

A Socio-Semantic Analysis of Code-Switching in Nigerian Universities

Acka, Kuram-Vande Kenneth

Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
kennygees@gmail.com

Dr. (Mrs) Rashidat Salawu AbdulRasheed

Federal College of Education, Zaria
and

Dr. Isyaku Saminu

Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

Abstract

Whatever one writes or speaks today is expected to carry a message that should be understood by readers or listeners as intended. This study focuses on socio-semantics of students code-switching and the fluctuation of societal language meaning and social meaning placed on codes of two or more conventional languages and their dialects in a conversation. Some university students who maintain their cultural dialect, language, and accent are viewed as “stupid,” “inferior” or “rudimentary” by their peers. The theoretical framework adopted for this socio-semantic study is ‘conceptual analysis’ as explained by Lyons (1977:109) and Saeed (2003: 34-46, 266-76), Fishman’s (1972) “Domain and Topics” analysis and Labov’s (2006) “Quantitative Paradigm” analysis. Data was sourced from some selected universities; students in the universities constitute the study and population while three major instruments were used: unscheduled non-participatory observation, questionnaire and motive-determination interview. Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used to analyse the variables on the questionnaires to present the results of the data collected. A summary of the findings is presented in tables for easy comprehension aimed at drawing a valid conclusion. The analysis shows that, domains of discourse and pragmatics, language use and meaning-making have significant impact on the Nigerian university students and it was observed that the use of English language for a meaningful dialogue was almost impossible by students as result of the frequent code-switching. It also indicates that students use Nigerian languages to make meaning, due to their level of “proficiency in Nigerian languages compared to English language” and that, “they have more lexical items of their proficient language in their repertoire”.

Keywords: *Language use, Socio-semantics, Nigerian university students, Social meaning, Code-switching, Lingua franca.*

Background to the Study

The nature of whatever one writes or speaks today is expected to carry a message that should be understood by readers or listeners as intended. However, discourse involving different choices of codes for the expression of meaning and the users’ ability to freely use any code by switching between predominant languages for the expression, it could become impossible for listeners to understand, yet again it could be productive if the listener is competent in both choices of codes.

This study focuses on socio-semantics, code-switching and the fluctuation of societal language meaning and social meaning placed on codes of two or more conventional languages and their dialects in a conversation (in this case Nigeria’s lingua franca). Erman (2005:11-16) presenting “Issues in Code-switching: “Sociolinguistic Dimensions of Code-switching”, with debates on “The Meaning of Social Meaning”; elaborated on Blom and Gumperz’s three types of social constraints which presumably affects code choices of speakers for meaning making; setting, social situation, and social event. Hymes (1972) in his opinion of the choice of codes for settings explains that, social situations and social events are not kept apart, thereby making it almost impossible for speakers to avoid code-switching. This study focuses on the sociolinguistic, social and/or societal semantic aspects of code-switching that affect the society’s conventional language usage for meaning-making in the users’ choice of codes.

Gumperz, (1982 & 1992) cited in Erman (2005) on conversational code-switching, sees code, the dialect, and even style of switching processes as implicit ways of conveying meaning as part of the interaction between speakers within the society not minding the conventional rules violated (p12). Auer (1995), Alfonzetti (1998), and Sebba (1993) further employed conversation analysis techniques; where Auer asserts that, “any theory of conversational code-alternation is bound to fail if it does not take into account that the meaning of code-alternation depends in essential ways on its ‘sequential environment’” (p.116), in other words, the meaning attached to switched codes are violated and there is need to be interpreted in relation to the preceding utterances as well as the situation/environment that demands the choice of the codes for the

conversation. For Auer, the sequential rootedness of meaning in bilingual conversation is “relatively independent” of its social meaning for the community (p.132) cited in (Erman, 2005). This means, the conventional societal meaning of a language is independent of the social usage of the same variety no matter the context.

On the other hand, social meaning of code-switching is seen by Blom and Gumperz’s (1972) as a product of individual interactions to the extent that it is created and negotiated locally as well as formally in contemporary today’s Nigerian university context. In other words, social meaning lies not within the act of switching itself, but in the perceived association between speech activities on the one hand, standards and individual’s ability of a language choice on the other. Therefore, the central aim of this paper is the investigation of how a network of Nigerian university students, well-read bilinguals and most of all students of English Language in Nigerian universities alternate between English and other ethnic languages in everyday formal/casual conversations, and how their choice of language relates to their social identification and the relation of meaning in every conversation.

Wardhaugh (1986) asserts that, the term code can be used to refer to any kind of system that two or more people employ for communication, whether it is language and dialect or pidgins and creoles, all are codes. Alternatively, if we look at ‘switching’, it appears just as a movement; movement from one object to another. This means that you shift, switch or move from one code to another while speaking. This shift, switch, and movement of bilingual speakers from one code (language) to another is called “code-switching”. There are numerous investigations (Shin & Milroy, 2000; Li & Milroy, 1995; Myers-Scotton, 1993) which have demonstrated the opposite and consider code-switching as an additional resource for interaction purpose, yet they have not necessarily looked at the switch socio-semantically at the formal/informal level and the effects on the standard language for meaningful expression. It is obvious that there is a well-documented and refined literature which rejects the negative claim that code-switching is a sign of laziness and deficiency in language use. Rather, it claims that bilingual speakers have the prestige of exploiting their treasure of linguistic knowledge to express meaningful thoughts and ideas (Wong, 2000).

There are different languages (codes) used by Nigerian students for interaction today, in that, most students are either bilinguals or multilingual speakers of Nigerian languages. This has led to peculiar problems for meaning-making in a context where the formal/standard expression of English language is expected of an individual. Furthermore, most Nigerian students have been in contact with at least one (1) or several other languages and/or dialects besides their Mother Tongue (L1) and Second Language (L2) (possibly Amr-Eng and BrEng), where students’ environments, the nature of other ethnic groups, classrooms, social and religious gatherings, and campus settlements make switching inevitable.

Breitborde (1983) vehemently claims that the social meaning of code-switching cannot afford to ignore the societal regularities and the macro-level organization of social relationships, which arguably gives meaning to individual choices (cited in Erman, 2005), but not realizing that this hypothesis reflects communities that have basically one dominant language with multiple dialects of the same language based on the macro groups, unlike Nigeria, where we have multiple languages and dialects. Debatably, Fishman’s (1965, 1972) model of domain analysis explained code-switching in urban contexts, given that it tells us very little about what the speakers accomplish as a result of alternating between available codes in their linguistic repertoire.

Some university students who maintain their cultural dialect, language, and accent are viewed as ‘stupid,’ ‘inferior’ or ‘rudimentary’ by their peers. In addition, most of the studies on code-switching concentrated on the degrees, nature, people, groups, patterns of occurrence, attitude to, functions, forms, causes of code-switching to draw conclusions on the linguistic aspects of the alternation. However, very few look at code-switching as a way out for making-meaning. This study addresses part of this problem by investigating the influences of status, gender, age, level of education, location, and domains of discourse, pragmatics, meaning making, language use and nature of alternation amongst bilingual university students and students of English language and any other language of the selected case study.

