Effects of Code Switching on English Language Teaching and Learning in Bilingual Classrooms

Siele Hilary, Barasa Peter Elizabeth Abenga

Department of Curriculum Instruction and Educational Media, Moi University,
P.o Box 3900 Eldoret, Kenya.E-mail: larrysiele@gmail.com

*Author for correspondence and reprint requests

The study was conducted at Bureti district provincial secondary schools from October 2007 to April 2008. The study sought to investigate the effects of codes witching on English language teaching and learning. This was carried out based on the background that the language situation in Kenya is a multilingual one where speakers are competent in English, Kiswahili, and mother tongue. English is a medium of instruction in schools and an official language of communication while Kiswahili is a lingua franca as well as a national language. Indigenous language serves as a language of communication among various ethnic groups depending on situations or locale. Within these contexts code switching or alternation between languages is the norm.

A survey of specific target category of schools were sampled using stratified purposive sampling, and a random selection of form three students, presumed to be stable bilinguals, were observed and tape recorded in groups of 5 to 10 for 10 minutes each as they carried out the classroom activity. All the targeted class subject teachers took part in the study. The data was analyzed qualitatively and descriptively using absolute numbers and percentages. The results from the study showed that code switching is a linguistic challenge that affects teaching and learning of English in and outside the classroom, and across the curriculum. Teachers who were fluent in mother tongue as L1 switched the most than those fluent in English and Kiswahili as L1. The observation results showed that code switching provides sample experience for learners and Kiswahili acts as first language for students from different backgrounds. This affects learning English as second language at phonological, lexical and grammatical levels. The study concluded that there is need to re-look into the institutional policy on language and research done on multilingual language processing to mitigate the effects of code switching on English language and proposed ways for future intervention.

Key words: Code switching, bilingualism and multilingualism.

Introduction

Multilingualism and language contact is a reality in the modern world. This is brought about by several factors among them: education, social and economic mobility, and migration. Multilingualism can be defined as ability to speak two or more languages or

competence in two languages,(Hakuta ,1996). As individuals maintain their home/indigenous language, situation where they come in contact and need to communicate becomes inevitable. A speaker would then become competent in more than one or two languages. This is multilingualism. Africa has the highest number of multilingual speakers, Kenya included.

On the other hand bilingualism is possessing competencies in two languages (Hakuta 1996). In Kenya, English functions as a medium of instruction in schools, administration, legal system, the press and the media and communication among different users; whereas Kiswahili functions as a lingua franca among different communities. Furthermore, it is a national language that serves to establish cohesiveness besides the indigenous language that serves to establish and reinforce various ethnic identities of various communities. All these languages are used in everyday life depending on situations.

Kenyan's language policy has been that English is an official language and a language of instruction in schools, while Kiswahili is a national language that brings together the various speakers, (Mukuria, 1995, Barasa 2005). However, the educational curriculum in Kenya has undergone several changes that have impacted greatly on language policy and practice in schools. From these changes, Kiswahili has gained tremendously and has even competed with English (Mazrui Ali, 1990). All the changes that have taken place, and which form part of the government policy, are in line with UNESCO'S recommendations (1953): that the first grade one to three be taught in mother tongue or the language of catchment area because the learners understand it best. Where English is taught as first language, L1, in exclusive schools, it is recommended that Kiswahili be taught as a subject. Where Kiswahili is the first language, L1, English should be taught as a subject. From grade 4 onwards English is made a medium of instruction.

The situation on the ground is different. There are several upcoming private schools that do not adhere to the government policy. Irrespective of the language catchment area and first language, most schools, including the government public schools, teach Kiswahili and English right from grade one. By the time the learners are in secondary school, they are fairly competent in more than two languages. This phenomenon leads to linguistic challenges as is the case with code switching and Sheng and this affects the learning of English as a second language. The implication is, both English and Kiswahili are languages in competition within the learner's disposal.

The main objective of the study was to study the effects of code switching on English language teaching and learning within the above context. The study has five sections: introduction; current language situation, policy and practice; methodology; data analysis; discussion and conclusion.

The current language situation in Kenya: policy and practice

Kenya is a multilingual society with over 42 languages spoken besides English and Kiswahili, (Kembo-sure, 2000). Both stable and unstable codes like Sheng can be included in the number of languages being spoken, (Bosire, 2006). Indigenous languages are largely spoken at homes especially in rural areas where the speakers are homogenous. At work or schools where the speakers are from different ethnic backgrounds and other public domains, English and Kiswahili are used.

