

Constraint-Based Code-switching during ESL Lessons in a Multilingual Classroom and their Implications to Second Language Development

¹Beth Njeri Ngugi, ²Albert Mugambi Rutere, ²Felicia Yieke

¹Muranga University of Technology, Kenya

²Laikipia University, Kenya

Abstract

In code-switching, the grammars of two or more languages are in contact. The grammar of languages involved in the code-switching process may be similar or different. Studies have indicated that where the grammar of two languages differ, syntactic constraints are likely to result. The current study was undertaken to establish the syntactic constraints in English to Kiswahili (ENG-KIS) code-switching and the possible implications to English language development in (ESL) lessons. This was achieved through three objectives: establishing the use of Kiswahili during the English lesson by teachers; finding out rules applied by teachers during code-switching; and finally, investigating possible syntactic constraints in ENG-KIS code-switching. Contrastive Analysis theory by Lado was used to analyse the elements of code-switching in the two languages. Matrix Language Framework by Myers-Scotton provided a frame for the discussion of the syntactic constraints. Audio-video recording was used to collect data for analysis. The findings indicated that teachers used Kiswahili during English lessons to enhance content delivery. Further, rules of the two languages were not observed during code-switching; and finally, there are syntactic constraints in English to Kiswahili code-switching. In conclusion, the study observed that extensive use of code-switching and failure to follow rules of languages during code-switching may affect second language development in the ESL classrooms. The study recommends use of code-switching when necessary in ESL classrooms; and also adherence to rules of the two languages during code-switching in ESL classrooms in order to reduce negative transfer. These measures will enhance L2 development.

Keywords: Code-switching, embedded language, matrix language, syntactic constraint.

Introduction

The debate on whether or not code-switching is a rule governed process has been there for long. However, linguists are in agreement that each language has its grammar that guides its users. Therefore, to understand the grammatical aspects used in the code-switching process, there is need to interrogate the syntax of the two languages used in the code-switching process. van Valin and Lapolla (2000) observe that one of the most important components of grammar is its syntax. This is because syntax forms the heart of sentence structure and the rules of semantics and phonological components are taken to be an interpretation of the syntactic structure (Mwangi, Kinyanjui, Gecaga, Indangasi & Mukunga, 2009). Besides, Mwangi et al. (2009), van Valin and Lapolla (2000) suggest that to understand the grammar of a language, it is necessary to understand rules that human beings employ to join words into meaningful structures.

Research has shown that code-switching is a rule governed process (Malmkæjar, 1991) as opposed to being an haphazard activity as previously viewed in other studies, thus syntax of the two languages involved in the process must be investigated. The focus should be on how the grammars of the two languages are incorporated in an utterance. There have been both theoretical and empirical studies that have identified rules that guide code-switching. These rules include: equivalent constraint and free morpheme constraint; dual

structure principle, dependency constraint, and closed items constraints. These constraints are reviewed and presented in the next section.

Equivalent Constraint and Free Morpheme Constraint

Poplack (1979) examined intra-sentential Spanish and English code-switching. Using clauses, phrases and single elements like nouns and verbs, Poplack developed equivalent constraint and free morpheme constraint. Equivalent constraint states:

Code-switching will tend to occur at a point in discourse where juxtaposition of L1 and L2 does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, i.e., at points which the surface structures of two languages map to each other (Poplack, 1979: 10-11).

Poplack postulates that as long as the word order of the two languages is similar, then it is possible to have a switch. For instance, in the sentence below it is possible to have a switch between the verb 'see' and object 'teacher' between English and Kiswahili as shown in example one.

Example 1

English	see the teacher
Kiswahili	<i>ona mwalimu</i>
CS	<i>ona teacher</i>

Appel and Muysken (2005) support equivalent constraint arguing that when the phrase structure rules (word order) of both languages are identical, switching is possible. Ulrich (2004) observes that equivalence constraint assumes that languages in contact share the same categories and do not envisage the categories in the two languages mismatching because of typological dissimilarities. Thus, should there be dissimilarities between the languages, ungrammatical utterances will be evident. Although Poplack's equivalent constraint did not discuss the constituents of the switched elements, it helped the current study in explaining the point at which code switching occurs. Further, it was useful in discussing elements of code-switching and syntactic constraints. Poplack also developed Free Morpheme constraint which states that code switching may not occur between bound morphemes. It means that a switch may occur at any point in a sentence on condition that the surface constituent of the matrix language is followed. Further, the incoming word should also be a free morpheme like the word it replaces during the switching.

