Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Development Studies (SGOJAHDS), VOL. 4 No. 4 December, 2021; Pg 87-102; ISSN: 2695-2319 (Print); ISSN: 2695-2327 (Online)

CODE-SWITCHING AS A RHETORIC DEVICE AMONG SELECTED STUDENTS IN LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA

BY

OYEKA, CHIAMAKA NGOZI (PhD)
Department of Linguistics, African And Asian Studies
University Of Lagos,
Lagos, Nigeria
Email: chiamaka.oyeka@yahoo.com

&

NWAGBO, OSITA GERALD (PhD)
Department of Linguistics, African and Asian Studies
University Of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria
Tel: 08027925545; E-Mail Osynwagbo@Gmail.Com

ABSTRACT

Code-switching is an interactive strategy used by bilinguals to negotiate disparate identities. This study is concerned with the phenomenon of code-switching in the experience of students from selected secondary schools in Lagos state. This is with a view to delineating the trajectory of code-switching and the motivation for the interactive device. A total of 90 students from three schools in three LGAs in Lagos State were purposively selected for the qualitative research. The participant observation technique was used and students' interactions were secretly recorded on tape. The result reveals that the students switched mainly from English to Yoruba or Pidgin. Igbo and Hausa featured minimally in their discourse. In terms of motivations, the students were motivated by the following: solidarity, formality, anger, frustration and emphasis. Bilingual and multilingual students switched from one language to another to express varying emotional states of mind as well as endorsing multiple identities. The use of different languages in discourse by young people suggests that switching of codes enhances fluency in discourse among youths.

Keywords: **bilinguals, Multilinguals, code-switching, interactive device.**

Introduction

The term Code Switching refers to a situation in which a speaker uses a mixture of distinct language varieties as discourse proceeds (Aikmajian, Demers, Farmer & Harnish 2007). The switch of codesis usually evident in the conversations of bilinguals or multilingual speakers. A speaker may start off with a language variety and either mixes it up half way with another or ends up with another code. Babalola & Taiwoin Abonyi (2013,p. 20) attest that the communication which involved a native tongue and a foreign language, or two foreign languages or even at times

dialects of the same language can be initiated with one language and concluded in another. Switching of codes is completely different from borrowing from another language. Akimajian, Demers, Farmer & Harnish (2007) clarify the difference between code switching (hereafter, CS) and borrowing by noting that:

> In case of code switching, the speaker is in effect using two distinct language varieties at the same time…speakers of one language borrow words from another language, the foreign words come to be used as a regular vocabulary items (p. 308).

Borrowed words are conventionally accepted among users of a language variety. They are used regularly in their speech and are most often adapted to their pronunciation but CS is not. People switch for diverse reasons and at different points in their communication.

Some communities are famous for switching back and forth constantly during a single conversation (O'Grady, Archibald & Katamba 2011). Continuing, they elucidate that the mix that results sometimes with such switches gets its own name which is usually intended to be derogatory. Spanish-English switching in the United States is often called Spanglish, while Canadian French-English switching is Franglais. Using Yoruba community in Nigeria as an example, Romaine (2000) illustrates that instances of CS are described by community members as *amulumala* or *adaluade*' verbal salad'. 'Salad' refers most often to a mixture of both cooked and raw vegetables with other ingredients. Verbal salad therefore stands for a situation where there is an admixture of languages in verbal communication between people who understand and speak two or more languages. The Igbo call such usage or mixture Ngiliigbo.

There are various reasons behind switching of codes. Wardhaugh (2010, p. 98) explains that 'code-switching can arise from individual choice or be used as a major identity marker for a group of speakers who must deal with more than one language in their common pursuits.' Wayer (2018, p.102) lends credence to the above explanation by noting that '…a number of researches suggest that code-switching and code-mixing are used as additional resources to achieve particular interactional goals and one noticeable goal is style…'. Citing Gal,Wardhaugh(2010,p. 98) explains further that 'Code-switching is a conversational strategy used to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries; to create, evoke or change interpersonal relations with their rights and obligations.' It can be clearly understood from the above explanations that a switch may be intentional. It may be used to establish solidarity or create social distance. It may also be used to indicate a shift in the topic of discussion. Abonyi (2013)avers that a switch may be unintentional as a result of psycho-sociolinguistic variables that the speaker is not consciously aware of.

In her contribution on why people switch codes, Holmes (2013, p. 35) notes that a speaker may switch to another language as a signal of group membership and shared ethnicity with an addressee. She explains further that young people often switch codes to signal their sophistication and identification with modernity. A switch may also indicate the status relations between people

or the formality of their interaction. Ndimele in OkeeOkoro (2017, p. 6) reveals the reasons why people switch codes to include: lexicalin adequacy, the situation, a stylistic device and portrayal of language competence. Worth mentioning is that there may be a switch when there is need to bridge a gap in communication. People also switch as a way of laying emphasis.