Review of Related Literature: Socio-semantics

The concept “socio” is seen as a prefix to a content concept, although, in this review, it is seen as a combining form that denotes social or the society meaning of language use. A combining form of meaning, “social”, “sociological”, “society”, etc, in the context of the review, “socio-semantics”; where social, societal (group, community, common, public, collective etc) and sociological usage of language meaning meets. The major and recent expansion of various socio-semantic communities of bilinguals proves that code-switching has

been supported by a wide range of groups (age, status, culture, education etc.). Many of these are entirely unique and have simultaneously led to the availability of large amounts of detailed data on the users' choices of codes to express meaning in whatever context. Little or no review has been done in the area of "socio-semantics", although, some works could amply be related to the concept; where Jay Lemke reviewing Hasan's (2009) book on "Semantic Variation", stated that, adults and young children of different class families frame questions and answers, commands and requests, and grounds and reasons in casual conversation and in normal (formal) settings; in other words, they choose predominant codes in their repertoire that are used in whatever context or situation (even in formal settings). van Leeuwen's (1996) review on socio-semantics deals with options for representing social actors, with specific attention paid to discourse; his proposed analytical category is sociological rather than linguistic, although, he asserts that, "there is no neat fit between sociological and linguistic categories" (van Leeuwen 1996:33 cited in Reza et al, 2012).

Van Leeuwen's socio-semantic approach was to describe the social and semantic features of representation of the social actors in a social interaction, although basically in the studies within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the framework has been used to analyse media discourses (van Leeuwen, 2008 cited in Reza et al, 2012), nonetheless, we appreciate that his review pointed out groups or associations, with a chosen code for their interactions. Therefore, we also know that sociolinguistics studies the effects of any and all aspects of society, including cultural norms, expectations, context and the effects of language use on society. This review on social/societal semantics as a branch of the field of linguistics, that investigates human practices in specific social and cultural circumstances, tries to explain meaning-making both as a societal and social practice or integration on language usage and the effects on the learners or speakers of Nigeria's 'lingua franca'.

Language makes it possible for one to communicate one's thought, as languages, dialects, groups codes are increasingly coming into contact as a result of the impact of scientific and technological developments; it is imperative for thoughts to be wider than one's cultural setting. The domain of discourse determines the register employed in each domain.

Appel and Muysken (1989) function model observes that, switching can serve the referential function. According to them, topics related to switching may be thought of as serving the referential function of language. Alfonzetti (2002) also states that, "speakers switch to the code they consider more appropriate for a given topic" (p.197), she adds that although this sometimes happens, it simply fails to account for many other contextual implications of the occurrence (effective meaning-making), and that it is a contextualization cue used to signal a change in the conversational context. Holmes (1992) further reiterates that, there are domains of language use that induce language choice for situational meaning-making.

Concept of Code-Switching

Gardner-Chloros (2009) defines code-switching as "the use of several languages or dialects in the same conversation or sentence by a bilingual person". According to her, code-switching in this sense means switching between different languages or language varieties by bilinguals and multilinguals in the course of a single conversation. Through code-switching in linguistics many bilinguals will utilize their ability to shift from one language to another to communicate with others in an unchanged setting and usually within the same utterance (Bullock & Toribio, 2009) not necessarily minding if the listener understands the intended meaning. The Nigerian university is a community where this occurs as a result of various convergences of many ethnic groups.

The interactive significance of code-switching between bilingual speakers cannot be overstated, even though, the outcomes of surveys show that it is conversational strategies generally used by bilinguals to efficiently share social and communicative significances. Inuwa (2014) asserted that "Hausa bilinguals alternate between the two languages to quote a speech made by someone without dropping the intended meaning" (8). They use code switching strategy to address different audiences within the same utterance, and sometimes make an objective comment. On the other hand, whenever the bilinguals lack a linguistic element in one language, they have an option of using its equivalent in the other code. The bilinguals sometimes use code switching to avoid message ambiguity by uttering the same statement in another language to clarify the message to the anticipated listeners. They, however, switch between languages when they intend to indicate a precise point, or at times to display exclamations such as anger or surprise. Some members belonging to a certain language group or ethnicity, such as students/friends normally use code switching to share the individuality that binds them together.

Code-switching occurs when the speakers involved in a conversation use both languages together to the extent that they change from one language to the other in the course of a single utterance (Wardhaugh 1986), although, this could be seen as inappropriate for communities like Nigeria, if the speaker or listener is not a competent speaker of one of the languages in the conversation. Poplack and Meechan (1995:200) emphasize the fact that, in code-switching the languages are clearly separate from each other, when it involves two competent bilinguals of the languages, each of which is internally consistent with the morphological and syntactic (and optionally, phonological) rules of its language, which means, the use of code-switching by people is dependent on their linguistic acquisition level, and the types of socialization (context) and interaction (situation) they are involved in but also being able to keep both languages apart where the lingua franca is required.

Code

Romaine (1988:48) opines that “code is a term which refers to a variety”. A code may then be an idiolect, dialect, sociolect, register or language. A speaker has a linguistic repertoire that consists of a variety of codes. In a monolingual situation, the use of different codes depends on the variability of language, while in a bilingual or multilingual society, it is normal for the people to be in a situation where a choice between two or more codes (languages) has to be made. In such a situation, bilinguals may want to consider for example, who speaks to them, in which language or variety, and when or where the conversation takes place (Fishman, 1965). Hymes (1964) suggests eight factors that bilingual, multilingual and monolingual speakers do consider when choosing a code to express meaning. The factors are speaking (which stands for “setting and scene” in form of location, occasions and natural situation), participants (which stands for people—users or speakers), ends (which could be goals or purposes), act sequence (that is order of speech, conversation, narrative, etc.), key (in form of spirit, manner and feelings), instrumentalities (like registers and forms of the speech), norms of interactions (which is the contextual custom in using the codes), and genre (like lecture, poem, proverb forms, etc.).

Code-Switching and Code-Mixing in the Nigerian Context

Nigeria today has more than five hundred (500) languages and over one thousand dialects. This has given room for the growth of bilingual or multilingual speakers who use English language in the country. Therefore, code-switching occurs frequently in almost all conversations, even in professional settings. With multiple languages in the country, the possibility of mixing English with ethnic languages is inevitable. The concept of “code-mixing” is used to refer to a more general form of language contact that may include cases of code-switching and other forms of contacts. The emphasis here is on the grammatical features and lexical items from two languages in a sentence (Muysken, 2000).

Code-mixing is the change from one language to another within the same utterance or in the same oral/written text. Some sociolinguists differentiate between code-switching and code-mixing while others simply refer to them both as code-switching. Hudson (2001) separates code-switching from code-mixing by defining code-mixing as alternations that happen when a fluent bilingual talking to another fluent bilingual change codes without any change at all in the situation. The other assertion is that, code-switching has become a common term for alternate use of two or more languages, or varieties of language or even speech styles, while Gal in (Wardough, 1986:103) points out that, code-switching is seen as a conversational strategy used to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries, in order to create, evoke or change interpersonal relations with their rights and obligations.