Romaine (1989) did a study on Spanish and English bilinguals. The findings of her study support the free morpheme constraint. Romaine observes that code switching may not occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless it is phonologically integrated. For instance, she observes that in Spanish/ English code-switching, a switch may occur between a determiner and a noun but not between a noun and an adjective. Romaine identifies possible switches between Spanish and English between noun phrase and verb phrase, and also between preposition and noun phrase. It was the interest of the current study to establish whether such switches were possible in English-Kiswahili code-switching.

The free morpheme constraint, like the equivalent constraint faced criticism of failing to explain why it was not possible to have switches between some free morphemes. For example, Belazi, Edward and Almeida (1994) observe that switching between a perfect auxiliary, which is a free morpheme and its main verb 'seen' is possible as illustrated in example 2.

Example 2

I had seen the fire before he shouted.
I had *onad* the fire before he shouted

It is observed in example 2 that although the perfect auxiliary ‘had’ is free; the verb ‘*ona*’ had to undergo a phonological integration to add ‘-d’ to mark tense and for a switch to be allowed; an issue that Romaine does not support. Romaine argues that switching should be allowed if only a word is used at its original form without any changes on its structures.

Dual Structure Principle

Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) in their quest to explain the extent to which guest constituent should be similar to that of the host language developed the dual structure principle. They felt that equivalent constraint was non-restrictive. Dual structure principle states that:

The internal structure of guest constituents need not conform to the constituent structure rules of host language, so long as the placement in the host language obeys the rules of the host language (Sridhar & Sridhar, 1980: 28).

According to Sridhar and Sridhar, the equivalence is in terms of rules of the host language. It is possible to have a switch between elements of two languages if the rules are similar. Likewise, a switch is not possible if the word order of the elements of the two languages is not similar. For instance, a switch between English and Kiswahili noun phrase is not possible because the rules are different. The noun phrase of English may consist of pre-nominal modifiers such as possessive pronoun or adjectives which are used as post nominal modifiers in Kiswahili.

Example 3

Kiswahili	<i>Hiki kitabu ni kizuri</i>
English	This book is good.
CS	This book <i>ni nzuri</i> .

In example 3 above, code-switching between the copular verb ‘is’ and the adjective ‘good’ is allowed because the switch does not violate either English or Kiswahili rules.

Dependency Constraint

Muysken, Di Sciullo and Sing (1986) developed the dependency constraint that states that there cannot be a switch between two elements of two languages, if they are lexically dependent on each other. However, for elements that are not restricted to each other, they argue that a switch can occur. Thus, code switching may only occur when there are ungoverned elements such as tags, exclamations, interjections and most adverbs from two languages. Example 4 (i) and (ii) illustrate switches between tags and adverbs respectively.

Example 4

- i) ENG: She will come, wont she?
KIS: *Atakuja, si ndiyo?*
CS: She will come, *si ndiyo?* (*tags*)
- ii) KIS: *Atafika jioni*
ENG: She will arrive in the evening

CS: She will arrive *jioni*. (*Adverb of time*)

The study observes that most of the early studies on grammatical constraints considered code-switching to be a surface phenomenon involving words in a sentence. Appel and Muysken (2005) group the constraints as linearity and dependency constraints, which they also refer to as universal constraints. The constraints were regarded as linearity constraints because switching from one language to another in the middle of a sentence is only possible if the linear order in both languages is preserved. Dependency constraint category occurred because the constraints proposed that code-switching can only occur on constituents that are not bound together. The current study used the two universal constraints to discuss the code-switched item. Linguists like Joshi (1985) and Myers-Scotton (1997) developed constraints on closed-class items and matrix language framework. In their study, they shifted focus from linearity and dependency to constituents in a sentence which was the focus of this study.

