993a, 121), the Blocking Hypothesis thwarts any occurrence of an EL content morpheme in case “it is not congruent with an ML content morpheme counterpart” in terms of the thematic role assigned to. Thus, in example (40) above, the English phrase ‘phone number’ is articulated in the singular according to English logic which takes all digits of the telephone number as one unit. Nevertheless, the logic in Kinyarwanda is different, since it considers the individual digits as separate units making a group of numbers. This is the reason why the possessive modifier *ze* (his) of ‘phone number’ is in CL10 as a plural noun class.

Example (41) illustrates the EL Island Trigger Hypothesis:

(41) Visitor U:

Ngizo [Showing the file registration number on top of the letter]. Nishyuzaga **trois millions**.

‘Here there is. I claim three million.’

According to Myers-Scotton (1993a, 142), “it predicts where exactly EL islands must occur”. The sentence contains an EL island, *trois millions* (three million), which has a quantifier *trois* (three) as part of the phrase. Because *trois* (three) is a system morpheme and it is accessed, there is not any other way to integrate it in Kinyarwanda-French code-switching except to maintain it in the EL island. Other permutations provided by the MLF Model are not possible since they would not result in well-formed expressions according to the EL structure.

Examples (42), (43) and (44) illustrate the EL Implicational Hypothesis:

(42) Receptionist T:

Oooh ! Sorry my dear! None ugiye he?

‘Oooh! Sorry my dear! Where are you going now?’

(43) Receptionist U:

Bien sûr, witwaza ifoto na **certificat de mariage** yo ku murenge.

‘Sure, you bring a size photo and a marriage certificate from the Sector authority.’

(44) Receptionist K:

So, Pole sana! Nimubabaze ubwo bazababwira impamvu.

‘Very sorry! Please ask them and perhaps they shall tell you the reason.’

According to Myers-Scotton’s (1993a, 144), EL islands are fully-fledged expressions integrated in the ML according to the extrasentential type of code-switching. The formulaic expressions such as the English ‘sorry my dear’ in (42), the French *bien sûr* (sure) in (43) and Kiswahili *pole sana* (very sorry) in (44) function as the EL islands which may be found in many other similar contexts. They are fully-fledged forms from their respective ELs and integrated verbatim in the ML Kinyarwanda.

APPENDIX 4

1. Sample interactional data

A. Original data

MIMINERA 18/12/15 AM

main ideas	details & explanations
T: <u>buza</u> R ↔	Receptionist m. 30yrs + 3 technicians + tools uniform
T: tuje burba Rytala	
R: ? iki?	- Greetings i- Rze
T: Kmi EDO → gutera flat sera muri mtg sera	- Copied &!
R: ? amiri → ugira alate lose binyo? - ata we ndaye !!	- hesitation
T: amambukho gashira? nta phoe los yadubye	- Collapsing as talking for a while.
R: OK - yashatse, aka → etage landafasha	- loss n' alate mise
T: U? fon?	
R: ✓	- going with satisfaction
T: Sana, Rze	
	<u>Enbl</u> : phoe, fon, bora, Kmi
	OR: etage
	Su: Sana
<u>SYMBOLS USED:</u>	
T: Technician	
R: Receptionist	
↔ greeting one another	
?: To ask a question "what"	
Kmi: Company	
→ going to do...	
sera: screen	
mtg: meeting	
→ bigger and bigger	
bor: boss	
U: fon	
✓: yes	
Rze = thanks	

B. Transcribed data

Visitor M: Mwaramutse?

‘Good morning?’

Receptionist N: Mwaramutse.

‘Good morning.’

Visitor M: Twari tuje kureba Kayitaba.

‘We’d like to see Mr. Kayitaba.’

Receptionist N: Mu biki?

‘What about?’

Visitor M: Ni *company* yitwa *EDO Ltd*, twari tuje kumanika *flat screen* muri *meeting room*.

‘It’s a company called EDO Ltd, we’d like to install a flat screen in the meeting room.’