Essentially, it has been difficult to differentiate between code-mixing and code-switching by scholars; however, they have enabled one to see some indicators related to the differences of these two sociolinguistic terms. First, code-mixing bilingual speakers seem to apply some words or phrases from foreign languages while the other language (code) functions as the base language. Secondly, the assumptions that bilingual speakers mix codes when there is no topic that changes, neither does the situation (Gumperz, 1986). A different view proposes that if it involves changing into a foreign clause or sentence, it should be defined as code-switching but if it involves the use of foreign phrases or group of words, it is identified as code-mixing. Poemer (2011) adds that the use of code-switching or code-mixing is determined by the formality of the situation, while code-mixing is found in the less formal situation, code-switching possibly occurs in a formal one depending on the accepted code.

Code-Switching in Nigerian Universities

In Nigerian university communities, speakers use code-switching as a way of communicating their ethnicity among others. They work towards declaring an ethnic identity as they demonstrate acceptable ethnic group markers to the others (Trimble, et al 2005). Babalola and Taiwo (2009) gave a good example of this assertion by some Nigerian artistes who try to relate with their roots. Such artistes have consistently strived to make creative use of their indigenous languages in their songs, although most songs are written in English language. Therefore, in relating language with one's mental image and the importance of identity, an artiste could connect with people from his own background. Nigerians listeners within the university community in-turn use the ability to relate with social groups who understand the usage of words or sentences code-switched in Nigerian music. Artistes' use of code-switching in music gives second language learners and bilinguals the opportunity to proclaim their ethnicity and identity. And because of this, there is huge pride of users, who tend to ignore the diminishing level of their ability to keep the languages apart in formal situations for a meaningful expression.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework adopted for this paper is 'Conceptual Analysis' as explained by Lyons (1977:109) and Saeed (2003: 34-46, 266-76) Fishman's (1972) "Domain and Topics" analysis and Labov's (2006) "Quantitative Paradigm" analysis as an eclectic study. The term conceptualism is used to refer to any theory of Semantics that defines the meaning of a word or expression, a concept associated within the mind of the speaker and listeners. This framework is supported by numerous hypotheses of the theories of meaning such as code-switching, interactional sociolinguistics, the Semantic Model of Conversational Code-switching by Gumperz further modified by Auer (1984) and the "Ideational Theory of Meaning" developed by Locke (1975) cited in (Brown et al, 2010). The theory explains that the meaning attached to words can be separated from the words themselves; that is to say, meaning originates in the mind in the form of ideas. Therefore, language is a mechanism for expressing thoughts and thought is viewed as a succession of conscious ideas while words or codes are just sensible signs for the convenience of interaction. The ideational theory is perceived to be conceptual or vague because of its dependence on mental images for decoding the meaning of words. Locke also calls this a mentalist theory of meaning; it is because the meaning of a word is the mental image or idea of the word or expression generated in the mind of the speaker or hearer.

Research Methodology

The research design for this paper combines aspects of qualitative and quantitative analysis; this mixed method could add technical hitches to the research design and use the advantages of both designs as well (Creswell, 2008), nevertheless, it enhanced the collection and analysis of data. The components of design allows the researcher to rely on codes/varieties and languages/dialects used in code-switching with English Language by students of the University of Agriculture Makurdi and Benue State University in relation to their expression of meaning as related to this study of 'socio-semantics' in code-switching (sociolinguistics). The qualitative research design is constructed with the types of knowledge intended to form a better argument within the framework and theoretical concepts of the thematic; thereby bringing an understanding and a perspective towards semantics, sociolinguistics and linguistics at large. Two hundred and fifty students (250) were selected randomly. The data collected was stratified along the domains of language use and the technique was adopted in selecting students from natural contexts of language use that formed the sample for the study.

Data Analysis

The data presented below is order to determine the socio-semantic effects of social meanings on the conventional language meaning of code-switching, illustrate code-switching prominence among university students and show the socio-semantic codes, situation/context used for interactions and the implications of code-switching in Nigerian universities, determine the frequency and rate of code-switching among university students, illustrate if code-switching among students in the selected case study is proficiency-driven or deficiency-driven and exemplify the influence of domains of discourse, pragmatics, language use, meaning-making and nature of language alternation on students. A summary of the findings are presented in Twenty One (21) tables below for easy comprehension aimed at drawing a valid conclusion.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Male	183	76.9	76.9
Female	55	23.1	23.1
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The results showed that 76.9% male students responded to the questionnaires, while 23.1% are females. The result reveals that there is no significant influence of gender on code-switching, though male students code-switch more frequently than their female counterparts. Note that, the paper's focus is not on the gender differentiation of the use of code-switching but the general usage by students; although, the observations and recording, male students code-switch often as a result of their peer group association.

Table 2: Distribution of the Age Range of Respondents

Age Range	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
18-24	55	23.1	23.1
25-30	157	66.0	66.0
31-35	26	10.9	10.9
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The table above shows that twenty six (26) students representing 10.9% fall between 31-35 age bracket, fifty five respondents between the ages of 18-24, while one hundred and fifty seven representing 66.0% are between the ages of 25-30 years. This indicates that there are students who are older and probably more experienced and those who are younger and are possibly bilingual speakers.

Table 3: Level of Education for Respondents (Class)

Level	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
400 and above	238	100.0	100.0

In analysing the Level of Education influence on Code-switching, it is not always easy to categorize individuals into classes, because such categorizations may not be very adequate for empirical research. Chieni (2001) suggests that there are different scales used to classify people within a social system such as; occupation, education, income, where people live and so on. The assumption is that each group's level of education (100 Level to 600 Level and Masters Level) is likely to affect its language use and the representation in the Table 3 above shows that all the respondents were either in 400 Level or above and do code-switch.

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents According to their Institutions

Institutions	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi	95	39.9	39.9
Benue State University, Makurdi	143	60.1	60.1
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The table shows that a total of ninety five students responded from the University of Agriculture with 39.9%, while 60.1% of the respondents are from the Benue State University.

Domain of Discourse on Code-Switching Meaningfully

In order to understand that nature of code-switching by students, topics and context of the conversation, the interlocutors involved, location or place, all summed up the response presented in the tables below in order

to identify the influence of domains of discourse, pragmatics, language use, meaning-making and nature of language alternation on students? Questions were posed to students in the one of the data collection methods; questionnaires (see appendix 1).

Table 5: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching with Parents at home

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	77	32.4	32.4
Often	110	46.2	46.2
Most often	51	21.4	21.4
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The table indicates a greater percentage of respondents switch in a conversation with parents at home. One hundred and six one (161) summing up 67.6% of the total respondents agreed they “often” or “most often” code-switch when discussing with parents at home, in other words, parents also condole Nigerian languages with their children more than the standard English language for relation, although, this is as a result of the speakers’ repertoire competency.