Constraint on Closed-Class Items

Joshi (1985) proposed constraints on closed-class items. The constraint predicts that no switch may occur between a preposition which is a closed item and its complement. Joshi's model was criticised for lacking a theoretical background. Further, in ENG-KIS code-switching, it is possible to have a switch of the closed items like prepositions as exemplified in example 5.

Example 5

ENG: He placed the key on the table.

KIS: *Aliuweka ufunguo juu ya meza.*

CS: He placed the key *juu ya* table

Myers-Scotton (1997) later gave constraints in code-switching a different perspective. She examined constituents of a code-switched sentence in terms of morphemes. In her view, the two languages used during code-switching do not participate equally in an utterance. According to Myers-Scotton, the host language, which she refers to as the Matrix Language (ML), dominates the guest language that she refers to as the Embedded Language (EL). The ML provides the content morphemes while the EL provides the system morphemes during code-switching. The content morphemes are verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs while the system morphemes include the functional words and all inflectionals that show tense and plural among other aspects. She did a study on code-switching between Kiswahili and English language which is similar to the current study but different in two ways. First her study examined code-switching in the informal setting while this study focused on the classroom which is a formal setting. Further, Myers-Scotton used Kiswahili as the ML and English as the EL while in this study English is the ML and Kiswahili is the EL. It was the interest of the researcher to establish how the grammar of a host language influenced the code-switching in a sentence.

Example 6

ENG: He played very well.

KIS: *Alicheza vizuri.*

i) CS: *Aliplay vizuri*

ii) CS: He *chezad* very well*

In example 6(i) where Kiswahili is the matrix language a switch between the verb 'play' and 'cheza' is allowed because the original form of the word does not undergo any integration. In contrast to Kiswahili where English is the matrix language example 6(ii) the verb had to undergo some morphological integration by adding a suffix '-d' to the verb 'cheza' for it to be incorporated in a sentence. Hence, such is not a switch but borrowing as Sridhar and Sridhar (1980) noted and should not be allowed. The framework used by Myers-Scotton guided the study in the identification of the matrix language and embedded language. Ulrich (2004) avers that linguists have not agreed on how best code-switching constraints may be formulated. It is however clear that there are syntactic constraints that exist whenever two languages are involved in a code-switching process. In addition, Garner (2007) observes that features of a linguistic item can only be investigated in relation to situation and language in a given context. The study focused on the classroom discourse in relation to how linguistic items of both English and Kiswahili were used during code-switching.

Theoretical Framework

Contrastive analysis (CA) by Lado (1967) and Matrix language framework (MLF) by Myers-Scotton (1997) guided the study. MLF guided the study in identifying both the matrix language in the study and the embedded language (EL) which were English and Kiswahili respectively. CA was applied in the comparison of elements of code-switching in order to identify similarities and differences in L1 and L2. The similarities between the word order of the matrix language (English) and EL (Kiswahili) were used to predict a possible switch of the two elements on the one hand. On the other hand, the differences between the word order of English and Kiswahili were used to predict a syntactic constraint.

Croft (2003) notes that studies on language structure have shown that although languages may have similarities, they could also differ from each other in many unpredictable ways. In view of the existence of both similarities and differences in languages, there is need to study the language structures of different languages especially in the bilingual world. The comparison is necessary in bilingual education where the role of L1 in target language learning has been identified.

Methodology

The study was carried out in three public primary schools in Nairobi-Kenya. Nairobi is the capital city of Kenya. As a result, it attracts its population from diverse ethno-linguistic groups. There are over forty local languages used in Kenya. In addition, there are foreign languages which form a minority. As a result of this language situation, Kiswahili language functions as a lingua franca and is used during interaction between different communities in social places such as markets, places of residence, schools, churches and other places where people meet. In addition, Kenya's language policy states that Kiswahili should be used as a medium of instruction in the lower classes in mixed ethnic schools. Since the study was on the use of Kiswahili during English lessons, the choice of the study location was deemed appropriate.

Random sampling was used to select standard one, two and three in two schools which had more than one stream. In the other one streamed school, the data was collected in class one, two and three. Audio-recording was used in one out of the 3 schools selected for the study. The researcher observed that video-recording was good as it also provided necessary data for the study. The observations were made in relation to the use of code-switching during the English lesson.