Receptionist N: Ya yindi nini cyane, wagirango abantu bose bakwirwamo? Nta we nabonye ubanza adahari.

‘That very big one, you may think all people can fit in? I did not see him, perhaps he is not around.’

Visitor M: Mwamuduhamagarira? Nta *phone* ye boss yaduhaye.

‘Could you please call him for us? Our boss did not give us his number, but they talked.’

Receptionist N: *Okay*, reka mubaze numve. [calling him for a moment]. Ngo yasohotse, ariko mujye muri **étage** ya kane, murebe abarimo babafashe.

‘Okay, let me call him [Calling him for a moment]. He says he is out, but you go to the 4th floor and they will help you.’

Visitor M: Muri kane, *four*?

‘To the fourth floor?’

Receptionist N: Yego.

‘Yes.’

Visitor M: Sawa murakoze.

‘Fine, thanks.’

6 Ese mulana buranga indimi 2 amahanga hari
aho kubonye niba leta kuba umunyaho usohamye?
Cfr R 3

7 mulana buranga indimi anayaza cyamubu kubonye?
Cfr Rep 12

SYMBOLS USED:

Q: Question

R: response

ENGL: English

FR: French

SW: Kinyarwanda

RWA: Rwanda

V: verb

≠: otherwise, but

gabo: traditional (gukunda)

RWA: Rwandans, Rwanda

umutwe: citizen

abany: region

+ : and

inter: international

tech: Technicians

Kyas: Kenyans

Abany: Indians

abany: educated

Com: Communication

abany: people

↔: going and back

byse: all of them

Cfr: refer to made to

B. Transcribed data

Researcher: Twagiye tubona ingero z'abaza hano mukavugana mu Kinyarwanda, icyongereza, Igifaransa n'Igiswahili. Ubona biterwa n'iki?

'We have had examples of people who speak with you in Kinyarwanda, English, French and Kiswahili. What do you think are the reasons?'

Receptionist T: Byerekana ko Abanyarwanda barenze bagenda begera andi mahanga. Ubona ari byiza kuko bigaragaza ko bateye imbere. Ariko ku rundi ruhande ni bibi kuko byangiza ururimi rwacu gakondo.

'It shows that Rwandans have crossed the borders and they are getting closer to foreign countries. It's good since it shows that that they have progressed on the one hand. But on the other hand, it's bad because it harms our mother tongue.'

Researcher: Uvuze ibyo kwegera amahanga bituma nifuzza kumenya niba hari isano byaba bifitanye na *EAC, internationalisation, globalisation*?

'You've talked about getting closer to foreign countries and I'd like to know if there is a relationship with EAC, internationalisation, globalisation?'

Receptionist T: Kuvanga indimi bigaragaza aho abantu bagiye baturuka n'imico bahakuye ndetse n'ururimi bakaba badashobora kubiyambura. Na none Umunyarwanda ubu yarenze imbibi z'igihugu cye, yiyumva nk'umuturage w'akarere kagutse katari u Rwanda gusa.

'Switching from one language to another shows people's origins and different cultures they have brought along as well as the language that they may never get rid of. Moreover, the Rwandan has gone beyond the culture of his/her country and he/she considers him/herself as a citizen of a broader region than only Rwanda.'

Researcher: Ubona hari izindi mpamvu zitera iri vanga ry'indimi (code-switching)?

'Do you think of other reasons behind this mixing of languages (code-switching)?'

Receptionist T: Njye mbona ari ukwerekana gusa ko bagutse babaye *international*. None se nka

bariya ba *technicians* bakorera Abanyakenya n'Abahinde bavuga icyongereza. Ni ngombwa ko bahuza ku rurimi.

'According to me, I think that it shows that people have gone beyond their boundaries and become international. For instance those technicians work for Kenyans and Indians who speak English. Thus, it's compulsory to understand each other through the language.'

Researcher: Nka hano se ko baba ari bonyine nawe, kuki batavugaga mu Kinyarwanda gusa?