There are diverse opinions on the effect of CS on language users. Romaine (2000, p. 54-55) opines that 'Although the existence of bilingualism, diglossia, and code-switching has often been cited as a factor leading to language death, in some cases code-switching and diglossia are positive forces in maintaining bilingualism.' In other words, while some opine that CS leads to language death, others see it from the angle of its strength in maintaining bilingualism.

On different types of CS,Mahoolian in Abonyi (2013) identifies two types which are Intersentential and Intrasentential. While Intersentential switch refers to switching between languages at sentence or clause boundaries, Intrasentential switch refers to switches within a clause involving a phrase, a single word or across morpheme boundaries. Holmes (2013) observes among others, emblematic/ tag switching which is using switch at the beginning /ending of a sentence- the switch is simply an interjection or a linguistic tag in the other language which serves as an ethnic identity marker. Situational switch according to her is when people switch from one code to another for reasons which can be clearly identified. Based on the above, this study investigates types of switching and their motivations in the interactions of secondary school students from three Local Government Areas in Lagos State, Nigeria.

Previous Studies

A number of empirical studies have been carried out in code switching across languages. Aharanwa's (2012)study on code mixing and code switching as a linguistic behavior in multilingual Nigeria revealed that the major determinants of code-mixing and code-switching are the audience, locale and topic of discussion. She affirms that code mixed and switched utterances obey certain grammatical rules and the motivational factor is far from inability to find the lexicon of the host language. She draws the conclusion that code-mixing and code-switching in Nigeria are regarded as conventional linguistic behavior.

Ona (2012) examined language interference as an aspect of CS. His work reveals that CS helps to bridge the gap in communication, compensates for deficiency and occurs when the speaker is upset, tired or distracted in some manner. CS also allows second language speakers to increase the impact of their speech and use it in an effective manner. The researcher concludes that CS should be incorporated in the teaching of foreign language.

In his work on CS in child language, Abonyi (2013) reveals that a child sometimes code switches to another language due to lack of vocabulary from either of the two languages in his linguistic repertoire, and due to environ-mentality but adult bilinguals code switch due to style and not necessarily due to lack of vocabulary from either of the two languages in his linguistic repertoire.

He draws the conclusion that CS is not a negative phenomenon but a natural phenomenon that results among bilingual/multilingual.

Kharkhurin& Wei (2014) studied the role of CS in bilingual creativity. Their findings show greater innovative capacity in bilinguals who code-switch frequently and regularly as compared to their counterparts who do not code-switch in their everyday practice.

Nwagbo's (2016) study on identity and CS among Liberian refugees in Oru camp revealed that CS is not an arbitrary linguistic practice but a systematic strategy used by speakers to achieve socio-cultural objectives in the course of a conversation. Additionally, the acquisition of another language makes one a part of the other culture; promotes inter-ethnic bonding and peaceful co-existence; and creates socio-economic opportunities for the recipient.

The reviewed works demonstrate that CS is advantageous to bilinguals and multilinguals as it does not only help in bridging a gap in communication, it compensates for deficiency in speech, makes one part of another culture and increases innovative capacities of bilinguals. The concern of the present study is to find out the types of switching and the motivations behind them, in the interactions of secondary school students in a multilingual society.

Method

A total of 90 students from three secondary schools in three LGAs – Somolu, Surulere and Mushin- in Lagos State were randomly selected for the study. The students comprise male and female students and all of them were teenagers between the ages of 13 – 18. With the aid of three research assistants for each school and support from teachers in the selected schools, students' interactions were secretly recorded on tape. The purpose behind the secret recording was to get a natural data. If students had knowledge of the recordings, they might have reasons to modify their utterances. Ten conversations were recorded from each school and the relevant ones, that is, the ones with switches, were selected for this study. The recordings were done mainly during break time in the schools and partly after school period. The setting for the recordings was the school environment comprising playground, school gate, and surroundings. The recorded interactions which were transcribed formed the data for this study.

Data presentation and analysis

Here, the collected data are carefully presented. The focus here is the languages involved in the switch, the type (s) of switch and the reason(s) behind it.

DATA 1

Speaker 1: 1.So, when you now saw that guy, so, what did he say?

Speaker 2: 2. Nothing.

Speaker 1:	3. Báwo ló		ṣe	wá	rí	bẹ́yẹn?
	4. *How*	*be 3sg*	*do*	*come*	*see*	*that?*

5. "How did it go like that?"

Speaker 2:6. Mi ò mọ̀, òun náà ló ṣe é.
7. *1sg NEG know, he the be 3sg do Pro?*
8. "I don't know he did it."

Speaker 1: 9. OK. A máa try náà ni, àbí kí la fẹ́ẹ́ ṣe sii?
10. *Ok. 1pl AGR-thebe,or Qm we like do at Pro?*
11. "Ok. We are going to try or what do we do about it?"

Speaker 2:12.We just try our best on something and get over it.

Speaker 1: 13. Bẹ́ẹ̀ ló ṣe máa rí.
14. *Yes be 3sg do AGR look.*
15. "That is how it's going to be."