Table 6: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching Academic Debates in School

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	71	29.8	29.8
Seldom	10	4.2	4.2
Often	106	44.5	44.5
Most often	51	21.4	21.4
Total	238	100.0	100.0

This table indicates the influence of Nigerian languages in this domain of discourse, a total of 70.1% of the respondents said they either ‘seldom’, ‘often’ or ‘most often’ code-switch in this domain of discourse of academic debates; a formal setting that requires all students to be able to interact using the Standard English language.

Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching

Domain of Pragmatics on code-switching basically deals with the standpoint of ‘language use’ and ‘context of usage’. This section focuses on the pragmatics of ‘inter-languages’ (English usage and Nigerian ethnic languages) and the context to which BSU, UAM students relate, a focus which is justified by the growing importance of English as a global lingua franca.

Table 7: Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching for Language Harmonization at Social Gatherings

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	68	28.6	28.6
Seldom	19	8.0	8.0
Often	106	44.5	44.5
Most often	45	18.9	18.9
Total	238	100.0	100.0

Sixty eight respondents representing 28.6% admit that they do not code-switch in order to harmonize with speakers of the same ethnic group, 8.0% ‘seldom’, 44.5% ‘often’ and 18.9% ‘most often’ code-switch in this domain of harmonization of language.

Table 8: Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching Academics with Classmates in Classroom

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	10	4.2	4.2
Seldom	12	5.0	5.0
Often	159	66.8	66.8
Most often	57	23.9	23.9
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The table shows that a total 95.8% of the respondents either “seldom”, “often” or “most often” code-switch in this domain of pragmatics, since the context is formal and the domain indicates it’s an academic discussion, only 4.2% of the respondents state that they do not switch to other languages in this domain of discourse when talking about academic issues with course mates in the classroom.

Domains of “Language Use” on Code-Switching

Domains of “language use” was first proposed by Schmidt- Rohr in 1932, and later developed by Fishman; based on Fishman (1972:20) as cited in Romaine (1988), “domain is a socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationship between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institution of a society and the area of activity of speech community in such a way that individual behaviour and social patterns can be distinguished from each other and yet related to each other”.

Table 9: Number of Nigerian Languages Spoken by Respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Two	157	66.0	66.0
Three	81	34.0	34.0
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The table indicates that 66.0% of the total respondents speak two Nigerian languages, while 34.0% speak three Nigerian languages, in other words, students in these institutions are either monolingual or multilingual speakers of some Nigerian languages.

Table 10: Level of Proficiency on the Nigerian Languages Spoken

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Native Speaker/Mother Tongue (L1)	151	63.4	63.4
Second Language (L2)	26	10.9	10.9
Proficient in both Languages	61	25.6	25.6
Total	238	100.0	100.0

A total of 63.4% of the respondents indicated that they are L1 speakers of the Nigerian languages they speak, 10.9% indicated same as their second languages; while 25.6% agreed they speak both languages. This result clearly indicates that respondents are proficient speakers of the languages presented in the table.

Table 11: Languages used for Thoughts both in School, Home or Social Gathering

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Tiv and English	55	23.1	23.1
Igala and English	26	10.9	10.9
Pidgin English and English	51	21.4	21.4
English	94	39.5	39.5
Idoma and English	12	5.0	5.0
Total	238	100.0	100.0

60.4% of the total respondents chose a Nigerian language before English as their languages of thoughts in school, social gatherings and at home. 39.5% indicated English language as their only code for thoughts in whatever context.

Table 12: Language of Communication with Classmates

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Tiv and English	12	5.0	5.0
Idoma and English	16	6.7	6.7
Igala and English	8	3.4	3.4
Pidgin English & NE	41	17.2	17.2
English	161	67.6	67.6
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The language of communication among the students in the study area shows that Nigerian languages are the first option, and 32.3% of the total respondents indicate Tiv, Idoma, Igala, and Pidgin with English as their language of communication with classmates, while 67.6% indicated they use English language for communicating with classmates.

Table 13: Speakers Duration of Spoken Nigerian Languages

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
1 hour	51	21.4	21.4
6 hours	55	23.1	23.1
24 hours, 7 days a week	55	23.1	23.1

No response	77	32.4	32.4
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The table indicates that fifty one respondents (51) representing 21.4% code-switch for an hour daily, while 23.1% for six hours daily and 23.1% indicate they code-switch twenty four hours, seven days of the week (in other words, all days of their lives). Therefore, long term code-switching influences the speaker or the user of Nigerian languages against their use of English language.

Domain of Meaning-Making on Students’ Language Use

Semantics is a term that refers to how meaning is assigned in language while a domain is essentially a specific place or territory. A semantic domain is a specific place that shares a set of meanings, or a language that holds its meaning, within the given context of the place. Harriet Ottenheimer a specialist in Linguistic Anthropology defines a semantic domain as a “specific area of cultural emphasis” (Ottenheimer, 2006).

Table 14: Students’ use of Nigerian Languages for Meaningful Conversation (Code-Switching)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Feature more specific words	55	23.1	23.1
Fluid relationship with words	106	44.5	44.5
No response	77	32.4	32.4
Total	238	100.0	100.0

67.6% of the total respondents agreed they use Nigerian languages to convey meaning, while 44.5% said it is because of their level of proficiency, 23.1% also said using Nigerian languages gives them more lexical items of their proficient language in their repertoire.

Table 15: Reasons for Nigerian Language(s) Choice over English Language

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Ease of Understanding	42	17.6	17.6
Ease of Explanation	63	26.5	26.5
Ease of definition	21	8.8	8.8
Ease of interpretation among the people	25	10.5	10.5
Better choice of words than the English language	16	6.7	6.7
No response	71	29.8	29.8
Total	238	100.0	100.0

This table presents data based on previous tables and with focus on the preference given to Nigerian languages over English language in order to make-meaning in a conversation, and 70.2% of the total respondents said they prefer Nigerian languages to make sense because it is “easily understood”, 17.6% said “explanation is easy”, “26.5% admit “lexical items are defined easily”, “10.5% maintained “interpretation is done among people effortlessly”, “6.7% said “there are better choice of diction than English language words”, 29.8% did not respond to this question.

Students’ Nature of Code-switching (Language Alternation) in Nigerian Universities

Language alternation describes the alternating use of two recognizable grammatical systems; two “languages” in some sense of that word. Language alternation concerns linguistic form, while code-switching concerns the contextualization of communication. In order to understand students’ nature of code-switching, the need for their opinion was requested, with an open ended section of the questionnaire.

Table 16: Number of Times Students Code-switch

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Never	59	24.8	24.8
Seldom	20	8.4	8.4
Often	28	11.8	11.8
Most often	131	55.0	55.0
Total	238	100.0	100.0

One hundred and thirty one students of the total respondents state they “most often” code-switch to Nigerian languages, 11.8% “often”, 8.4% “seldom” switch to L1 to make meaningful conversation, while 24.8% of the total respondents said they “never” code-switch at all.