'For the present case where they are with you, why don't they speak in Kinyarwanda?'

Receptionist T: Kandi byaramaze kubinjiramo? Bigera aho wumva abo muvugana bese bazi icyongereza. Nanjye bijya bimbaho, abaje hano bese nkababwira no mu icyongereza. Iyo mbonye hari utabyumva mpita mpindura mu Kinyarwanda gusa.

'They have already adopted it (code-switching). It has reached a stage where you think that all of your interlocutors understand English. Sometimes, it happens to me to speak some English to each customer. When I see that the customer does not understand, I immediately change and speak Kinyarwanda only.'

Researcher: Mu bisanzwe, ese ubona hari *category* y'abantu bakunda kuvanga indimi?

'As per your experience, is there any category of people who mostly mix languages?'

Receptionist T: Nsigaye mbona bese babikora, ariko cyane cyane abize n'abajeunes. Abaturage bo ntibababizi iyo biva.

'It has become common to all people, but mostly educated people and the youth.

Ordinary citizens do not know anything about that.'

Researcher: Uretse kuvugaga icyo umuntu ashaka, hari inyungu idasanzwe mubona yaba iri mu kuvugaga ikinyarwanda n'indimi z'amahanga?

'Apart from communication, could be there any other special purpose pursued in mixing Kinyarwanda with exoglossic languages?'

Receptionist T: Yewe, akenshi biba ari ukugira ngo berekane bo basomye, mbese ko basobanutse.

‘Eeh, most of times they would like to show that they are educated, in other words, they are knowledgeable.’

Researcher: Ni ibisanzwe ko ababagana bavuga Ikinyarwanda. Ariko se iyo umuntu aje avuga ashyiramo indimi z’amahanga, hari icyo bihindura ku myifatire yawe kuri we ?

‘It is commonplace for your customers to speak in Kinyarwanda. Could be there any change of attitudes, on your behalf, when visitors switch to exoglossic languages?’

Receptionist T: Reka mbifata nka *communication* gusa, nta kindi!

‘I take it as communication only, not anything else!’

Researcher: Ese ubona hari isano hagati y’ibi byo kuvanga indimi na *EAC, regional integration* na *globalisation*?

Receptionist T: Urumva se byabura! Imipaka yaragutse, abantu baragenda hirya no hino, abandi baraza ino, byose bigahurirana.

‘It is possible! People are crossing borders, they are going everywhere and others are coming to us; it is a mixture.’

Researcher: Murakoze, akazi keza.

‘Thanks and enjoy your work.’

2. Sample of focus group discussions data

(i). Focus group discussions with Group A (2 ladies and 2 gentlemen). They were transcribed as follows:

Question1: What do participants understand by code alternation and code-switching?

Response1: Language may be used alone or in alternation with others. It depends on the level of education of different individuals. As for code-switching, two or more languages are used together in the same conversation. For instance, in political leaders' speeches, somebody may start in Kinyarwanda and then mix with English.

Question 2: Examples of Kinyarwanda –English code-switching encountered in their everyday life (workplace, classroom, home, etc).

Response 2: Code-switching is found between teachers and Head teacher/Master of studies. (Eg: Nari nje gutira *the book of English* 'I'd like to borrow the book of English'. There are many examples between teachers themselves in conversation during break time (Eg: abanyeshuri banjye ntibari *serious*, uzi ko mbaha *exercises* ntibabone *good results* 'My students are not serious, when I give them exercises they do not get good results'). In other gatherings like in pubs, meetings held by local authorities, and even between individuals, English is used in mixture with Kinyarwanda.

Question 3: What types of code-switching (Intersentential, intrasentential, emblematic) are mostly used in conversation?

Response 3: Emblematic CS is the most used (Eg: yeah, so, yes...), followed by intrasentential CS (especially at school) and last intersentential CS (speeches held by higher authorities, or when to express anger). The reason may be the lower level of the mastery of English.

Question 4: Do speakers code-switch consciously or unconsciously and examples?

