Hieber, Daniel W. 2007. Language change & variation in Mombasa: Recent trends in Kimvita Swahili. Independent study project, 'Development, Health, & Society', Spring 2007, School for International Training, Nairobi, Kenya.

LANGUAGE CHANGE & VARIATION IN MOMBASA:

RECENT TRENDS IN KIMVITA SWAHILI

DANIEL W. HIEBER
(dwhieb@gmail.com)

SIT Kenya: Development, Health & Society
Spring 2007

Academic Directors: Jamal Omar and Odoch Pido

Advisor: Donna Pido

~ ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ~

This project represents the culmination of a year's worth of study in Kenya, as well as my own intellectual development in linguistics, and not a line of it would have been possible without the continued help of a number of people, many of whom have helped me find a life here in a place halfway across the world.

First and foremost I would like to thank Jamal Omar and Odoch Pido for making this a semester to remember. Jamal especially supported me in my endeavors graciously accomodated me time and time again. Your support did not go unappreciated. Many thanks to Odoch's wife, Donna, for being my advisor and saying 'I support you' in a way that gave me confidence to proceed and that few people have. Also, thanks for the continued friendship of Athman Lali and Ali Shariff, both of whom are wonderful people I am proud to call friends.

A thousand thanks to my homestay family - Asya and Margaret and Bush - for being such wonderful and generous hosts to me this semeseter, and providing me with a safe and comfortable place to call home, if even for a little while. And continued thanks Rukiya and her family, who have become my family as well, and taken me in as such and looked after me like one of her own.

I would have been lost in all of this if not for the invaluable help of Hamisi Issa, who served as a research assistant and primary informant, but more importantly was my emotional support for the entire semester, and a valued friend. I cannot thank you enough.

Of course, thanks go out to all my informants on Hinawy Road, for making this project a fun experience and as effortless as possible.

Finally, there are my fellow wazungu, both here and in the States, who need thanking. Here in Kenya I would like very much to thank Colin Haverkamp, for being my right-hand man and partner in crime, whose company made for a great semester. And also Caroline Huggins, both for her friendship and for being my 'tutor' in Kenyan culture, and who motivated me to dive headfirst into that culture. Back home I must thank George Greenia and Tom Wood, who have been a constant this whole year, and given me much love and support. And of course my family, particularly this time Mom, Dad, Leigh, and Gramp, who even when things get rough - and they usually do - are there through it all.

Mungu akubariki.

~DWH

~ TABLE OF CONTENTS ~

Hieber, Daniel W. 2007. Language change & variation in Mombasa: Recent trends in Kimvita Swahili. Independent study project, 'Development, Health, & Society', Spring 2007, School for International Training, Nairobi, Kenya.

~ ABSTRACT ~

This project examines the process of language change in Mombasa Swahili, and specifically examines the correlation between language attitudes and a) morphological simplicity, and b) code-switching. It first outlines the processes by which language change occurs, and then methodically gathers data via language attitude surveys and recorded conversations. Both sets of data are analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. The paper concludes that there is a tenative correlation between language attitude and language use patterns. Finally, the information presented is pulled together and for a specific case-study of a recent grammatical trend in Mombasa Swahili.

§1. INTRODUCTION

Whether or not speakers like it, languages are always changing. The English of two thousand years ago isn't even recognizable as English today, and even the English of a hundred years ago sounds stilted and odd to our ears. People (especially old people) are constantly railing against this change, lamenting current developments in the language as 'slang' or 'corruption', and pontificate about how the language is deteriorating and nobody speaks 'proper' English anymore. It happens all across the world.

In Kenya, the issue revolves around the youth and a dialect called Sheng. Like every generation before it, the Kenyan youth of today are the propagators of change in the language, all the time creating new expressions, while at the same time letting other aspects of their language 'deteriorate'. And just as the youth are only continuing an age-old process, so the adults are perpetuating a constant criticism of the process of change. These two opposing viewpoints serve to balance each other, allowing for a gradual process of linguistic change over time.

Kenya today is home to numerous varieties of Swahili, due mostly to its status as a lingua franca, meaning that most of its speakers know it primarily as a second language for the purpose of communication between communities. Swahili tends to become less grammatically complex the farther one goes from the Coast, where the language originated. Add to that the influence of English and the local indigenous languages, and the development of a mixed code (specifically Sheng in Nairobi), and Swahili is ripe for linguistic change.