The audio-video recording provided the researcher with data on classroom discourse between teachers and learners especially on language use. Since it was the main data collection method, the data was transcribed to enable the researcher get information on

several issues of the study. Using clauses with ENG-KIS constituents from the transcribed data, the researcher was able to identify the elements of code-switching used, as well as analyse the syntactic constraints during code-switching.

Discussion of Key Findings

Teachers and learners were observed to code-switch to the Kiswahili language during the English lessons. Code-switching was used to explain new words, to explain complicated instructions in a language activity, to appoint the next speaker in the classroom discourse, and also to correct learners. Syntactic rules of both English and Kiswahili were not given much attention. This may be because of the assumption that code-switching rules were not necessary. Therefore, the focus was placed on understanding of the concepts at the expense of the packaging of the information.

Further, a close look at some of the texts retrieved from the recorded data revealed that almost 70 percent of the words used were in Kiswahili. An analysis of the recorded data, confirmed that teachers used Kiswahili extensively. Teachers' over reliance on Kiswahili disadvantages the learning of English language. Similar observations were noted by Chamber (1991) who stated that in some cases, teachers and learners engaged unnecessary L1 use which threatened the learners' optimal learning of the target language. Cook (2002) suggests that proper planning of use of code-switching during the lesson by teachers is necessary for effective learning of the target language. Celik (2008) also argues that use of code-switching has positive impacts, but it should be used with caution to avoid disadvantaging the target language.

Myers-Scotton (1997) has proposed that during code-switching, the Morpheme order and system morpheme principles must be adhered to against which possible syntactic constraints may arise. In the current study, English is the matrix language. It is therefore expected that all the elements should follow the surface order of the English language and the ones that did not follow were used to explain the syntactic constraints. The elements of code-switching were identified as pronouns, conjunctions, verb phrases, noun phrases, prepositions and adverb as the main elements in code-switching. These are discussed in the next sections.

1. Noun Phrase

The noun phrase may have elements used before or after the noun head in both English and Kiswahili. It was observed that the morpheme word order of English was different from that of Kiswahili. Rugemalira (2007) proposed that elements in a Kiswahili noun phrase may follow some order. A noun phrase in English may have similar elements like Kiswahili with a few exceptions but following a different word order as illustrated in example 7.

Example 7

i)KIS: *Vile Vitabu vyangu vyote viwili vya kwanza vilivyo*
Dem + noun + poss + Quant+ NUM + Ord +

Vizuri Vilivyo maktabani.
Adj + Rel clause

ii)ENG: All those/my first two good books that are in library
Qua + Dem/Poss + Ord +Num + Adj + N + Rel clause

In English and Kiswahili noun phrase word order, the similarities were observed in the demonstrative and the relative as example 8(i) and 8(ii) show respectively. Demonstrative elements in Kiswahili are used before the noun head as in English. Similarly, a relative clause in Kiswahili takes the last position in a noun phrase as in English. The similar positioning of the demonstratives and relatives allows a switch between the two languages

during code-switching, such that in example 8, the switch between ‘that’ and ‘hiyo’ is allowed.

Example 8

- i) What is the name of that place?
Dem+ N
- ii) What is the name of hiyo place?
Dem + N
- iii) ENG: He bought the old books which were stolen
Rel.clause
- iv) C/S: He bought the old books vilivyo ibwa.
Relative clause

Similarly, in an English utterance, it is possible to switch to a Kiswahili relative clause as observed in example 8 (iv) where a Kiswahili relative is allowed into the English noun phrase. The relative clause and the demonstrative agree with the morpheme order of the English language resulting to a switch. The switch between such elements as demonstrative and relative clauses during code-switching is supported by Poplack’s Equivalence constraint which postulates that code-switching between equivalent elements in a sentence is allowed (Poplack, 1979).

All the other Noun phrase elements including possessives, numbers, ordinals, quantifiers, adjectives and some demonstratives in Kiswahili are used after the noun head. Such Kiswahili elements contrast English morpheme word order which leads to syntactic constraints. Each constraint within the noun phrase was identified and described starting with the demonstrative in the next section.