In Kenya, it is not uncommon to find two or three languages being spoken in a given situation. The speakers have English, Kiswahili and an indigenous language at their

disposal. This phenomenon gives rise to code switching and other language challenges as is the case with Sheng. Sheng is increasingly gaining recognition among the urban youth and adults, (Ogechi, 2002). Sheng is a mixture of Kiswahili and English and borrows heavily from indigenous languages mainly Luo and kikuyu, (Osinde, 1986). In a way, it is from of code switching, (Myers Scotton, 1995).

The current language situation in Kenya is a result of the influence of various policies over the last 25years. An overview of the policy development of the two languages, Kiswahili and English, is necessary as it formed the basis of the research. After independence in 1963, English remained the official language used in government legislation, legal documents, official documents and other official transactions. However, the government wanted a unifying language and the choice became Kiswahili. Though it had spread across the ethnic boarders as a result of trade, it served as a lingua franca. It was therefore adopted as a national language, for national cohesion, and even proposed as a discipline in the department to be established later in Royal College (later university of Nairobi) (Mukuria, 1995).

It is worth noting here that the education curriculum in Kenya has been undergoing several changes occasioned by recommendations of various government commissions over the years and these have impacted on language policy and practice both in primary and secondary school levels. The major changes that occurred to Kiswahili as a language was after the introduction of the 8.4.4 system of education; when it was made a compulsory subject way back in 1984. It was to be examined in two national examinations: Kenya certificate of primary education (KCPE) and Kenya certificate of secondary education (KCSE). The government made frantic efforts to implement it by employing untrained teachers to teach in secondary schools and at the same time popularized the subject in diploma courses in teacher- training colleges, in servicing and establishment of full Kiswahili departments in universities (Mukuria 1995). During the same time, English suffered major changes; it was combined with literature and given fewer lessons in the curriculum.

According to Mazrui (1995), the government's decision to make Kiswahili a compulsory and examinable subject in both primary and secondary schools put it may have long term implications for the potation of Kiswahili to compete with English as we witness an increasing number of graduates, constituting potential educational elite who are proficient in Kiswahili'' (ibid). It is importance to note that the changes that formed part of the government policy were in line with UNESCO'S recommendations (1953): that the first grade one to three be taught in mother tongue because the learners understand it best and because to begin the school life in it will make the break between home and school as small as possible. Where English is taught as first language in exclusive schools, it is recommended that Kiswahili should be taught as a subject. In this case, mother tongue has no place in school except may be in home setting. Where Kiswahili is the first language, L1, English should be taught as a subject. In such a case, it is often in a multilingual environment. However, where the language of the catchment area is mother tongue or a monolingual environment, English and Kiswahili are taught as a subject. From grade four onwards English is the medium of instruction. There is no place for indigenous languages after this grade.

In spite of the foregoing developments, the practice on the ground is quite different and a complex one. Many parents, guardians and even head teachers, insist on the use of

English both in primary one and kindergarten because of its prestige, (Ogechi, 2002). Over the years, the study of Kiswahili as a subject has become popular with the students in various universities and colleges. This is occasioned partly by the fact that currently, certification considers a pass in either English or Kiswahili. In effect, the two languages carry equal weight. English and Kiswahili are two languages which hold significant positions in the curriculum though Kiswahili has gained tremendously and has "undermined the role of English as a service language in the curriculum" (Barasa, 2005).

The resent gains in Kiswahili have seen the rise in its use and publication of books aimed at improving the teaching of the language. Authors like Ken Walibora, Swaleh Mdoe, among others are coming up with novels, classical poetry and children stories, which are aimed at putting Kiswahili on an equal footing with English, Mazrui,(1995). Its role has father been recognized as a language that enhances national cohesion hence the politicians as well as the media use it even where the speakers are homogenous. This is further attested by the fact that it has become a language of communication in official domains, for example, they are used together with English in official forms, telecommunications and technology and as lately as in internet.