This paper examines the process of linguistic change in Mombasa, Kenya. In order to do so, we must consider both what and who are the driving forces in the language. In terms of the *what*, this paper looks at several issues relating to linguistic change, drawing from sources in the literature. First are the basic processes of linguistic change, specifically morphological

simplification. Second, on how linguistic variation is measured and examined. Third, we will look at the syntactic elaboration of Swahili as a counter to morphological simplification. Finally, we will examine the process of mixing languages known as code-switching, and how it relates to linguistic change.

As to *who* is driving the linguistic change, this paper has one overarching objective: to examine the correlations between language attitudes and (a) morphological complexity, and (b) the presence of code-switching. Can the way a speaker uses a language (specifically in ways that contribute to its change over time) be predicted based on their language attitudes? Answering this question requires three steps: (a) examining the language attitudes of a speech community, (b) examining the morphological complexity and presence of code-switching in their speech, and (c) drawing correlations between the two. Achieving these objectives constitutes the core of this paper.

§2. BACKGROUND

Unfortunately, language attitudes are not an easy thing to qualify (or quantify). Their study is generally subjective, and based mostly on speakers beliefs regarding specific issues. Often these beliefs are contradictory, and vary depending on the topic. It is difficult to draw a definitive line between beliefs and attitudes. Even this project ran into considerable difficulties when it came to collecting data on language attitudes and qualifying/quantifying it. Here, the point was to study "general" language attitudes - no easy task since language attitudes are best defined in relation to particular issues. In linguistics, language attitudes are best defined in terms of prescriptivism versus descriptivism.

Linguistics is based on the idea of descriptivism, i.e. that the task of linguistics is to *describe* the way language is used without imposing value judgements. Meanwhile, it is the job of grammarians to *prescribe* the rules of language, and they are the people constantly telling us to not split infinitives and that prepositions are a bad thing to end a sentence with. But prescriptivism and descriptivism can be used to describe a speaker's beliefs as well. Consider for example a speaker who thinks double negatives are a 'corruption' of language. This speaker likely prescribes to a belief that languages should have good logical form, so that two negatives must of necessity make a positive. But this is not how language works. So when a speaker says 'I ain't goin' nowhere', his utterance actually has a positive meaning in the sense of 'I'm not going anywhere'. In fact, many languages use double negation to show emphasis, such as Spanish where *no sé nada* means 'I don't know anything'. In this paper, we will talk of speakers having prescriptivist or descriptivist beliefs on a continuum from one to the other.

Related to that is whether or not a speaker is a likely catalyst for advancing language change. Prescriptivists, as you would expect, are likely to show a regression away from language change, towards some arbitrary historical point which they deem as 'proper' in the development of the language. But the correlation is not always a direct one: sometimes people with prescriptivist attitudes are more likely to be the locis of change themselves, ironic as it may be. For instance, a bilingual who believes that one of his two languages is impoverished and incapable of addressing certain topics (advanced science, for example) will be more likely to integrate elements of his second language to compensate (especially if that language is English), inevitably having an effect on the language. For the purposes of this study, then, we will talk of speakers who are likely to advance or regress from the process of linguistic change in Swahili as distinct from being prescriptive or descriptive.

Now that we have a way to define language attitudes, we need to define what we mean by morphological complexity. A morpheme is the smallest unit of speech in a language which can carry meaning. For example, in English <-ed> is a morpheme because it carries the meaning 'past tense'. <-s> is another example, meaning 'third person singular verb'. Swahili morphology is much more complex than that, with each verb typically having at least four or more morphemes (e.g. *u-li-ni-changany-ik-a*). When we said in the Introduction that certain varieties of Swahili were less grammatically complex than others, we were actually referring to this system of morphology. Some speakers use only very basic morphology. Consider the two examples below; the first is Standard Swahili (S.S.), and the second from a recorded speech sample:

(1) *umekwisha kuona?*

u-	me-	kw-	ish-	a	ku-	on-	a
you	PAST-PERF	INF	finish	AFFIRM	INF	see	AFFIRM

'have you seen?'