Table 17: Students’ usage of Nigerian Languages and English Language when Writing

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Yes	110	46.2	46.2
No	51	21.4	21.4
No response	77	32.4	32.4
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The data collected showed that 46.2% of the total respondents said “Yes”, 21.4% said “No”, while 32.4% of the total respondents did not respond. Undoubtedly, there is influence of Nigerian language usage on the Standard English language in whatever context of usage as well as in students’ writing.

Table 18: Effects of language Alternation on Students’ Meaningful Conversation and Writing

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
It affects the original form of the mother tongue	106	44.5	44.5
It affects the standard nature of English language	132	55.5	55.5
Total	238	100.0	100.0

One hundred and Six respondents representing 44.5% said, “It affects the native language (L1)”, 55.5% stated that, the usage has “affected the standard nature of English language”.

Table 19: Views on the Effects of Code-switching on English Language Standard Expression by Linguistics Students

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Very Negative	139	58.4	58.4
Negative	53	22.3	22.3
No response	46	19.3	19.3
Total	238	100.0	100.0

An open end question, requesting students’ opinion/views on the effect of code-switching on English language and Linguistics students of Nigerian Universities, 58.4% said it is has a “Very Negative”, and 22.3% said the usage has a “Negative” effect on university learners of English language.

Table 20: Effects of Code-switching on Successful Communication with Non-Users

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
First language speakers finds it difficult to be fluent and proficient	89	37.4	37.4
Second language speakers finds it difficult to speak their mother tongues fluently and proficiently	89	37.4	37.4
Conflict choice on the use of semantics and the environment in which it would be spoken	56	23.5	23.5
No response	4	1.7	1.7
Total	238	100.0	100.0

The table presents students’ responses on reasons why the use of code-switching has affected effective communication with non-users, and 37.4% said “first language speakers find it difficult to be fluent and proficient”, 37.4% stated that, “second language speakers find it difficult to speak their mother tongues

fluently and proficiently”, and 23.5% also said, “there is conflict of choice on the use of semantics and the environment in which it would be spoken”.

Motive-Determination Interview

The interview is carried out much later after the initial conversation (observational) to determine from the respondents whether the meanings and switches in their utterances were done as a result of bilingual proficiency or deficiency. Below is a presentation of data collected on fifty (50) interviewees, where twenty (20) questions were asked.

Table 21: Indicating the Motive-Determination Interview

Sn	Questions	Responses	F	%
1	What do you know about code-switching and semantics”?	They have no idea of what the term “Code-switching means, likewise the term “semantics.	33	66.0%
	Respondents said:	“Code-switching is when you are speaking in English and change to another tribe or language, while semantics means ‘definition””.	2	0.04%
		“Switching another language when speaking English and then coming back to it, semantics means interpretation or definition or giving meaning to something”.	4	0.08%
		“Speaking English and diverting to another language and coming back to English, semantics can be said or mean “definition” of something”.	1	0.02%
		“One is in a conversation and speaks different languages, not really sure of semantics”.	5	10.0%
		“For instance speaking to me in English and translates to another language or dialect the listener doesn’t know that someone else understands”.	5	10.0%
2	Which word(s) or expression(s) do you use from your language and is the usage deliberate?	responses were basically exclamations: fear, surprise/shock, cry for help etc, although, when they don’t want a third or more party to hear their conversation, a specific code is chosen in order to carry on the conversation:		
	Respondents said:	“No”	20	40.0%
		“Yes”	30	60.0%
3	What language did you first learn to speak before school age?	Tiv	22	44.0%
	Respondents said:	Idoma,	18	36.0%
		Igbo,	4	0.08%
		Hausa	4	0.08%
		English	1	0.02%
		Ufia.	1	0.02%
4	Can you only speak English or only Nigerian languages, pidgin and is it easy or difficult?	“they speak both because they are easy”, some said “English is kind of easy than the Nigerian language, because it’s not my language”	22	44.0%
	Respondents said:	“speak Igbo and English, although Igbo is easier”	3	06.0%
		“Hausa and English, but Hausa is easier than English”,	4	08.0%
		“some also said both but then surprisingly very difficult”	4	08.0%
		“Pidgin (common),	3	06.0%
		French (quite difficult)	10	20.0%
		Nigerian language(s) (very often because of the nature of the environment), and maintained that “English is quite difficult to use because of the dominant languages in the context they find ourselves”.	1	0.02%
			3	06.0%
5	Do you think code-switching is a sign of proficiency or deficiency in one or both languages?	Students also think it is as a result of deficiency in English language that makes them switch to Nigerian languages,	33	66.0%
	Respondents said:	It is the level of proficiency/ability in the language or dialects that makes speakers switch,	15	30.0%
		It all depends on the context/situation of usage.	2	04.0%
6	Do you feel code-switching can be associated with or belonging to the “elites”?	“Yes”	35	70.0%
		“No”	15	30.0%
7	Do you see code-switching as something positive or negative about yourself?	Students think code-switching sometimes has negative effects	45	90.0%
		Few think it doesn’t.	5	10.0%

8	Do you prefer Nigerian languages over Standard English to make sense in a conversation?	Students do prefer Nigerian languages over Standard English to make sense in a conversation,	33	66.0%
		Some said otherwise,	10	20.0%
		while a few thinks it depends on the environment one finds themselves.	7	14.0%

Discussion

Nigeria is a multilingual society with diverse cultures and languages, despite the dominance of English as the language of wider communication nationally and globally, it is classified as disrespectful in some quarters for a young person to communicate in English with an elderly person; this notion encourages the constant usage of speakers' mother tongue, given that, speaking the mother tongue serves as a polite technique, which however decreases the users' performance and competence in the country's lingua franca. The researcher agrees with Oseghale (2012) that, "...scholars of semantics are of the opinion that since English is spoken in Nigeria as a second language; socio-cultural variables are bound to influence the variety of English spoken by Nigerians". In circumstances like this (a multilingual national as Nigeria, with individuals proud of their mother tongue), a larger percentage of the Nigerian populace would prefer using their mother tongue in order to communicate meaningfully. According to the analysis, the connotation is that there is greater predisposition to code-switch in the urban areas than in the rural settings; the rural competence influences the standard conventional and official language in the urban areas. Below is a comprehensive discussion of the findings of the analysis:

Analysis of data on the psycho-physical variables shows that gender, age, level of education has no significant influence on code-switching among students in the institutions, although the random distribution and response on questionnaire shows that, male respondents are more than the female. Meanwhile results on age differ from McClure's (1977) assertion, that age is an essential variable that influences language alternation. Likewise, results on level of education corroborates Hoffman's (1991) opinion that, switching is a by-product of education, in other words, one's level of education does not influence code-switching, although to a degree, bilingual speakers would influence the switch. In this case, it was not as a result of the speakers' competency of the Nigerian languages and English language, but that; speakers are incompetent users of English language, likewise level of education does not limit individuals' code-switching. On the other hand, location has a significant influence on switching between Nigerian languages and English language within the university communities. This affirms Romaine's (2000) opinion that, because there is a convergence of different ethnic groups in the urban areas, there is the tendency for code-switching to be used functionally.