Mazrui (1995) observes that Kiswahili is assuming a universalistic role which includes the process of making it a scientific language". It is a language of oral communication in government offices and a language to convey government policies to the people. Kenya's proposed constitutions over the past decade were both written in both English and Kiswahili. Arguably the two languages are co-official. Bearing this in mind, the question that can be asked is: what are the implications of these developments?

Mazrui (1995) argues that the complimentary and partial competition of languages leading to interplay in roles and functions may trigger sociolinguistic dynamics in the language system. This has given rise to the phenomenon of Sheng and code switching in almost all the domains-private and public. This has proved to be a challenge to teachers, learners and policy makers. The question is: what are the effects of codes witching on English language learning and teaching in such bilingual classrooms? The classrooms are bilingual in the sense that their linguistic backgrounds are heterogeneous and that only Kiswahili and English are the available choices in a classroom context set up.

Research Design and Methodology

The study used survey method whereby specific targeted secondary schools in south rift-Kenya were surveyed. The population consisted of form three students from provincial schools only. There were 16 schools during the time of study; ten boys' schools and six girls school, each school operating under the quota policy of admission.

The classes were presumed to use English or Kiswahili in classroom interaction. The form three students were chosen on the premise that they are stable bilinguals; able to express themselves in both English and Kiswahili.

In the study, stratified purposive sampling was used whereby the provincial schools were categorized according to gender (strata). Five boys and three girls' schools, each with an average number of forty five students per classes, participated in the study. Observation and tape recording were used to obtain qualitative data from the students while a questionnaire was administered to the teachers. The class was provided with an impromptu simulated decision making activity during a class lesson. The activity was

intended to give students hands- on experience in use of language of their choice. Each group was observed and tape accorded for 10 to 15 minutes. The tape recorded information was later transcribed for subsequent analysis. The questionnaire was analyzed quantitatively.

Results and Discussion

The results were analyzed and discussed under the following themes: code switching and language use in classroom, code switching and language dominance and code switching and learning English**.**

Code switching and language use in classroom

The results from observation and tape recording showed that student-to- student interaction provides opportunity for code switching in a formal classroom set up. The extract below serves to highlight this phenomenon.

Extract 1

This was an extract from a boys' school in a group engaged in activity 2.
A: Ok … *Hii* plan *tutaanza kuandika sasa itakuaje?*
Ati river *ndio ime*burst*, halafu*…… make plans to be implemented and make decisions.
(Ok this plan we are going to put in writing. How will it be? That the river has burst its banks, then therefore make plans to be implemented and decisions)
B: *Ni* boats *zinakuja kuokoa*
(There are boats coming to rescue)
C: *Lakini* imagine *……………ama*
(But imagine……………..or)
A*.: Sasa* your measures ………..you should take (now)
B*: Sasa* (now) steps…… and the state of some boats
D. *Hii nini ime-* collapse?
(What is this that has collapsed?)
A: (interruption) *maji inakuja juu………. inakuja kwa ………..inakuja kuzama ndani ya* boat
(Water is getting in/up……. It is getting into the boat)
B. *Sasa* where... (Now where…?)
C: You have got idea *ati*……………… that
A*: Sasa-utafa-nini* (shortened form of Swahili
Words *sasa* (now) and *utafanya* (what will you do)
B: Draw… make plans to be implemented and the decision immediately.

In spite of the fact that the activity in question was meant for discussion as part an oral skills lesson, the students switched from English to Kiswahili and vice versa as they discussed, however, once the decision was made, it was then put into writing. The fact that the students were alternating between the two languages does not mean that the communication was without a hitch. In fact it was observed that a lot of non verbal cues

were employed in their interaction. Furthermore, such switching was done under specific contexts, which included; seeking clarification, signaling alternation or interruption, elaboration, explaining and emphasizing, just to name a few. Kiswahili words were used to fill the gap or as a form of style.

Several observations were made from these results. One, it is plausible that the activity at hand made cognitive demands on the learners and therefore they switched unconsciously. Code switching therefore provided experience for learners to interpret the contextual experience and understand the task. Two, the fact that the discussion was done orally before putting it in writing in English confirms the current research that first language can assists in learning second language, (Kembo-Sure, 2000, Cooks, 2002, Nalep, 2006, Foley 2002). Mother tongue is not necessarily the most frequently used language in everyday life, but is the language on which the speaker relies on for intuitive knowledge in terms of form, structure and meaning for bilinguals, (Foley, 2002). Since Kiswahili is the language that brings together different ethnic groups, and in some instance a first language, it equally becomes a first language in a bilingual classroom thus provides a basis for code switching.