(2) *shona?*

sha-	on-	a
already	see	AFFIRM

'have you seen?'[1]

Both are variations on an idiomatic expression meaning roughly 'do you understand?' or 'are you with me?', heard commonly in a form closer to (2) on the Coast. Historically (2) derives from (1), as the form *umekwisha* eroded until only *-sha-* remained, and was grammaticalized to the verb *-ona*.

[1] The glosses used here are defined as follows:

PAST PERF – Past perfect tense
INF – Infinitive verb marker
PRES IND – Present indefinite tense marker
SUB – Subject agreement marker
PAST – Past tense marker
COP – copula (i.e. a form of the verb 'be')
DEF – Definite locative marker
DO – Direct object marker
AFFIRM – Affirmative verb marker
CLASS – Noun class marker
REL – Relative marker
COND – Conditional tense marker
DIST – Distal demonstrative
LOC – Locative marker

What we need is an objective way to measure morphological complexity. One way is simply to count morphemes; (1) above has eight morphemes, while (2) has only three, so (1) is more complex. The problem comes with instances like (3) and (4) below:

(3) *nakupenda*

na-	ku-	pend-	a
I-PRES IND	you	love	AFFIRM

(4) *napenda wewe*

na-	pend-	a	wewe
I-PRES IND	love	AFFIRM	you

Both are considered acceptable forms with the same meaning, 'I love you'. Yet clearly (3) is a more complex construction than (4). So instead, we must count the morphemes *per word*. Then we see how (3) (four morphemes in the verb) is more complex than (4) (three morphemes in the verb).

This is just one of the ways we can measure morphological complexity, and later we will be using a variety of tools to examine the morphology of participants' speech, such as the avoidance of irregular forms, or the preference for the present tense when Standard Swahili offers (and sometimes requires) more advanced alternatives. It is very difficult to create one definition of complexity which adequately allows for consistent measurement.

Our other potential correlation, code-switching, is (relatively) easier to define. It is an important aspect of language variation, because bilinguals are often catalysts for linguistic change (Bonvillain, 1993). They are capable of finding new ways to more precisely express their meaning, usually by incorporating linguistic material from their second language (L2) when they find their L1 deficient, and these innovations will then spread beyond the bilingual community (Hieber, 2006: 5).

When two different languages are mixed this way, it is known as code-switching.[2] Sometimes these switches are easy to spot, other times not. Below are two examples, again taken from subjects' recordings, with the English underlined:

(5) *wanakwenda trip*
'they are going on a trip'

(6) *gari ilihajikiwa na barabarani*
'the car was hijacked on the road'

Fortunately, code-switching is easy to measure. You simply count the number of instances of its occurrence. More difficult is to say *why* speakers performed the switch. Scotton (1976) says that code-switching is motivated primarily by social reasons, but in Hieber (2006) I show how many code-switches are entirely linguistically motivated. Sometimes, words from other languages are used so much that they actually become a *part of* the lexicon. Most Kenyan speakers of Swahili, for example, use the word *televisheni* for television instead of S.S. *runinga*. This is particularly the case in Kenya, where the languages have become so conflated as to be a mixed code (Hieber, 2006) (more on this later).

Now we have only to pull our three foci of study together into a consistent framework. How do they relate? Specifically, like our overarching objective states, how does language attitude relate to (a) morphological simplification, and (b) the presence of code-switching.

We will try tackle (a) first with what I call the *simplification theory* of language attitudes. Simplification theory takes for granted the fact that linguages change partially through a process of simplification, in some of the ways we have shown above. This simplification does *not* necessarily produce simple forms, however. It often makes even more complex constructions

[2] In actuality, there are two types of integration - code-switching and code-mixing - each with slightly different definitions. This distinction is irrelevant for the current project, so the term *code-switching* will be used indiscriminately to encompass both. For a more in-depth discussion of these phenomena, see Hieber (2006) and Fishman (1972).

than before, through a process of grammaticalization (more on this later). So simplification can at the same time serve as complexification - hence the process of language change (in part).