The analysis shows that, domains of discourse (registers employed in a conversation, codes for a topic, language choice) and pragmatics (language use and context of usage), language use (languages in a users' repertoire, topics and relationships between communicators) and meaning-making (meaning assigned on a code for a specific territory of usage) has a significant impact on the Nigerian university students in the study area. This indicates that, topics, situations, settings/location, context of usage does not necessarily limit students from choosing their competent or proficient code for interactions, and in this case, we found that, the lingua franca is not the first choice of code in their repertoire to interact. This finding agrees with the observation of Alfonzetti (2002) that, speakers switch to the code they consider more appropriate for a given topic and/context; showing an extensive level of switching both in formal and informal settings while 'discussing academic issues with teachers' and 'academic issues with course mates in classroom', 'academic issues with school administrators', 'during academic debates with fellow students', family discussion, friends and social gatherings' conversations etc.

Based on the data collected, it was observed undisputable that, students find it almost impossible to make meaningful conversation in their spoken English language, given the analysis reveals that 67.6% of the respondents agreed they use their Nigerian languages to make meaning, and when asked why, 44.5% said it is because of their level of "proficiency in Nigerian languages is better than that of English language", (in other words, they are competent speakers of their languages than that of English language), while 23.1% declared that, "they have more lexical items of their proficient language in their repertoire". The long term code-switching user has high influence on the speaker or the user of Nigerian languages who is expected to use English language in formal settings, indications show that, the duration respondents spent speaking and thinking in any of the Nigerian languages in their repertoire is high with 67.6% of the respondents affirming "they use languages or dialects to speak or think at least 1hour, 6hours or 24hours 7days a week".

Students in these institutions prefer Nigerian languages over English language in order to make-meaning in a conversation, 70.2% of the respondents said they prefer Nigerian languages, stating clearly that, it is “easily understood”, 17.6% “explanation is easy”, 26.5% “Nigerian language lexical items are defined easily”, 10.5% “language interpretation is done among people at ease”, other respondents argue that, “there are better choice of diction than English language words”. The analysis further reveals the implication of usage of Nigerian languages and Standard English language when writing in whatever context, no matter the requirement, 46.2% of the total respondents agrees it has a negative effect on their usage of English language. Respondent further indicate that the switch between Nigerian languages and Standard English language has a significant influence on students of English language, 58.4% said it is has a “Very Negative effect”, while 22.3% said the usage has “Negative” effect on university learners of “English language”.

Analysis on the nature of students’ code-switching among Nigerian university students and students of English Language (in particular) indicates that 75.2% of the total respondents state they “most often”, “often” and “seldom” code-switch to Nigerian languages to make meaningful conversation. The usage, language choice, creation of codes by groups or associations elaborates on social and societal meaning of either the choice of words and grammatical expression in whatever context or situations of usage. Having affected the standard usage of English language and students’ meaningful expression, the outcome is that the Nigerian languages’ conventional lexical items and meanings are altered by groups or association to suite their usage. The case study reveals that students encountered difficulties with the use of Standard English Language while interacting (both at formal and informal settings) and that listeners do not understand when they use the wrong choices of codes in a certain context. This reveals that, any meaningful conversation in Nigerian languages is based on the context of the groups or associations’ networks, that relate and appeals to their local languages or dialects with the use of terms readily associated.

This paper has added a considerable value to the field of linguistics, semantics and sociolinguistics and the nature of English language use in Nigeria with particular emphases on the language use of Nigerian university students and meaning making. This paper highlighted the features and linguistics performance of university students, and a clear indication that Nigerian university students’ code-switch inappropriately in order to express meaning including at formal settings or domains that requires standard usage of English Language. Amid this, the findings revealed that, the nature of code-switching, frequency of code-switching by students both at the formal/informal context, shows that, English language in Nigeria has little or no native speakers of Standard English language (Br.Eng). This paper has also added that considerable knowledge to our today’s linguistic field, indicating that scholar, teachers, well-read bilinguals, linguists and professors of English language in Nigeria code-switch even with students within the academic environment, thereby given room to learners’ frequent switch of codes both in formal and informal context, indicating that being a bilingual or a multilingual is no longer an just an ability but as a result, the inabilities of speakers standard English language users to fall back to their ethnic languages in order to express meaning.

Conclusion

The paper concludes that the socio-semantic impacts/effects of social usage have significant influence on the standard usage of English language among Nigerian university students as well as students of English language as a result of frequent usage of mother tongue or some other Nigerian language. The Nigerian languages, dialects, groups or associations’ codes, students’ mother tongue and second languages (not English language in this case but Nigerian languages), academic environment (classrooms and administrative offices), social gatherings within the academic environment, home, religious environments are all types of situation/context for code-switching in Nigerian universities. This implies that, the frequent switch in all these context/situations makes it almost difficult for students to keep informal and formal choice of language use apart. This was clearly revealed in the analysis, the frequency and rate of code-switching among university students is exceptionally high, because Nigerian university students’ code-switching is proficiency-driven (with Nigerian languages) and deficiency-driven (with Standard English language).

The impact of the domains of discourse, pragmatics, language use, meaning-making and nature of language alternation on Nigerian students indicates that it is also almost impossible for speakers to choose the appropriate code for every context/situation in order to make meaningful expressions on topics or issues while interacting. The domain of language use of students indicates that, the socio-semantic (social in this case) impacts of social meanings of language use over the conventional language meaning is appreciated even among the elite. The influence of domains on students switching in the classrooms clearly shows users language preference (based on student repertoire language proficiency) against the nation’s lingua franca.

The socio-semantic (social, societal) implication of code-switching against the conventional language indicates that, societal or conventional lexical and sentential meaning of language is lost (based on the users and the context of usage), while those of the students (social usage) is adopted and accepted. The review indicating that, meaning is expressed most often when using more than one language during interactions and the elaboration on the socio-semantics of students' language use in whatever context/situation affects the standard expression of English language used for a meaningful expression.