On the other, the habitual spontaneous and uncommon use of Kiswahili words in sentence constructions as well as literal translations may automatically find its way into English grammatical system. The same elements can transfer to writing thus can pose a challenge to the teacher. The results further showed that code switching serves its own purpose within the classroom context: intimacy, solidarity, reducing social distance and as a style, (Myers-Scotton 1995). This is attested by the use of the Swahili short form lexicons such as *sa-* for *sasa, utafa* for *utafanya* and so forth.

The questionnaire results revealed that the teachers, whose languages are within the continuum of the three languages: i.e. MT, English and Kiswahili, just as their students do, switch outside the formal classroom setting and even in class too. Those who reported having three languages and were fluent in them switched the most, while those fluent in two i.e. English $ Kiswahili, did not switch at all. This implied that the more fluent the teacher is in mother tongue, the more he is likely to switch in classroom context. The processes under such multilingual context are complex and were outside the scope of this study. However, the notable explanation given by most teachers was that they switch to elaborate or clarity a point specifically when teaching grammatical structures and vocabulary. Ironically many disapprove of the students code-switching.

Table 1. Number of languages known by the teachers, order of their fluency and code switching in classroom

No. of languages known		Order of fluency	Code switching in classroom	
A	3	English, Kiswahili, other(MT)		No
B	3	Mother tongue, English, Kiswahili, Sheng	yes	
C	2	English, Kiswahili		No
D	3	Mother tongue, Kiswahili, English, Sheng	yes	
E	3	Mother tongue, Kiswahili, English	yes	
No .of respondents		5	3	2
Percentage/total		100	60	40

Code switching and language dominance

The results revealed that code switching is unconscious and spontaneous occurrence in informal context. The extract bellow was used to highlight this phenomenon.

Extract 2

A: a) *si* boats *zinakuja ku*? A*i.. na kupokota pia*
(I thought boats are coming to …? And to be involved included too). *Kupokota* is a Sheng word meaning be included)
C: b) Imagine that *kwa* room *yaani*…. Implementing plans, *waelewa?*
(Imagine that in a room that is …… implementing plans, do you understand?)
A: c) So your measures….. How you should take *na* (and) the state of the boats. *Si .*.……..
(You will…..)
B: d) *Hii ni nini*…. *Hii* (what is this…. This, (gesturing)
C:e) *sasa* imagine *kwa* room *unampa* exams then…. (Now imagine in room you are giving out exams then...)
A: f) *Kuna meli hapa inakuja kuto watu na kupelek mahali* (there is a boat coming to rescue people and ferry them somewhere)
C: g) Make tactics, plans *haraka* immediately)
B: h) So *angalia tuendeki*….. *ata sija*-get time
(so look where we are heading to …. Even I have not got time)
A: i) *waacha … soma* (No. stop read)

The exchanges were characterized by continuously uninterrupted discourse in either English or Kiswahili and even 'Sheng'. The Sheng words functioned as stylistic forms to fill the gaps in the interaction e.g. '*si*' for 'don't you think' and '*kupokota*' for Kiswahili; 'be included'. Kiswahili is the dominant language that provides the matrix here. The morphemes that constitute switching words are either drawn from English and Kiswahili, or are drawn from Kiswahili and Sheng. For instance, *sija*get (Swahili pronoun negation 'have not' -*sija)* has the word 'get' embedded in it; and '*tuendiki*.' (Kiswahili word 'tuende or tunaenda') is restructured to conform to the groups style.

The results conform to Myers Scotton's (1995) position that Kiswahili English code switching is unmarked or expected choice which indexes interpersonal relationship. Code switching occurs with the most dominant language providing embeddiment. However, the study found out that Kiswahili/Sheng code switching draw their morphemes from the two languages, both of which are unmarked or expected choice and dominant. It is worth noting here that Sheng is unstable code. Heredia and Brown (2007) argued there is more code switching when speakers communicate in their first language. Both Kiswahili and Sheng were the dominant codes in discourse as observed throughout the study. It is therefore plausible to posit that; where the dominant language provides a matrix, the new code (as is the case with Sheng) though unstable, is equally dominant in interaction provided that it is unmarked or the expected choice. The results from the teacher

questionnaire too reveal the same trend about code switching occurrence and the dominant language as in table below.