Simplification theory next says that language use can be predicted based on language attitudes and beliefs, specifically that those speakers with descriptivist beliefs or beliefs that predict linguistic advancement (rather than regression) are the ones who initiate and perpetuate language change. If langauge changes primarily through a process of simplification, then those speakers predicted to advance language change must be doing so by 'simplifying' their speech. In other words, descriptivist speakers are much more likely to show morphological simplicity in their speech than prescriptivist ones.

This is the hypothesis for part (a) of our research objectives. A corollary to that is that prescriptivists don't institute language change, and ergo won't show evidence of morphological simplification in their speech.

For the same reasons, we predict for part (b) of our objectives that speakers with descriptivist views will show a higher presence of code-switching in their speech. This also seems simply common sense.

With our framework set, we now turn to the linguistic literature to look at several aspects of our topic more in-depth.

§3. The Linguistic Context

How Languages Change

In *The Unfolding of Language* (2005), Guy Deutscher tackles the puzzle of how languages can seem to be constantly 'deteriorating' and yet develop at the same time, in a way accessible to the average reader with no background in linguistics. There are three main motivations for

linguistic change, he says: economy, expressiveness, and analogy. Economy is simply the tendency to save effort, and we have already seen one example of this in the reduction of *umekwisha*. Expressiveness "relates to speakers' attempts to achieve greater effects for their utterances and extend their range of meaning" (Deutscher, 2005: 62). Analogy refers to speakers' attempts to bring order to the system of language based on comparison of its parts.

The key to all of these is linguistic variation. For us in the present, it seems impossible for languages to change as drastically as they do, yet that change is happening all the time. After all, we seem to deal all right with the fact that 'wicked' when said by a teenager is a good thing, but a bad thing when uttered by an adult, or that 'gay' now has both derogatory and positive uses. Little wonder we don't even notice when this change happens over a period of time.

Deutscher also points out that the processes of creation and destruction in language are really one and the same, or perhaps parallel processes (pp. 110-4). Take *umekwisha kuona* again, for example. Economy allows that the beginning of words can be lost fairly easily, especially if the information in them is sometimes redundant or otherwise obvious (as is the case with Swahili prefixes at times). So what was once a full verb (*kwisha*) has now become a separate tense usually interpreted as the recent past, the *-sha-* tense. Likwise the verb *-sikiliza* 'to listen' is normally heard as only *-skiza*.

Analogy has its fair share of contributions to linguistic change as well. For example, what's the correct past tense of 'to hang' as in 'they are going to hang him tomorrow'? Is it 'hung' or 'hanged'? Prescriptivist grammarians will tell you that it's supposed to be 'hanged', which historically has been the correct form. But due to analogy to pairs like 'sang-sung', and the fact that hangings are less common these days (meaning the word isn't heard as frequently), 'hanged' is becoming 'hung'.

Or another example, this time from metaphor: the phrase *-kata shauri*, which literally means 'cut matter', has come to mean 'decide' instead. In English, the verb 'to will' once meant only 'to want', but has since developed into the marker for the future tense. Swahili has done almost exactly the same thing, through a process of metaphor and reduction, so that the verb *-taka* 'to want' has now become the future tense marker *-ta-*. (This is still evident in certain forms like *tu-taka-po-enda* 'when we go', where a fuller form of the future tense marker is required.)

Linguistic erosion, then, is simultaneously a process of creation, and later we will see how these processes are coming together to create an entirely new form of the most basic word in any language – 'be' – for Swahili.

Measuring Linguistic Change

Sociolinguistics provides us with a number of tools and suggestions for the analysis of language variation and change. From what is known as the ethnography of communication, we find a more anthropological approach to linguistics. The ethnography of communication is essentially comparative speaking (in the same sense as comparative politics), and is an "approach to the sociolinguistics of language in which the use of language in general is related to social and cultural values" (Fasold, 1990: 39). In Swahili communities, for example, it is customary to give an extensive series of greetings before bringing up the topic of conversation, and long pauses in conversation are both normal and expected. This is very different from speech in America, where greetings are sparse if offered at all, and any silence of more than a few seconds tends to make people uncomfortable.