The conversation in this data involved two participants, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, and two languages, English and Yoruba. The above data has bothinter-sentential, intra-sentential and tag switches during a conversation by two speakers, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2. The conversation started in English by Speaker1 and Speaker 2, before Speaker 1 switched to Yoruba in line 3. Here, the switch came in as a result of astonishment. The first speaker was really surprised at the behavior of the subject of discourse (that guy) and switched immediately to Yoruba, his mother tongue, so as to drive home his point. The participants continued the discussion in Yoruba, until line 9, when Speaker 1 used an emblematic switch to English (Ok) to momentarily show agreement with the last speaker's opinion, and immediately switched back to Yoruba within the same sentence, mainly to ask a question. In response to the question, Speaker 2 switched back to English to proffer a solution; the switch to English seems to be a way of strengthening and emphasizing her response to the inquiry. Having found a way out of their challenge, Speaker 1 concludes with another switch to Yoruba. On the whole there were five consecutive switches in the conversation motivated by different factors. An important aspect of this sample is that both speakers contributed to the switches, though unequally; Speaker 1 contributed 2 switches and a tag switch while Speaker 2 contributed 1 switch in the course of the conversation.

DATA 2

Speaker 1: 1.You need to come and teach me…the Pythagoras Formula that we
2. were taught on Friday.
Speaker 2: 3.Ok, by what time I should come?
4. "Ok, what time should I come?"

Speaker 1: 5.Ṣé o máa ráyè ní ọ̀la tá a bá.
6. *Qm 2sg AGR look-space be tomorrow REL 1pl meet*
7. ti kúrò ní kíláàsì?
8. *ASP leave be class?*

9. "Will you be able to come tomorrow after the class?"

Speaker 2:	10. Hà!	Mi	ò	lè	ráyè	o.	Mo	máabusylọ́la	
	11. *Excl.*	*1sg*	*NEG*	*able*	*look-space*	-	*1sg*	*AGR-*	*at tomorrow."*
	12. "I won't be able to make it. I will be busy tomorrow."								
Speaker 1:	13. Báwo,	ṣé	o	fẹ́	kí	n	féèlì	Test	
	14. *How,*	*Qm*	*2sg*	*like*	*that*	*ASP*	*fail*	-	
	15. tí	a	fẹ́	se	ní	Wednesday		ni?	
	16. *REL*	*1pl*	*like*	*do*	*at*	-		*Qm?*	
	17. "Do you want me to fail the Test on Wednesday?"								
Speaker 2:	18. No,	rárá	I will try.						
	19. -	*neg.*	- - -.						
	20. "No, No, I will try."								

The data involved two participants, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, and two languages, English and Yoruba. The data here has both inter-sentential and tag switches during a conversation by two speakers, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2 before Speaker 1 switched to Yoruba in line 5.Speaker 1 switched to Yoruba for the purpose of wooing and appealing to Speaker 2; The show of solidarity was aimed at attracting favour from Speaker 2 to oblige her and grant her request. The exchange continued in Yoruba until line 18 when Speaker 2 broke it with a tag switch (No) to highlight the fact that he was willing to oblige Speaker 1's request for assistance. Speaker 2 followed this up with another switch to Yoruba (rara) aimed at emphasizing the fact that he was not opposed to assisting Speaker 1. Speaker 2 switched back to English and concluded the conversation. It is apparent that both speakers contributed evenly to the switching during the conversation; Speaker 1 contributed one switch while Speaker 2 contributed one switch and a tag switch.

DATA 3

Speaker 1:	1.Wọ́n	fún	walóúnjẹ,		wọ́nfúnwa		lómi;	kò	sí
	2. *H-Pro*	*give*	*us*	*be-food, H-pro*		*for us*	*be-water*	*NEG*	*at*
	3. nn̄kan	tí	Àn̄tí	Àjọkẹ́	ò	ṣe	fún	wa	lánàá.
	4. *thing*	*REL*	*Aunty*	*Ajoke*	*NEG*	*do*	*for*	*us*	*at-yesterday*
	5. Tí	o	bá	rí	i,	omi	yẹn	tutù	gan-an.
	6. *If*	*you*	*meet*	*look*	*it,*	*water*	*that*	*cold*	*DEGREE.*
	7. "She gave us food, she gave us water, and there was nothing aunty Ajoke did								
	8. not do for us yesterday. If you want to believe, the water was very cool."								
Speaker 2:	**9.** Ṣé	ká	jọ		lọ	lónìí?			
	10. *Qm*	*let-us*	*together*		*go*	*at-today?*			
	11. "Do we go together today?"								
Speaker 1:	**12.** Àfi	ká	a	jọ		lọ	ọ̀dọ̀	Àn̄tí	Àjọkẹ́.
	13. *Unless*	*let-us*	*1pl*	*together*		*go*	*place*	*Aunty*	*Ajoke.*

14. "We must go to Aunty Ajoke's together."
Speaker 3: 15. Are you going home?
Speaker 2: 16. Yes, we are going.