Demonstratives

Within the noun phrase, the English demonstrative is used before the noun head while in Kiswahili it can be used either before or after the head noun. The demonstrative which is used before a noun head can be allowed to code-switch. But for the demonstrative that is used after the noun head, a switch should not be allowed as it will cause a syntactic constraint as shown in example 9.

Example 9

- i) ENG: In this game we have three teams, *zime jiandaa*
through practice
- ii) KIS: Kwa mchezo huu
- iii) CS: In huu game...*

In example 9, a switch of the English demonstrative ‘this’ and ‘*huu*’ in Kiswahili is not allowed. The constraint is created by the morpheme word order in the NP of the two languages. In English, the demonstrative in an NP takes the ‘NP: Dem/N’ pattern while Kiswahili takes the NP: N/Dem. A switch at the indicated point in example 9 (iii), will violate the syntactic rules of the two languages

Possessive Constraints

Possessives are used to specify the Noun head in a noun phrase. In an English NP, the possessive is used before the Noun head. Considering example 10 (i) and (ii), the possessive in English is used attributively while in Kiswahili, it is used predicatively in relation to the noun head.

Example 10

- i) ENG: Your car is good.
Poss+ N
- ii) KIS: Gari lako ni zuri
N+Poss
- iii) CS: lako Car is good*

In ENG-KIS code-switching, a possible constraint may occur if a switch between English and Kiswahili possessive determiner is switched. Myers-Scotton's morpheme order principle states that the surface order should be that of ML which is English. For code-switching to occur, the morpheme order of Kiswahili should agree with that of English. Since the Kiswahili possessive is used after the noun head, a switch with the English possessive determiner should not be allowed as illustrated in example 10. (i), The possessive pronoun 'your' is used before the noun head 'car' in example 10, while 'lako' in example 10 (ii) is after the noun head 'gari'. Therefore, a switch between 'your' and 'lako' as illustrated in example 10 (iii) should not be allowed.

Adjective Constraint

The English adjective is positioned before the noun head in a noun phrase. The position of adjective in English contrasts with the Kiswahili adjective because its adjective is placed after the noun head as illustrated in example 11.

Example 11

- i) ENG: Sometimes the teacher tells you that you are a polite boy.
AdJ + N
- ii) KIS: wakati mwingine mwalimu anakwambia wewe ni mvulana mpole.
N + Adj
- iii) C/S: Sometimes the teacher tells that you are a mpole boy*.

In example 11 (i), the adjective 'polite' is used before the noun head 'boy', while 'mpole' is used after the same noun head.

A switch between the Kiswahili adjective 'mpole' and the English adjective 'polite', as shown in example 11 (iii) should therefore not be allowed. The constraint is because the morpheme order of the English and Kiswahili adjective in a noun phrase are different. The use of the adjective after the noun head violates the English morpheme order which is the ML in this study. Myers-Scotton (1993) argues that in code-switching, morpheme word order should be followed. Similarly, 'mpole' cannot be used before the head noun 'boy' because Kiswahili word order that requires the adjective to be after the head noun will be violated. Chan (2004) further observes that such switch between a functional head and its complement is allowed on condition that the complement meets the requirements of the head. The Kiswahili adjective does not meet the conditions of the English adjective except the demonstrative adjective.

Quantifiers

Quantifiers in English are used before the noun head. A switch in the quantifiers is allowed when the quantifier in the other language is also used before its noun head. For instance, in Kiswahili, a quantifier is mostly used after the noun head as in example 12.

Example 12

- i) ENG: All these people make competitors to have...
Dem +Quant +N
- ii) KIS: Hawa watu wote huwafanya washindani kupata...
Dem +N+ Quant
- iii) CS *Wote* these people make....*

A switch between the quantifier 'wote' and 'all' is not allowed as illustrated in example 12 (iii). A syntactic constraint may result because the English noun morpheme order and the Kiswahili one is different. Unlike the quantifiers in Kiswahili which are used after the noun head, the English is used before the Noun head. Use of the Kiswahili 'wote' before the noun head 'people' violates Kiswahili morpheme order and therefore should not be allowed.

Numerals

Numerals indicate the figures in a noun phrase. Numerals in English are used before the noun head. An incoming language should also have its numerals used before a noun head for code-switching is allowed in a sentence where English is the matrix language as exemplified in example 13.