Table 2. Opinion of teachers on code switching in classroom language activities where there is less teacher direct involvement and occurrence

Opinion	Code switching in classroom with less teacher direct involvement		Code switching occurrence	
	No. of respondents and percentage		No. of response and percentage	
Agree	4	80	3	60
Disagree	1	20	2	40
Total	5	100	5	100

Code switching and learning English

The results showed that code switching occur as part of inter language or interference at various levels: phonological, grammatical and lexical. At phonological level, the word stress and intonation and other prosodic features took Kiswahili rhythm. Pronunciation of certain sounds had either been influenced by Kiswahili or had taken the style common in Sheng, for example, the sounds /t/, th'/0/ and /d/. There was lengthening of vowels unnecessarily or production of the dental sounds as alveolar. It was farther found out that when reading out the activity, some learners adopted the stress and intonation of Kiswahili words unconsciously.

At the lexical level, results indicated that code switching provides for extensive borrowing and restructuring of words from English to Kiswahili or Sheng. For example, 'check to *cheki*, 'fake' to *feki* or avoidance of certain words altogether if the anticipated statement might appear ungrammatical.

At the grammatical level, the Kiswahili word order and question formation have influenced the way English is used as second language. For example, what could begin as a question in English as 'what is this', becomes, 'this is what?', a Kiswahili equivalent of '*hi, ni*?'

The past research in this area has viewed code switching as either providing learning experience or affecting learning a second language. Tarone (1983) terms it a communicative strategy, for instance, when the learner transports native words or experiences and translated into the inter language utterance. However, this may spell failure to learn English as second language. Many teachers agreed with the view that code switching can affect pronunciation competence and fluency.

Other scholars have argued that code switching is a source of exposure rather than interference. Both Chomsky (1965,) and Skinner's (1957) theories, according to Skiba, (1997), rely on exposure to appropriate samples of language for learning English as second language. Furthermore, if first language aids in learning second language, as argued earlier (Brumfit, 1984, Ellis, 1992, Brown 2007), it is plausible that since learning the second language using the first language is due to ignorance rather than interference, (Richards, 1996), code switching could be bilinguals source of exposure samples. However, this is not so where the languages in question are learned or used in instruction simultaneously in the same contexts. This is not the case in Kenya classroom context where English is a language of instruction while Kiswahili is the home language or lingua

franca and is only taught as a subject. It is therefore probable to posit that code switching in this context influence English language learning as a second language.

Conclusion

From the study, several conclusions can be drawn. First, code switching is an inevitable phenomenon within language contact contexts. Teachers just as the students do code switch in and outside the classroom formal contexts, though they disapprove of the same. The teachers who were knowledgeable in at least three languages and are fluent in their first language other than English and Kiswahili switched the most in classroom. This phenomenon underscores the fact the first language has been ignored as a resource. On the other hand, while switching is motivated by desire to provide deeper meaning and understanding of concepts by the teacher, it raises questions of methodology, for example, the role of first language in second language learning. Teachers should therefore guard against code switching unless it accrues more benefits than using the language of instruction.

Second, Kiswahili and Sheng are the dominant languages used in classroom interaction. Consequently, English is increasingly becoming less used by the students, and as such, faces competition from Sheng and Kiswahili. It could not be established whether these two languages provided a basis for cognitive processes for learning English. Nonetheless, they provided interference at various levels and can be viewed to influence the learning of English.

Acknowledgement

References

Auer, P. (1984), Bilingual conversation. In Nalep C. (2005) '*Code switching' in socio cultural linguistics.*
*http://www.colarado.edu/ling/CRIL/vol19 issue 1paper.a.html.*Research in linguistic vol.19 Boulder: University of Colorado. 2007
Barasa L.P, (1997), English language teaching in Kenyan secondary school: Policy planning and practice. Unpublished Thesis.
University of Hull. In Omulando (2002), *The effect of Kiswahili on the use of English as a medium of instruction and Language in Kenyan Secondary Schools*. M Phil Thesis. Submitted to Moi University. Eldoret.
Barasa, L.P (2005), *English language teaching in Kenya : Policy training and Practice'*. Eldoret: Moi University Press.
Blom and Gumperz, J. (1972), Social meaning in linguistic structures. In Myers- Scotton, (1995). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bosire M. (2006), *Hybrid languages 'The case of Sheng'* Albany. State university   of New York   http://www.lingref.com/cpp/acal//36/paper 1423.pdf.html.