Response 4: Some speakers switch unconsciously since they take CS as their usual language. For

example, there are some Rwandans who do not master Kinyarwanda because their historical background, and they mix it with Kiswahili, English or French in order to keep the conversation flow or to correctly express themselves. Others do it consciously especially among the youth and other persons who would like to show that they know English. An example of one parent during PTA meeting (*police yashyizeho deadline yo gutanga izo raporo* ‘the police has set a deadline to submit the reports).

Question 5: In cases where code-switching is done willingly and consciously, what could be the motivations? Give examples.

Response 5: In places (workplace, residence areas, areas governed by Anglophones) where there are a lot of Anglophone people (from Uganda especially), people switch to English to sound like Anglophones, and identify with someone they know very well as an English speaker. Moreover, they want to show that they know English or French, thus they are superior to their colleagues who ignore one of them (*hari icyo nzi nanjye* ‘I know something’). People who switch to English, French or Kiswahili would like to sound like Rwandans from other countries, especially English speaking countries like Uganda. As most of our high level leaders came from Uganda and thus they speak English, people think that behaving like them gives a certain high consideration in society. Moreover, switching to English serves as an indicator of integration in the EAC (regional), people would like to sound East African and be treated as closer to Ugandans, Kenyans and Tanzanians. Last, switching to English helps in doing trans-border business.

Question 6: Through switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili; what kind of image do Rwandan bilingual speakers portray to their interlocutors?

Response 6: The current Rwandan is identified as multilingual and someone who uses technology (Eg: telephone, TV). Most of the modern technologies are in English, and the users definitely must know a bit of English to be able to use them. In short, the current Rwandan is “up to date” (*arasobanutse* ‘knowledgeable’). For businessmen, speaking

English or Kiswahili with Ugandans or Kenyans shows that they are able to do trans-border business.

Question 7: Is there any relationship between code-switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili with regional integration, internationalisation, or globalisation?

Response 7: When foreign languages enter the country, they bring along their original culture.

Therefore, code-switching enables people to be multicultural. For instance, one who speaks English has a portion of English culture. Also, speaking multiple languages helps people to move in different countries and to interact with people of different linguistic backgrounds. For example, Rwandans may interact and do business with Tanzanians through Kiswahili. Furthermore, it is clear that the use of exoglossic languages, especially English and Kiswahili, has increased after Rwanda has been member of East African Community.

Question 8: What are the audience's attitudes (negative or positive) towards Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching?

Response 8: It depends on how and where CS is used. Youth favours it while old people do not appreciate it. Some people take CS as arrogance; show off, strong willing to sound in category of people (*urwiganwa* 'conformism'). However, fighting against Kinyarwanda-English CS is not possible since it has reached a level of been integrated in the current Kinyarwanda speech.

Question 9: Focus group additional input regarding motivations for Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching with a focus on socially-related motives.

Response 9: Code-switching is a characteristic of the "New generation". It is used in speaking but also in some writings (announcements, sign posts, advertisement). It is also used in language creation (music: some songs in both Kinyarwanda and English) and literature

(plays, drama). However, switching to foreign languages does harm out native language Kinyarwanda.

(ii). Focus group discussions with Group C (1 lady and 3 gentlemen). They were transcribed as follows:

Question 1: What do participants understand by code alternation and code-switching?

Response 1: Code-switching involves using a lot of languages in one conversation. For example, many higher authorities mix English with Kinyarwanda in their speeches or during meetings.

Question 2: Are there any examples of Kinyarwanda-English, French or Kiswahili code-switching the participants have encountered in their everyday life situations (at workplace, in the classroom, at home, in meetings, etc)?

Response 2: At workplace (school), when the Headmaster expresses anger, he switches to English. There are some people who would like to sound like the Boss (who speaks English) and switch to English. During meetings held by local authorities, there are sometimes people who want to show that they are educated and mix their Kinyarwanda speech with English words. Sometimes, they switch in order to practice a show-off (*kwiyemera* 'be boastful'), and this show-off is linked with the high status of educated people or leaders. There are other people who switch to exoglossic languages to show that they are educated or to sound like educated people. Others mix languages to show that they are superior to ordinary citizens (*gukandagira abaturage* 'beyond ordinary citizens').