The conversation above involved three participants. The conversation stated in Yoruba by Speaker 1, and Speaker 2 continued the discussion in Yoruba, until line 15 when Speaker 3 who had not put in a word, switched to English. The switch to English seems to be motivated by two factors. First, it seems that Speaker 3 found the subject of the discussion between Speaker 1 and Speaker 2 boring, and so deliberately switched to English as a digression. Secondly, and objectively, it could be reasoned that both Speaker 1 and Speaker 2 were proficient in Yoruba, but Speaker 3 was probably not too proficient in Yoruba, and therefore switched to English to remind them of her presence in their midst. This line of reasoning is premised by the oddness of Speaker 3's question, which was not tangential with the discussion between Speaker 1 and 2. In response to Speaker 3's inquiry, Speaker 2 admitted that they were going home and so brought the discussion to an end. In this data, a solitary switch was made (inter-sentential) from Yoruba to English, by a participant who, up till that moment, had not contributed to the discussion.

DATA 4

Speaker 1: 1. Give me my Test Tube jọ̀ọ́! Máà jẹ́ kó fọ́.
2. - - - *please NEG allow NEG break.*
3. "Give me my Test Tube please! Do not break it."
Speaker 2: 4. Calm down! Kò lè fọ́ jọ̀ọ́. Kó oní sùúrù.
5- - *NEGablebreakplease. That 2sg have patience.*
6. "Just calm down! It will not break. Be patient."
Speaker 1: 7. Bá mi gbé e! Bá mi gbé e!! Bá mi gbé e!!!
8. *Meet me carry PRO Meet me carry PRO Meet me carry PRO*
9. "Give it to me! Give it to me!! Give it to me!!!"

The conversation above involved two participants, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, and the switch used was inter-sentential switch. The conversation stated in English by Speaker 1, who also switched to Yoruba in the same sentence, by utilizing a tag (jọ̀ọ́), followed by a sentence in Yoruba. Speaker 1 was obviously unhappy with the way the Speaker 2 was handling their test tube; their switch was triggered by anger. It is common for those who are angry to use a formal language to neutralize their relation and show a marked social distance, or use a shared language to emphasize a point. In this instance, Speaker 1 switched to Yoruba to register their angst with Speaker 2's behavior and issue a command to Speaker 2. In reaction, Speaker 2 did not continue the conversation in Yoruba, their native language but switched (tag) back to English in line 4 (calm down!). Speaker 2 switched to English as a means of dismissing or obliterating Speaker 1's command in Yoruba.Thereafter, she continued the discussion in Yoruba by making a promise to Speaker 1 not to break the test tube, and Speaker 1 concluded the discussion in Yoruba. In this data, there were two switches, and both participants contributed equally to the switches,

although Speaker 1 contributed an inter-sentential and tag switches while Speaker 2 contributed a tag switch.

DATA 5

Speaker 1:	**1.**Chinasa, I have been looking for you since morning. Where is my
	2. Government note? I am about to go home.
Speaker 2:	**3.**Ehen, now! I am still using it. I thought you said you'll give me
	4. throughout today now.
Speaker 1:	**5.**Since yesterday, you too, o ṣáà mọ̀. You know we have test tomorrow.
	6. - - - - *2sg just know-* - - - -
	7."I gave you since yesterday after all you know we have test tomorrow".
Speaker 2:	**8.**I will soon finish it now, please now.
Speaker 1:	**9.**Ṣáà ṣe kíá be fast.
	10.*Just do fast* - -
	11."Be fast about it."
Speaker 2:	**12.**Ṣe bí a jọ máa lọ ilé ni now?
	13.*Qm - 1pl together CONT go house be -?*
	14."Are we not going home together?"

In this data, there are two participants, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2. The conversation started in English by Speaker 1 with a question about a note book. In response, Speaker 2 used a Yoruba tag (eheen) before continuing in English to state her position and remind Speaker 1 of her promise to use the note for the day. Speaker 1 protested and used a Yoruba tag switch (o ṣáà mọ) to register her anger and complete her stance on the matter. In line 9, Speaker 1 switched to Yoruba and repeated the utterance in English (be fast) for emphasis. The Intra-sentential switch by Speaker 1 had an undertone of anger as s/he expected Speaker 2 to have returned his/ her note based on Speaker 2's knowledge that they will be having a test the next day. Thereafter, Speaker 2 continued in Yoruba, before finally concluding with a tag (now). Beyond the factors responsible for switching in this case, Speaker 2 who is Igbo, going by her name, switched to Yoruba, for reasons of solidarity with the first speaker who is Yoruba. Speaker 2 must be one of the numerous Igbo born and bred in Lagos who spoke Yoruba as a first language and had little or no proficiency in their mother tongue (Igbo). There were two tag switches in the conversation used by Speaker 1, while one tag switch was used by Speaker 2. However, Speaker 1 initiated the main switch in line 9, while Speaker 2 did not initiate any major switch.