Example 13

- i) CS: In this game we have three teams, *zime jiandaa*
Num + N
- ii) KIS: timu tatu that have prepared.
N + Num.

Considering example 13, a switch between 'three' in 13 (i) and 'tatu' in 13 (ii) cannot be allowed. There is a constraint because number in English is used before the noun head while in Kiswahili it is used after. Therefore, the English number cannot switch with number in Kiswahili whose morphological order is different.

Ordinals

English ordinals like numbers are also used before their noun head in English. Kiswahili ordinals in contrast are used after the noun head in a noun phrase as illustrated in example 14 (ii).

Example 14

- i) CS The first three teams *zitatunzwa*.
Det+ Ord+ Num+ N
- ii) KIS: Timu za kwanza tatu/Timu tatu za kwanza...
N + Ord+ Num

In example 14 above, a switch between the English ordinal 'first' and the Kiswahili on 'za kwanza' cannot be allowed because ordinals in Kiswahili occur after the noun head. A switch would create a constraint as it violates English word structure that requires the ordinal to precede the noun head

2. Pronouns

Kiswahili pronouns were observed to be different from those of English in terms of position in sentence and functions. Each type of pronoun that had dissimilarities was pressed for

clarity as observed in demonstrative, interrogative, personal, and possessive pronouns, which are hereby discussed.

Personal Pronouns

English and Kiswahili Personal pronouns were observed to have different rules in terms of usage and word formation. While English has free personal pronoun morphemes used as subject and objects in a sentence, Kiswahili has bound morphemes as exemplified in example 15.

Example 15

- i) He knew *angeshinda*.
- ii) *A-lijua* he would win the race.

In the above example, a switch between the English personal pronoun 'he' in example 15 (i) and the Kiswahili prefix 'a-' in 15 (ii) cannot be allowed. The English personal pronoun lacks a Kiswahili equivalent because the English personal pronoun is a free morpheme whereas Kiswahili one is morphologically bound. The free morpheme cannot replace a bound morpheme. A switch between a free personal pronoun and a bound personal pronoun will cause a constraint.

Further observations reveal that Kiswahili uses both the free and bound morphemes in place of a subject or object in a sentence as illustrated in example 16.

Example 16

- i) KIS: *Mimi ni-tapika chakula*
Pron. + Pron
- ii) ENG: I will cook the food.
Pron.
- iii) CS: *Mimi I will cook the food.**

Example 16(i) shows that Kiswahili allows the duplication of personal pronouns in a sentence since 'mimi' and the subject personal prefix 'ni-' are used in the same sentence. In contrast English allows one personal pronoun to be used as a subject in a sentence as shown in example 16 (ii). Duplication of personal pronouns in English violates its morpheme order. As a result a constraint will result when Kiswahili free personal morphemes are introduced as observed in 16(iii).

Interrogatives

In English, an interrogative pronoun takes the first position in an interrogative statement. Code-switching between interrogatives in Kiswahili and the English equivalent is allowed especially when the Kiswahili one takes the initial position. A Kiswahili pronoun may be in the initial position in an indirect sentence as in example 17 (iii). In addition, a pronoun in Kiswahili can take the middle or last position in a statement. A constraint is observed between the interrogative used at the middle and at the end of a sentence.

Example 17

- i) *Unafanya nini?*
1 2
What are you doing?
2 1
- ii) *Alimpa nani kitabu?*

conditional clause. While 'ki' is an infix in the verb 'u-ki-a-mbiw-a' its English equivalent 'if' is a free morpheme introducing the 'if' clause.

In ENG-KIS code-switching, a switch between a free conjunction in Kiswahili and English was allowed. Such switch is supported by Polack (1980) with the equivalence of structure constraint that proposes a switch where the rules of the two languages are not violated. The conjunction 'na' occupies the same position as the conjunction 'and' in the translated sentence in example 19 (i). The findings concurred with Gumperz (1982) who proposed a possible switch.