Brown, D. (1996), *Principles of language learning and teaching*. San Francisco   state University: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brumfit, C.   (1984), *Communicative methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge   University Press. Brumfit, C. (1992), *Communicative language teaching methodology*: *Accuracy and fluency.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumfit, C. (1992), *Communicative language teaching methodology*: *Accuracy and fluency.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1965), *Aspects of theory of syntax*, Cambridge Mass MIT Press.

Cleghorn A. (1992), *Primary level science in Kenya 'constructing meaning   through English and indigenous languages, qualitative studies in education'.* Nairobi

Cook, V. (2002), Portraits of the L2 user. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

Ellis, R. (1985), *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Foley, J and Thompson L, (2003), *Language learning 'A life long process.'* London: Arnold.

Hakuta, K.(1996),Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: A Research Perspective. *NCBE Focus: occasional papers on Bilingual Education. Number 1.* Retrieved from http: // www.nclela.gwu/edu/pubs/focus/html.

Heredia, R.R, and Brown, J.M (2007), Code switching. The Encyclopedia of Linguistics. Chicago : Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers. Retrieved on March 12 2007 from. Ling. Articles database.

Kembo, J. (2000), Language in education and language learning in Africa. In Webb & Kembo –Sure (2000), (Eds) *Introduction to languages and linguistics of Africa.* (P 287-302) South Africa. Oxford University Press.

Kembo-Sure, (1996), Language attitude use and proficiency 'A sociolinguistic study   of English in Kenya'. D. phil thesis submitted to Moi University. Eldoret.

Kramsh, C. (2002), *Language acquisition and language socialization: Ecological perspectives.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S.D.(1995), *Bilingual Education and Second Language Acquisition Theory*. Engelwood Cliffs.NJ: Prentice Hall International.

Mazrui, A. (1995), Slang and code switching: A case of Sheng in Kenya. In Bosire (2006),   *Hybrid   languages*.   A*lbany.*   Retrieved   from http://www.lingref.com/cpp/acal//36/paper 1423.pdf.html.

Mukuria D. (1995), Kenya's language policy developments 'Kiswahili'

 In Senanu & Williams (ed.) (1995), *creative use of language in Kenya.* Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.

Myers-Scotton, C (1993b), *Dueling languages: Grammatical structures in   code switching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, (1995), *Social motivations for code s witching: Evidence from Africa. O*xford: Oxford University Press.

Nalep C. (2006), '*Code switching' in socio cultural linguistics.*

<*http:www.colarado.edu/ling/CRL/vol19 issue 1paper*>. Research in linguistic vol.19 Boulder: University of Colorado. 2007

Ogechi, N. (2002), on language rights in Kenya. Moi University. Eldoret. *Nordic journal of African studies 1,2(3) : 277 -295'* . Retrieved on May 23rd 2007 from:http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/vol.12.3.html

Omulando, C (2002), The effect of Kiswahili on the use of English as a medium of instruction   and language in Kenyan secondary schools. Mphil Thesis submitted to Moi University. Eldoret.

Osinde, (1986), Sheng an investigation into social and cultural aspects of an
evolving language. MA Thesis submitted to University of Nairobi. Nairobi.

Richards, J. and Rodgers, S. (1986), *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Rivers, W.M (1983), *Communicating naturally in second language*: *practice in language teaching* Cambridge: Oxford University Press

Senanu & William, (Ed). (1995), *Creative use of language in Kenya.* Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.

Skiba, R. (1997), *Code switching as a countenance of language interference*.
The internet TESL journal 3,10.*http://ites//.org./Articles/Skiba-Code switching.html*>

Skinner, B.F (1957), *Verbal Behaviour.* New York: Appleton –century Crafts.

Tarone (1983), *A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: framework for communication strategies.* In Faerch & Kasper (1983) 'strategies in interlanguage communication' Longman: New York.

Webb, V. and Kembo-Sure, E. (2000), *Introduction to languages and linguistics of Africa.* In African voices ed. South Africa: Oxford University Press