DATA 6

Speaker 1:	**1.**Pàdí mi, wetinwe go chop now? Ẹgbẹ́ mi ló ń

2.*Friend my, what - will eat - peers mybe-3sg ASP*
3.Ṣayé now. Kò sówó lọ́wọ bàbá
4.*Do-world - NEG at-money at-hand father.*
5."My pal, what do we eat now? My mates are all enjoying life. There is
6.no cash on me."

Speaker 2: **7.**Me, I no get money oh!
8.*I, - NEG have - - .*
9."I don't have money."

Speaker 1: **10.**You no get money. Don't do me that thing na!
11."You don't have money. Don't treat me like that."

Speaker 2: **12.**You suppose see your Papa now. You get money.
13. ''You see your father from time to time. You have money''

Speaker 1: **14.**Bàbá mi òsi n'ílé now. Tí Bàbá bá ń bẹ
15.*Father my NEG be at-home - If father meet ASP is*
*16.*n'ílé tẹ́lẹ̀ ni, o mọ̀ now. A máaṣayé lọ.
17.*at-home before is 2sg know -.1pl CONTdo-world go*
*18.*We go party.
19. - - -
20."My father is not around now. If he is, you know, we will by now be
21.enjoying. We will go to parties."

22.How far ọ̀rọ̀ ball Barca-Arsenal yẹn now?
23. - word - - that -
24. ''How about the matchBarca-Arsenal match?''

Speaker 2: **25.** A maa win yin now
26. *1pl CONT - 2pl -*
27. ''We are going to win.''

The data above involved two participants, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2 in a conversation. The two languages involved are Nigerian Pidgin (NP) and Yoruba. The conversation started in NP by Speaker 1 who is addressing Speaker 2 about issues of food. After the first sentence in NP, Speaker 1 switched to Yoruba, (inter-sentential) and ends the second sentence with an English tag (now). Then he continued in Yoruba in the third sentence. The switch from NP to Yoruba must have been motivated by passion or sadness; Speaker 1 bemoans a fate that left him stranded with no money while his mates were enjoying themselves. It seems that Yoruba may have better expressions for indexing such existential conditions. However, instead of Speaker 2 to continue in Yoruba, he switches back to NP to complain about his own ill condition. The motivation for the switch by Speaker 2 was emphasis; his aim was to stress on the fact that he had no money and the choice of NP was appropriate. The conversation continued in NP, as both speakers argued back and forth, until line 14 when Speaker 1 switched back to Yoruba.His switch to Yoruba was motivated by the need to explain his situation to Speaker 2. It seems plausible that Speaker 1 was not more proficient in Yoruba than NP. This explains why he used Yoruba in lengthy talk and

used NP in short expressions as the data shows. Thereafter, Speaker 1 switches to NP and digresses by inquiring about a football match between Barcelona and Arsenal. Speaker 2's NP sentence in line 22 has two Yoruba tags; the two intra-sentential tags served to show the unstable disposition of his mind. In line 25, Speaker 2 switches to Yoruba in response but includes two English tags. As in the case of Speaker 1, the use of two intra-sentential tags by Speaker 2 demonstrates the unsteady condition of his mind. There were three inter-sentential switches in the conversation; two were initiated by Speaker 1 while 1 was initiated by Speaker 2. This is followed by six tags; three NP and one Yoruba tag switches used by Speaker 1, and two NP tags used by Speaker 2. Essentially, the switches expressed the social relationship between the two speakers..They interlocutors are friends and switched codes for ease of communication.

DATA 7

Speaker 1: 1.	Bola, are you prepared for the Test?									
Speaker 2: 2.	I have read the little I could.									
Speaker 1: 3.	Don't forget me when we start the Test									
Speaker 2:	**4.**	Ẹ	má	gbọ́rọ̀,	ṣe	wọ́n	jọ	kọ́	wa	ní
	5.	*2pl*	*AGR*	*hear-word*	*Qm*	*3pl*	*together*	*teach*	*1pl*	*in*
	6.	class	kó.	ni?						
	7.	-	*Qm*	*is?*						
	8.	"Listen to her, were we not taught together in the class?								
Speaker 1: 9.	Mo	mọ̀	bẹ́ẹ̀,	but	o	ṣì	bẹ́tà	mi	ní	gbogb
	10.	*1sg*	*know*	*that,*	*-*	*2pl*	*still*	*better*	*me*	*in*
	11	"I know that, but you are still better than I am in all ramifications."								
Speaker 2: 12.	Ìwọ	lo	mọ̀,	èmi	ò	lè	sèyẹn	ni	tèmi.	
	13.	*You*	*be-2sg*	*know*	*I*	*NEG*	*can*	*do-that*	*in*	*mine.*
	14.	"So, you will know. I can't comply with that."								