References

- Alfonzetti, G. (1998). The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 180-211). London: Routledge.
- _____ (2002). The conversational dimension in codeswitching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. *Codeswitching in Conversational Language Interaction and Identity* P. Auer (Ed). London: Routledge. p197
- Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1989). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: Johns Benjamins.
- Babalola, E.T. & Taiwo, R. (2009). Code-switching in Contemporary Nigerian Hip-hop Music. *Itupale Online Journal of African studies*, 1, 10-11. Retrieved from <http://www.cambridgetoafrica.org/resource>
- Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Breitborde, L. B. (1983). Levels of analysis in sociolinguistic explanation: Bilingual code switching, social relations, and domain theory. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 39, 5-43.
- Brown, K., Barber, Alex., & Stainton, Robert J., (2010). Ideational Theories of Meaning: Concise Encyclopedia of Philosophy of Language and Linguistics. In E J Lowe, University of Durham, Durham, UK. 2006 Elsevier Ltd.
- Bullock, B and Toribio, A. J. (2009) 'Themes in the study of code-switching', In B. Bullock and A.J. Toribio (eds.) *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic codeswitching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chieni, S.N. (2001). *Language and Society: Kiswahili, a national language or a social class language in Kenya. Kiswahili a Tool for Development the Multidisciplinary Approach*. Nairobi: Kimechapischwa na Downtown Printing Works Ltd. In Ene, Onyeanuna Innocent (2009). *Influence of Psycho-social Variables on Codemixing and Codeswitching among Igbo-English Bilingual Students*. In Enugu State, Nigeria: A PhD Thesis in English Language Education submitted to Department of Arts and Social Sciences Education, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage.
- Erman, Boztepe (2005). *Issues in Code-Switching: Competing Theories and Models: Sociolinguistic Dimensions of Code-switching; The Meaning of Social Meaning*. Teachers College, Columbia University working papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics 3(2): 1-27: online available at: <http://journals.tc-library.org/index.php/tesol/article/view/32> date assessed: 30/05/2016
- Fishman, J. A. (1965). Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique*, 2, 67-88.
- _____ (1972). Domains and the relationships between micro- and macro-sociolinguistics. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 435-453). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Gal, Susan. (1983). Comment. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 39, 63-72.
- _____ (1989). *Language and Political Economy*. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 345-367.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. New York
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). "The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching", in: *Papers on Language and Context* (Working Paper No 46, Berkeley); revised version as "Conversational code-switching" in *Discourse Strategies*, by J. Gumperz (Cambridge), pp 59-99.
- _____ (1986). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____ (1992). *Contextualization and Understanding*. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 229-252). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasan, R. (2009) *Semantic Variation: Meaning in Society and in Sociolinguistics*. Equinox Publishing Ltd. xiv + 484 pp.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York. Longman Publishers.
- Hudson, R. A. (2001). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge, UK: CUP. In Emeka-Nwobia, Ngozi U. (2014). *Code Switching in Igbo-English Bilingual Conversations*. *British Journal of English Linguistics* Vol.2, No.3, pp.1-6
- Hymes, Dell. (1964). Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. *American Anthropologist*, 6: 1-34. In
- Giiglioli, P. P. 1972. *Language and Social Context*. England: Clays Ltd. pp283-307
- _____ (1972). "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life" In: Gumperz & Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Blackwell: 35-71.
- Inuwa, N. Yusuf, (2014). *Significance of Hausa-English Code Switching*. *Academic Research International* Vol. 5(3) May 2014. Copyright © 2014 SAVAP International ISSN: 2223-9944, eISSN: 2223-9553. www.savap.org.pk

- 164 www.journals.savap.org.pk
- Li, Wei., & Milroy, L., (1995). A social network approach to code-switching: The example of a bilingual community in Britain. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker two Issues in CS: Competing Theories and Models 25 languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 136-157). New York: CUP
- Locke, J. (1975). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Nidditch P H (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press. In Brown, K., Barber, Alex., & Stainton, Robert J., (2010). *Concise Encyclopedia of Philosophy of Language and Linguistics: Ideational Theories of Meaning* In E J Lowe, University of Durham, Durham, UK. 2006 Elsevier Ltd.
- Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*. Vols. 1 & 2. London: Cambridge University Press. Pp109
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Oseghale, Esther Otekpen (2012). *Lexico-Semantic Features of Nigerian English*, Dissertation submitted in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Kaduna.
- Ottenheimer, Harriet J. (2006). *The Anthropology of Language: an introduction to linguistic anthropology*. Belmont (Canada): Wadsworth. p. 18. ISBN 9780534594367.
- Poplack, Shana, Marjorie Meechan (1995) *Patterns of language mixture: nominal structure in Wolof-French and Fongbe-French bilingual discourse*, in: *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, Milroy, Lesley/Muysken, Pieter, eds., 199-232.
- Reza Kheirabadi & Sayyed Behnam Alavi Moghaddam, (2012) *The Linguistic Representation of Iranian and Western Actors of Iran's Nuclear Program in International Media: A CDA Study. Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 10, pp. 2183-2188, October 2012: Academy Publisher. Finland.
- Romaine, S. (1988). *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman. In Mey, Jacob L. (2009) (ed.). *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics 2nd ed*, Oxford: Elsevier.
- Romaine, S., (2000). *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics 2nd Edition*. Oxford: OUP
- Saeed, I. John (2003). *Semantics*. 2nd ed, UK, Blackwell Publishing: pp. 34-46, 266-76
- Sebba, M. (1993). *London Jamaican*. Harlow: Longman.
- Shin, S. J., & Milroy, L. (2000). *Conversational Codeswitching Among Korean-English Bilingual Children*. *International journal of Bilingualism*, 4(3), 351-383.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *The Representation of Social Actors*. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Colthard (Eds.), *Text and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp.32-70) London: Routledge.
- _____ (2008). *Discourse and practice, New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics second Edition*. Cambridge USA: Blackwell.
- Wong, K. (2000). *Cultural functions of code switching among bilingual speakers from different communities*. [Online] Retrieved March 20, 2011, from <http://www.sfn.ca/~intlclub/Articles/codeswitching.doc>

Appendix

This research questionnaire is to collect and analyze data on the semantic deviation and the ineffective communication meaningless expression when code-switching from Standard English language lexemes, phrases and sentences to Nigerian ethnic groups' languages by university students while interacting and associations in whatever context. Kindly respond honestly to the items in this questionnaire. Your honest response could guide today's learners of English language, linguists, language educators and curriculum planners about language use and educational interference/remediation for the Idomas, Tivs, Igedes, Itollu, Yorubas, Igbos, Hausas and English bilingual students in Nigeria. Please respondents, kindly answer these questions with your discretion, as your information will also be treated with confidence. Thank you

INSTRUCTIONS

Please ticks (✓) appropriately in the parenthesis provided and also please fill in the blanks where necessary.

SECTION A: Preliminary information on the psycho-social variables of age, gender, education, and location

Sex a) Male () b) Female ()

Age a) 18-24 () b) 25-30 () c) 31-35 () d) 35-40 ()

Faculty.....Department.....

Level of Education

100 () b) 200 () c) 300 () d) 400 and above () e) Masters ()

Location:

Name of Institution.....

Town where the Institution is located.....

Local Government Area where the Institution is located.....

Senatorial Zone where the institution is located a. North b. East c. West

Are you a campus resident student? a) Yes () b) No () If No, where?

SECTION B: Domain of Discourse on Code-switching

Code-switching is the use of several languages or dialects in the same conversation or sentence by a bilingual person. It involves the use of lexical items or words in the languages; code-switching is a situation where the speaker deliberately changes a code being used, by switching from one to another. It involves the movement, whether psychologically or sociologically motivated, from one discrete code (language or dialect) to another within a communicative event.