What the ethnography of communication (EOC) entails for researchers is "a global understanding of the viewpoints and values of a community as a way of explaining the attitudes

and behaviors of its members...what is required is an intimate understanding of the community by the investigator" (Fasold, 1990: 47). Fortunately, I have been in a position this year to do just that. EOC depends primarily on participant observation techniques to discover what beliefs and values motivate the community's behavior. Direct questioning is not as reliable, because it often reflects the way participants think things ought to be, rather than how they are.

Creolistics - or the study of pidgin and creole languages and the process of pidginization - has also had more application for the study of linguistic variation and change than any other field (Fasold, 1990: 187). It is often extremely useful to look at varieties of a language as being on a continuum, with the standard, usually formal and high-prestige varieties on one end (the acrolect), and the completely nonstandard varieties at the other (the basilect). Between the two are a range of mesolects of different varieties. In Kenya, the acrolect would be the Standard Swahili (or *Kiswahili Sanifu*), with Sheng serving as the basilect. In between are mesolects like those in urban centers such as Mombasa, hovering somewhere in the middle.

One thing it is important to distinguish, however, is the difference between nonstandard codes and restricted codes. Restricted codes are used by everyone, and simply refer to language uses of a very simple variety, as is most everyday speech. Elaborated codes are more limited in their use, therefore some speakers may not be as competent in them. For example a high-school dropout is not likely to produce elaborated codes as well as his graduate-level counterpart is.

Restricted codes are different from nonstandard ones, however. The following example shows the difference nicely:

> (7) He be a hot mess who be thinkin' I wouldn't give no help to the person that be bein' robbed.
> (8) You're crazy if you think someone robbed another person and I didn't help them.

The first example is clearly nonstandard, with an idiomatic expression and nonstandard use of the verb 'be'. Yet it has a relative embedded construction, passive verb, and advanced conditional

tenses. Whereas the second example is completely standard, but syntactically resembles a restricted code.

The interesting thing about nonstandard features on a mesolect continuum is that they can often be implicationally scaled, meaning that the use of one feature implies and predicts the use of all the features that come before it. If a speaker lies very close to the acrolect, for example, he is likely to show only one or two nonstandard features - say feature A. If a second speaker lies halfway between the acrolect and basilect, he will exhibit both feature A and another nonstandard feature B; further, a third speaker at the basilect end of the scale would have features A, B and C. This is a powerful predictive tool showing a continuum of features from acrolect to basilect, in the order of their 'nonstandardness'. Later, we will be applying this technique to our data to see if certain morphological simplifications in speech are scalable in this way.

Syntactic Elaboration

Opposite the process of linguistic simplification is one of syntactic elaboration (motivated perhaps directly by expressiveness). The broader the syntactic options available in a language, the easier it is for a speaker to express nuance of expression. Joan Russell and Rehema Rajabu (1995) specifically examine one way in which Swahili has become syntactically elaborated, through the introduction of the *amba-* relative.

In the past, there were only two ways of creating a relative construction in Swahili, and like most verbal constructions, they involved suffixing on the verb. They are shown in (9) and (10) below.

(9) *kitabu kipendacho*

ki-	tabu	ki-	penda-	cho
CLASS	book	SUB	be liked	REL

'the book which is (usually) liked'

(10) *kitabu kilichopendwa*
ki- tabu ki- li- cho- pendwa
CLASS book SUB PAST REL be liked
'the book which was liked'

(11) *kitabu ambacho kilipendwa*
ki- tabu amba- cho ki- li- pendwa
CLASS book REL SUB PAST be liked
'the book which was liked'

The above three forms are listed in the order in which they appeared in Swahili historically. If you notice, each one is more syntactically elaborate than the last. The first is a general relative, and can only be used with the present indefinite/habitual tense. The second allows greater flexibility in the use of tenses (though it is still restricted to simple past, present, and future tenses), and allows for the subject of the embedded clause to be different than its higher clause, in such uses like *kitabu alichopenda* 'the book which he liked'. To top them all is the *amba-* construction in (11), which may be used with any tense, positive or negative, and has the ability to relativize any part of a phrase, whereas the second type can only relativize sujects and objects. Its benefits in terms of the syntactic flexibility of Swahili are great.