Question 3: What types of code-switching (Intersentential, intrasentential, emblematic) are mostly used in conversation?

Response 3: Most of times, emblematic Code-switching is used, others are less used. The reason

is that speakers do not master English, French or Kiswahili and they have a little vocabulary package.

Question 4: Do speakers code-switch consciously or unconsciously and examples?

Response 4: On the one hand, code-switching is conscious especially with the youth or other people in case of imitation. They want to feel closer to their fellows who speak English. On the other hand, it is unconscious especially with educated people since they do not pay attention to the phenomenon. For example in classroom, teachers switch to English or French without paying attention and take it as an ordinary language behaviour.

Question 5: In cases where code-switching is done willingly and consciously, what could be the motivations? Give examples.

Response 5: Switching serves the purpose of identification with fellows (especially young people who want to sound like their educated fellows, businessmen who would like to sound like educated people). Besides, ordinary citizens (*abaturage*) switch to exoglossic languages in order to sound like their leaders who frequently use English in their everyday work and meetings. As an international language, switching to English indexes the adoption of that international identity and going out of national boundaries. As the country has opened boundaries (welcoming people from other countries), switching to English or French shows an open identity not confined to Rwanda nation only. Switching to English or Kiswahili allows speakers to get benefits from outsiders, and thus Rwandans identify themselves as people ready for taking advantage of these opportunities. Lastly, Rwandans value more foreigners especially in service delivery, and speaking English, French or Kiswahili may convey to the speaker another consideration (probably higher than that given to fellow Rwandans) by the service provider thinking that he/she may be a foreigner.

Question 6: Through switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili; what kind of image do Rwandan bilingual speakers portray to their interlocutors?

Response 6: As the country is developing, people would like to show that they are also developing in different areas including the language domain. An ideal Rwanda has a telephone, a TV and runs a certain business to become rich. Thus, English is a good tool for him/her. Moreover, Rwandans aspire to international identity (being only Rwandan is not enough), thus he/she would like to be closer to people from other countries and even assimilated to them. In brief, switching to English shows that you are up-to-date and knowledgeable (*urasobanutse*).

Question 7: Is there any relationship between code-switching from Kinyarwanda to English, French or Kiswahili with regional integration, internationalisation, or globalisation?

Response 7: Switching to English and Kiswahili means that people have been integrated into the EAC and have the capacity to carry out business in EAC countries. It has been common to go to Uganda or Tanzania for business purposes, and people who switch to English would like to make the audience recognise that aspect. The integration in the EAC and globalisation have boosted the use of English, French and Kiswahili in Rwanda. Rwandan people would like to sound East African and be treated as closer to Ugandans, Kenyans and Tanzanians.

Question 8: What are the audience attitudes (negative or positive) towards Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching?

Response 8: Old people dislike code-switching since they feel that you are creating a gap between you and them, and you reject them for something else. The youth appreciates switching as it helps them to be what they want to be or to be treated as per their expectations. Code-switching to exoglossic languages also serves to show that they are “up-to-date” (*barasobanutse* ‘they are knowledgeable’). It suffices to note that fighting against code-switching is not possible since it has reached a level of being integrated in the current Kinyarwanda speech. Nevertheless, it would be better to code-switch from a language to another when the speakers understand each other in conversation.

Question 9: Focus group additional information about Kinyarwanda-English, French and Kiswahili code-switching as well as motivations.

Response 9: Since languages have different logics, when they are mixed it is challenging and this may result in a hybrid identity. Someone who speaks Kinyarwanda mixed with English, French or Kiswahili is difficult to identify, and it is challenging to recognise the language he/she masters. There are also instances of code-switching in art and literature (music, some songs, drama), and thus it could be better to set up guidelines to switching from Kinyarwanda to other languages for regulatory purposes.