	I switch Tiv, Igede, Idoma, Ittolu, Igala, Jukun, Igbo, Yoruba, NGE, NPE, Broken English, Hausa etc and English in my verbal communication at these informal settings	Most often	Often	Seldom	Never
1	When discussing family issues with my parents at home.				
2	During my leisure times with friends at social gatherings				
3	When telling stories to nephews/nieces at home.				
4	During games at school with course mates.				
5	When discussing with sports coaches during games at school.				
6	When planning birthday parties with families at home.				
7	When discussing academic issues at home with brothers and sisters.				
8	When I go to the supermarkets to buy things.				
9	When discussing issues on culture with relations at home.				
10	When I go to seek religious advice from a Priest/Pastor/Imam outside the place of worship.				
11	When discussing health matters with the college doctor/nurse in the clinic.				
	I switch Tiv, Igede, Idoma, Ittolu, Igala, Jukun, Igbo, Yoruba, NGE, NPE, Broken English, Hausa etc and English in my verbal communication at these formal settings	Most often	Often	Seldom	Never
1	When discussing academic issues with teachers in the class room.				
2	When talking about academic issues with course mates in the classroom.				
3	When discussing academic issues in the school with school administrators.				
4	When discussing health matters with the college doctor/nurse in the clinic.				
5	During academic debates with fellow students in the school.				
6	When discussing academic development with guidance counsellors at school.				
7	When discussing academic growth with the academic advisers at school				
8	When discussing issues on divination with Priest/Pastor/Imam in the church/mosque.				
9	When seeking for assistance from circulation officers in the library.				
10	When giving direction to strangers/guests at school.				

SECTION C: Domain of Pragmatics on Code-switching of Students

Code-switching is the bringing-in sentences, phrases or clauses of languages A and B or more while holding a conversation in language A.

	I switch Tiv, Igede, Idoma, Ittolu, Igala, Jukun, Igbo, Yoruba, NGE, NPE, Broken English, Hausa etc and English in my verbal communication at these informal settings	Most often	Often	Seldom	Never
1	When I converse with my parents at home on family issues				
2	During my leisure times with my friends at home at social gatherings				
3	When telling stories to my nephews/nieces at home.				
4	When I want to ex-communicate someone who does not understand Igbo at social gatherings.				
5	When I want to be very precise in my conversations with relation at home.				

6	When I want to harmonize with someone who understands Nigerian Languages at social gatherings.				
7	During games with my classmates at school				
8	When conversing with my games master during games at school.				
9	When planning birthday parties with my cousins at home.				
10	When discussing academic issues at home with my brothers and sisters				
11	When I go to supermarkets to buy things				
12	When talking about cultural issues with my relations at social gatherings.				
13	When seeking for religious advice from my Priest/Pastor/Imam outside the Church/Mosque premises.				
14	When discussing my health issues with the college doctor/nurse outside the clinic.				
	I switch Tiv, Igede, Idoma, Ittolu, Igala, Jukun, Igbo, Yoruba, NGE, NPE, Broken English, Hausa etc and English in my verbal communication at these formal settings	Most often	Often	Seldom	Never
1	When discussing academic issues with my teacher in the classroom				
2	When talking about academic issues with my course mates in the classroom				
3	When discussing academic issues in the school with school administrators.				
4	When discussing my health matters with the college doctor/nurse in the college. Clinic				
5	During academic debates with my fellow students in the school.				
6	When discussing about my academic development with guidance counsellors at school				
7	During discussions on my academic growth at school with my academic adviser				
8	During discussions on religious issues with my Priest/Pastor/Imam at the church/mosque.				
9	When seeking for assistance on how to look for books in the library from the Liberians.				
10	When giving directions to strangers on how to locate certain places at school.				

SECTION 1D: Domain of Language use on Code-switching

How many Nigerian languages do you speak? a) One () b) Two () c) Three () d) Four/More ()
 What are these languages?

.....
 Are you competent in all the languages? a) Yes () b) No ()
 If yes, what is your level of proficiency? a) Native Speaker/Mother Tongue () b) Second Language () c) Proficient in both ()
 What language (s) do you often speak?

.....
 What language(s) did you first acquire/learn to speak before school age?
 What language(s) is used during lectures?

.....
 What language(s) do you use for your thoughts, both in school (classroom), Social gathering and/or Home (Dreaming, Praying, Cursing etc)?

What language(s) do you normally use to communicate with your classmates?

In what language do you normally interact with other members of your immediate family (father, mother, brothers, and sisters)?

What do you use to interact with non-members of your close family (uncle, cousin, nephew, aunt)?

In what language do you interact with your colleagues (friends) outside your school?

What language(s) would you normally use if you are within the academic environment?

What language would you use in speaking to a non-colleague or a person not familiar with you, if you happen to come across such a person? (a) In his/her office or place of work?

(b) In his/her Home?

(c) In an informal setting (like a party, club house, restaurant, market, football field, etc.)?

How often do you speak or think in any of the Nigerian languages or dialects you speak?
 1hr daily () b) 6hrs daily () c) 12hrs daily () d) 24hrs daily () e) 24hrs, 7days a week ()

SECTION 2D: Semantics

Have you heard about Semantics?

Yes () b) No () If “yes”, How/Where?

What do you understand about meaning in a conversation?

Have you used any of your above languages to make meaning in a conversation? a) Yes () b) No ()
 If yes, why the choice of language?

Where and with whom do you use these languages? a) Social Gatherings with friends () b) Home with parents ()
 c) Classroom during lectures () d) Academic environment with lecturers ()

Do you think you are understood better with the use of Nigerian languages over Standard English language to make meaning? a) Yes () b) No () If yes, why?

Do you encounter difficulties in making sense a conversation with the use of Standard English Language? a) Yes ()
 b) No () If yes, what difficulties?

Do you think people understand you in a conversation with your choice of language used? a) Yes () b) No ()
 If yes, how would you know?

Do you think you make meaning to your every listener as you use Nigerian languages in every conversation or interactions? Yes () b) No () If “NO” in above, then why? If “yes” then how?

SECTION 3D: Code-switching (Language Alternation)

Do you code-switch? a) Most often () b) Often () c) Seldom () d) Never ()

With whom and in what contexts? a) Informal ()b) Formal ()
 (Please Specify)

Do you avoid code-switching? a) Yes () b) No () When and why?

During the course of one day, how often do you alternate the two or more languages? a) Most often () b) Often () c) Seldom () d) Never ()

Do you notice your own code-switches as you say them? a) Most often () b) Often () c) Seldom () d) Never ()

Do you notice when others do it and do they make sense to their listeners?

Why do you code-switch?

Do you use both languages when you write? a) Most often () b) Often () c) Seldom () d) Never ()

What would you say is the effect of code-switching on English language standard expression of meaning by linguistics students of Nigerian universities?

Has language alternation affected effective meaning-making in speech (utterance) and writing amongst students of English language?

Yes () b) No () If “yes”, How? If “No” why do you think so?

Do you think often users of code-switching have affected student’s effective communication when not using these languages or codes with non-users? Yes () b) No () If “yes” above, why?

How could this problem of effective meaning-making be resolved, if some students can only make sense or meaning when they code-switch with Nigerian languages, dialects, Nigerian English, Pidgin within the academic environment