There were two participants in this conversation, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, and two languages were involved: English and Yoruba. The conversation started in English language by Speaker 1 about preparations for continuous assessment in class. In line 4, Speaker 2 switched to Yoruba from English. The switch by Speaker 2 was motivated by the need to defend herself from Speaker 1's insinuation that she (Speaker 2) was more brilliant than her. Speaker 2 aimed at making it clear and apparent in Yoruba that Speaker 1 did not need her assistance because both of them were equal to the task. The switch to Yoruba served to suggest that Speaker 2 was not interested in assisting Speaker 1. Speaker 1 continues in Yoruba, insisting that Speaker 2 was better than her, and Speaker 2 boldly asserted that she will not render the assistance on the basis of her earlier submission. Evidently, this is the reverse form of using the native language for solidarity purposes; ordinarily, it is the first speaker who ought to use Yoruba to make the request in order to win the favour of the second speaker.

DATA 8

Speaker 1: 1. Have you seen the bag?
Speaker 2: 2. Yes, I saw it. It was not even fine.
Speaker 1: 3. ₦5,000.00 Naira, it is ridiculous.
Speaker 2: 4. The material is not even good at all.
Speaker 3: 5. The price ò worth ẹ̀ rárá, the thing is useless
6. - - *NEG* - *3sg* *at-all* - - - -
7. "The price is not worth it at all; the thing is useless."
Speaker 1: 8. No, no, me? I can't waste my money and buy such thing.
Speaker 2: 9. Ó ga o!
10. *3sg* *tall* -
11. "It is surprising."

There are three participants in this conversation; Speaker 1, 2, and 3, and two languages; English and Yoruba. The conversation started in English by Speaker 1 who raised the issue of the cost of a certain handbag. Speakers 1 and 2 sustained the conversation in English until line 5 when Speaker 3 entered the discussion by using a Yoruba tag (rara) amidst her expression in English. The tag switch rara was used for the sake of emphasis. Speaker 3 used the Yoruba tag to stress the fact that the handbag is not worth it.Based on Speaker 3's emphasis, Speaker 1 continues in English by stating that she will never waste her money on the handbag. Thereafter, Speaker 2 switched to Yoruba with an exclamation. The reason for the switched exclamation in Yoruba is the appropriate nature of that exclamation in Yoruba. It is a veritable means of showing surprise among the Yoruba. There were two switches in this conversation; a tag switch by Speaker 3 and an inter-sentential switch by Speaker 2 for varying purposes.

DATA 9

Speaker 1: **1.**Una fumble today o! I swear! Big time.
2.*2sg* - - - - - - -
3.''You disappointed me today! You really did''
Speaker 2: **4.**Inoknow.
5. - *NEG* -
6.''I did not know''
Speaker 1: **7.** Ọlọ́run, ẹ jẹojú mi.
8. *God,* *2sg* *eat-Pst* *eye* *my.*
9. ''You really disappointed me''
Speaker 2: **10.**Walai, mi òmọ̀.
11.*I-swear* *1sg* *NEG* *know*
12.''In all honesty, Idid not know''

There are two participants in this conversation, Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, and three languages: NP, Yoruba and Hausa. The conversation started in NP by Speaker 1 who was addressing Speaker 2 about a certain disappointing performance. Speaker 2 responded in NP by feigning ignorance. In line 7, Speaker 1 switched to Yoruba and invoked God to intensify her position. The reason for the switch to Yoruba is to intensify the accusation that Speaker 2 disappointed her. In response, in line 10, Speaker 2 used a Hausa tag switch to swear that she was innocent of the content of Speaker 1's accusation. After the Hausa tag, she continued the sentence in Yoruba to the end. Speaker 2 switched to the Hausa tag to demonstrate her innocence before Speaker 1. In this data, three switches are involved: NP to Yoruba involving an inter-sentential switch, Yoruba to Hausa tag switch, and Hausa tag to Yoruba involving an intra-sentential switch.

DATA 10

Speaker 1: 1. Nnaaeh, agụụna- agụ m.
2. Father DEM EXLhunger AUX- PRE-hunger me
3. ''I am hungry''

Speaker 2:4.Agụụna- agụkwumụnwa.
5. Hunger AUX- PRE-hunger-ENCLmyself
6. ''I am also hungry''

Speaker 3: 7. Tí ẹ báfẹ́ ṣeàbòsílẹ́ máa ń mọ.
8. If 2pl meetlikedohypocrisy be-2pl CONT ASP know.
9. ''It is when you need to gossip that you speak your language''

Speaker 1: 10. We were talking of how hungry we are…what to eat.

Speaker 3:11.Better. Before the both of you will sell me.
12. ''Better. I thought you are planning to sell me.''