Summary of Findings

In summary, the study observed that code-switching was used during the English lessons to some extent at the expense of the target language. Further observations revealed that English and Kiswahili grammar had both similarities and differences in syntactic rules of elements used in code-switching. The similarities in the syntactic rules allowed a switch between elements while the differences would result to syntactic constraints. The syntactic constraints were observed in noun phrases, pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions. In noun phrases, syntactic constraints were in elements like demonstratives, adjectives, number, numerals, possessives, ordinals and quantifiers. The syntactic constraints in the noun phrase were as a result of the word order of the elements in the phrase. English allows all its noun head modifiers to be used before it, while in Kiswahili, the noun head precedes its modifiers. Similarly, in English, an adverb that modifies an adjective appears before the adjective while in Kiswahili, the adverb is used after the adjective.

Syntactic constraints in pronouns were due to word order and constituents of the elements as observed in interrogatives and personal pronouns respectively. Interrogatives in Kiswahili are able to take any position in a sentence while in English, interrogatives take the initial position in a sentence. Interrogatives taking a middle or final position in a sentence result to syntactic constraint in English to Kiswahili code-switching. Personal pronouns in English are independent while in Kiswahili they are bound to the main verb. Some conjunctions in Kiswahili were also bound to the main verb while all the conjunctions in English are free. A switch between bound and free morpheme is not possible.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study observed that although code-switching is a good teaching strategy, its extensive use and failure to follow rules of the languages involved may affect second language development in the ESL classrooms. The study makes several recommendations. Firstly, teachers should use the target language during the lesson and code-switching be used only when necessary. Secondly, the rules of the language involved in code-switching should be observed during second language development in ESL classrooms. Thirdly, syntactic constraints of the languages used during code-switching should be identified since they may be used to expose learners to the differences in the languages involved, Such knowledge may not only enhance the second language development but also prevent a possible L1 to L2 negative transfer. Finally, in order to enhance second language development, only elements from incoming language with similar syntactic rules are allowed during code-switching.

References

- Abuom, T. O., & Bastiaanse, R. (2012) Characteristics of Swahili-English bilingual agrammatic spontaneous speech and consequences for understanding agrammatic aphasia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics* 25, 276-293.
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (2005) *Language contact and bilingualism*. Edward Arnold: Amsterdam University Press.

- Belazi, H. M., Edward, J. R., & Almeida J. T. (1994) Code switching and X-Bar theory: The functional head constraint. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25: 221-37.
- Celik, S. (2008) Opening the door: An examination of mother tongue use in foreign languages classroom. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education* 34, 75-85.
- Chambers, F. (1991) Promoting use of target language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal*, 4, 27-31.
- Chan, B. (2004) Beyond 'contextualization': Code-switching as a 'textualization cue'. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 23 (1) 7-27.
- Cook, V. (2002) Using the first language in classroom. *A Canadian Language Review*, 57(3): 403-423.
- Croft, W. (2003) *Typology and universals*. Cambridge University: Cambridge University Press.
- Garner, M. (2007) Techniques analysis III discourse. In Stockwell, P; Mullany, L & L. Iamas (Eds.) *The Routledge companion to sociolinguistics* (pp. 41-47). New York: Routledge.
- Gumperz, J. (1982) *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joshi, A. (1985) Processing of sentences with intrasentential code switching. In D. Dowty, L. Karttunen & A. Zwicky (Eds.) *Natural language parsing: Psychological, computational and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 190-205). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lado, R. (1967) *Linguistics across cultures*. An Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Malmkæjar, K. (1991) *The linguistic encyclopaedia*. London: New York Publishers.
- Mwangi, P., Kinyanjui, M., Gecaga, C., Indangasi, H., & Mukunga, M. (2009) *Distinction English for Primary Teacher Education Y1 and 2*. Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau.
- Muysken, P., Di Sciullo, A., & Sing, R. (1986) Government and code-switching. *Linguistics*, 22: 1-24.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1997) *Duelling languages: Grammatical structures in code switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Poplack, S. (1979) Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish terminology en Espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18: 581-618.
- Romaine, S. (1989) *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Rugemalira, J. (2007) The structure of Bantu Noun Phrase. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 15, 135-148.
- Sridhar, S., & Sridhar, K. (1980) The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-mixing. *Studies in Linguistic Science*, Vol. 10, 203-215.
- Ulrich, A. (2004) *Sociolinguistics. An interaction handbook of language and society*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.