The data here comprises of three participants, and three languages: Igbo, Yoruba and English.The conversation started in Igbo by Speaker 1 about hunger, which is confirmed by Speaker 2 in line 4. In line 7, Speaker 3 switches to Yoruba to accuse Speakers 1 and 2 that they were gossiping. Thereafter, Speaker 1 switches to English to explain to Speaker 3 that they were talking about hunger, and Speaker 3 is satiated and concludes in English. The reason for the switch to Yoruba by Speaker 3 was distancing or divergence. Certainly, he was a Yoruba while Speakers 1 and 2 were Igbo. However, while Speakers 1 and 2 were Igbo/Yoruba bilinguals, Speaker 3 was not Yoruba/Igbo bilingual. Hence, Speaker 3 felt distanced when Speakers 1 and 2 were discussing in Igbo. He switched to Yoruba (inter-sentential) to draw the attention of Speaker 1 and 2 to his presence. However, instead of Speaker 1 to respond to Speaker 3's accusation in Yoruba, he switched to English. The switch to English is motivated by openness; due to the fact that, Speaker 3 had accused them of gossip, Speaker 1 chose to switch to English, which is a neutral language

shared by the three interlocutors, in order to obviate any accusation of secrecy. It is also possible that Speaker 1 switched to English to resist being pushed to use Speaker 3's native language since he (speaker 3) could not speak Igbo. In other words, if you cannot speak my language, I can't speak your own. In this data, two inter-sentential switches were involved; one by Speaker 3 and the second by Speaker 1, with different motivations.

Discussion

The data shows that language contact and bilingualism are the major reasons behind CS.Five languages featured in the data. They are: Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa, English and Nigerian Pidgin (NP). English is the official language in Nigeria, while Igbo, Hausa and Yoruba are the three major languages in the country. On Nigerian Pidgin,Obisike, Nwala&Mbong (2019, p.78) observe that it serves as L1 in Port Harcourt LGA of Rivers state. They argue further that ''Pidgin English has continued to fill the gap in communication created by Standard English of diverse linguistic and educational backgrounds'' (p.79).

When one takes a look at the setting/ locale of the study, which is Lagos, the five languages that featured in the work will not raise a surprise. This is because Lagos is a big commercial city which once served as the capital territory of the country. As people moved to the city, they moved with their languages. Based on that, there is multiple language contact.

Data reveals that English and Yoruba languages are constants in all the conversations. They featured either as intra-sentential or inter-sentential switches. Yoruba, it will be understood is the language of the immediate community. Any Lagos resident who has spent some reasonable time in Lagos directly or indirectly understands a bit of the language based on constant contact with the speakers coupled with relationship with the immediate community. Most often, it is the language used by commercial bus drivers, traders in some markets and generally in the locality. As one continues to live in an environment, they internalizesome aspects of the language of the community, especially those ones that are in common usage such as greetings and popular clichés. This justifies the use of tag switches especially among the non-indigenes. More so is the fact that such usage is advantageous as it is a means of communicating solidarity and identifying albeit briefly with the other ethnic group. All these justify the reason behind its being constant in the entire data.

It has been mentioned earlier that English is Nigeria's official language. There are several reasons behind its featuring in all the conversations. Obiegbu (2016)states that:

> …every family, including semi-literate ones, wants to expose their children to English language right from the early stages of their lives. This is with a view to giving such children some head-start in schools as a result of the quest for ''social belongingness'' (71).

Here, parental positive attitude towards English language makes their children to learn it early in life, sometimes, as their first language. It is not a surprise then, when they switch it with their second language or the other way round if they learnt English as their second language. Early

acquisition of English language accounts for its constant feature in the discourse. Additionally, English language is the official language of teaching in secondary schools and also a subject of study in all the three tiers of education in Nigeria. A credit is required in it if one wishes to gain admission into a higher institution in the country. Added to the dominance of English in the data is the fact that, the participants were all secondary school students in selected schools in Lagos State.

The use of Pidgin English in Data six and nine prove the stand of Abonyi (2013) mentioned earlier, that bilinguals switch codes due to style and not necessarily due to lack of vocabulary from either of the languages in their linguistic repertoires. The interlocutors started off in Pidgin and ended their conversation in Yoruba. Their fluency in both languages shows that they might have equally started and ended their conversation in either code if they had chosen to do so. They only code switched based on style. Additionally, although Niger Delta is the home of Pidgin in Nigeria, the influx of people from Niger Delta has brought in Pidgin as one of the languages in the linguistic landscape of Lagos. Among all the age groups, teenagers are quicker in grapping new forms of a language such as Pidgin. It is instructive that the speakers who used Pidgin in the data were Yoruba and Igbo and not Niger Deltans. This is to show that they have had contact either with the original owners of Pidgin or with those who had learnt Pidgin from the original speakers.

The use of Igbo by the interlocutors appears only in Data ten. Despite the fact that the locale for data collection is not Igbo, the Igbo are well travelled and one cannot claim that there are only a handful of them in the selected schools. For instance, an Igbo name, Chinasa is mentioned in Data five as one of the interlocutors. The researchers do not claim that everyone who bears an Igbo name must be Igbo but the possibility of the discussant being Igbo cannot be overruled. The untoward attitude of some Igbo towards their language may not be unconnected with the number of times Igbo featured in the discussions. In data 10, the first two interlocutors were discussing in Igbo before they were interrupted by a third person who spoke to them in Yoruba because he felt distanced as a result of not understanding their language. The response of the first speaker shows he understood Yoruba but chose to speak English, an official language just to enhance peaceful co-existence. It is interesting that young Igbo in Lagos speak Igbo even in school, a formal space where it is not expected of them to speak the language. This is against the background of the fact that Igbo is endangered in multilingual spaces such as Lagos. Coupled with the fact that, most Igbo born in Lagos speak Yoruba as a first language, and do not speak Igbo at all, it is encouraging that some Igbo have acquired Yoruba without losing their own language. This is an integrative form of acculturation where a migrant adopts the host community language while maintaining their own heritage language.

Hausa featured only once in Data nine. It featured as an emblematic switch. Data nine features the highest number of switches- Pidgin- English- Yoruba- Hausa. It can be deduced that the tag switch which is a swear word is used to establish a point. Anyone can swear, using any language of his/her choice. There is no doubt that the interlocutor who used the tag is not Hausa by ethnicity, but must have directly or indirectly come in contact with Hausa language.

Data one, two, five, six, eight and nine contain both intra-sentential and inter-sentential switches. The remaining, three, four and seven had either of the two. The manner the students used the switches and the number of languages involved in their discussions shows that some of them were multilinguals and that they switched codes mainly for ease in communication. McGregor, Aharanwa (2013,p.218) argues that ''… bilinguals' language choice in a particular interactive context is determined by who they are talking to, the topic and so on''. The students in this study discussed with their peers and they discussed various topics of their interests in a relaxed mood, hence, their switch of codes is well understood to be for ease in communication, though with various specific motivating factors such as anger, emphasis, intensity, distancing, sadness, openness, etc.

There are various other underlying factors behind the students' switches. For instance, data one shows that two switches were initiated to show astonishment and emphasis respectively. In data two solidarity and emphasis are the reasons behind the switches. The switch in data three was occasioned by digression while the switch in data four was provoked by the emotion of anger by an interlocutor. In data five, the motivations for switch were emphasis and anger, while in data six, the motivation was sadness or passion. In data seven, the switch was hinged on self defence, while in data eight, the switch was premised on emphasis and surprise. In data nine, the switch was occasioned by intensity while in data ten, distancing and openness were the motivating factors.

Conclusion

This study examined code-switching as a rhetoric device among selected secondary school students in Lagos state. Data reveals multilingual ability among students. Five languages were involved in the switches- one official language and four Nigerian languages. There were both inter-sentential and intra-sentential switches. The students switched codes for sundry purposes. The switches made their conversations to have a free flow. The switches to different Nigerian languages serve as a pointer to group identity. Code switching should not be discouraged based on the fact that it promotes inter-ethnic understanding and peaceful coexistence among various groups in Nigeria.

References

Abonyi, D. (2012). Code-Switching in Child Language: A Psycholinguistic Perspective. *Journal of Nigerian Languages and Culture*, 14 (2), 17-34.

Aharanwa, C. (2012). Code Mixing and Code Switching: Linguistic Behaviours in Multilingual Nigeria. *Journal of Nigerian Languages and Culture*, 14 (2), 215-228.

Akimajian, A., Demers, R., Farmer, A.,&Harnish, R.(2007). *Linguistics An Introduction to Language and Communication.* New Delhi: Prentice-Hall.

Holmes, J. (2013).*An Introduction to Sociolinguistics,* 4thed. Oxon: Routledge.

Kharkhurin, A. & Wei, L. (2014). The role of Code-Switching in Bilingual Creativity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism.*http://dx.doi.org. retrieved on XXX

Nwagbo, O. (2016). Identity and Code Switching among Liberian Refugees in Oru Camp, Nigeria.*Ihafa: A Journal of African Studies,* 8 (1), 137-153.

Obiegbu, I. (2016). Language and Culture: Nigerian Perspective. *African Research Review*, 10 (4), 69-82.

Obisike, I.,Nwala, M.&Mbong, J. (2019). Impact of Pidgin English on the Effective Learning of English Language among Junior Secondary School Students in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science,* 9 (6), 78-84.

O' Grady, W., Archibald, J. &Katamba, F. (2011). *Contemporary Linguistics An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson.

OkeeOkoro, N. (2017). The Frequency of Code-Switching among the Igbo –English Bilinguals: A Case of Language Accommodation. *OduEnyiIMSU Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Igbo Studies,* 1 (1), 1-14.

Ona, J.(2012). Language as an Aspect of Code Switching. In Anyanwu, P. & Obuasi, I. (eds.) *Issues in Language and Human Development A Festschrift for Jerome Ikechukwu Okonkwo* (pp. 137-146). Enugu: SAN Press.

Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in Society An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 2nded. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *AnIntroduction to Sociolinguistics*, 6thed. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wayar, B. (2018). Code Switchingand Code Mixing as Styles in Hausa Gospel Songs and Sociolinguistics and Economic Development.*Abraka Humanistic Review*,8 (1),102-118.