The *amba-* relative originally comes from an archaic verb *-amba* 'to say'. Today the only remnants of the word are the verb *-ambia* 'to tell', the complementizer *kwamba* meaning 'that', and the *amba-* relative. Originally, a relative construction with the archaic verb *-amba* would have looked like (12) below, mirroring the construction in (9):

(12) *kitabu chambacho kinapendwa*
ki- tabu ch- amba- cho ki- na- pendwa
CLASS book SUB say REL CLASS PRES be liked
'the book which says (that) it is liked'

From here it is easy to see how this developed into a purely relative construction.

It is both interesting and relevant to note that the construction in (11) creates a morphologically simpler form of the verb *-pendwa*, because it has one less prefix now that the

relative marker is attached to *amba-*, which itself is not very morphologically complex. (11) is what is known as a more analytic construction, which put very simply means its morphemes are divided up into separate words more.

This raises the question of whether syntactic changes in Swahili are showing a trend towars more analytical constructions, and thus more morphologically simple ones. Could it even be that the morphological simplification of Swahili will force a syntactic elaboration in turn? It certainly seems possible. After all, the language already shows evidence of dropping its verbal prefixes in many situations, and the information in those prefixes might later on need new ways of being communicated. This is something we will consider later in our analysis of the data.

Code-switching

Carol Scotton has been the leading researchers of code-switching in East Africa for a good thirty years, back when the concept of code-switching was still new (introduced by Joshua Fishman (1972)). Her article "Strategies of Neutrality: Language Choice in Uncertain Situations" (1976) covers some of the motivations behind code-switching in studies conducted in East Africa.

Scotton's final conclusion is that "strategies of neutrality occur in any uncertain situation in which reciprocal participant accommodation is favored and long-term relationships are at stake" (p. 940). By strategies of neutrality, she means the effort made by speakers to avoid speech varieties with heavy ethnic associations. One of these strategies is the use of an 'ethnically neutral' lingua franca, such as Swahili in East Africa. English likewise is ethnically neutral, although contains other attribute associations such as high socio-economic status, authority, and

formality. The second, even more neutral strategy is code-switching, so that the speaker doesn't have to commit entirely to the social values associated with *any* language.

Scotton also states "When speakers must choose a language under conditions of uncertainty, strategies of neutrality dominate" (p. 919). The interesting thing is that, in Kenya, almost all language situations are uncertain ones. The government's language policy is vague at best, with Swahili as the 'national' language (perhaps in the same sense as having a state bird or national symbol) and English used for all official functions and business. But the lines are never so clear-cut, and it is difficult if not impossible to determine what social 'norms' dictate in terms of language use. Even Kenyans don't know which language is most appropriate for a given situation. Like Scotton says, this creates uncertainty and leads to strategies of neutrality, here namely code-switching.

Scotton found that 100% of her Nairobi sample reported using both Swahili and English as lingua francas at work, and that Swahili was an "overwhelming choice", although among the higher educated English showed more prevalance. We too will look for correlations of education to our data later, in hopes that we can support Scotton's conclusion.

Scotton chooses to define code-switching as "a device to change the social distance...because some or all participants see reason to change roles" (p. 935). While acknowledging that some code-switching occurs as a function of topic-change, or to accommodate for lack of linguistic ability, she prefers to subsume both types "under one definition of code-switching as a device to change social distance among participants", arguing that since this is an unavoidable result of any code-switch, it must be the primary motivation. She also says that code-switching is primarily a *response* to some salient situation.

Following Blom & Gumperz (1972), I believe code-switching should be divided into two types: linguistic and social.[3] My previous research has focused mostly on the linguistic reasons for code-switching, namely as a function of topic change and its relation to discourse-marking (Hieber, 2006). Later, we will also look at how code-switching might be related to morphological simplification.

§4. METHODOLOGY

Three sets of information were needed for this project: data about language attitudes, frequency of code-switching, and frequency of morphological simplification. For data about language attitudes, I administered a 50-item oral survey to 11 different participants, asking questions regarding their beliefs and attitudes towards language. Participants were given the chance to explain and discuss their responses in each case. This allowed for a quantitative analysis of participants' responses, as well as qualitative analysis based on the open discussion. All surveys were conducted in Swahili.

For data on code-switching and morphology, I then recorded each participant conversing in a natural setting with their peers. As often as possible, I would have new participants converse with old ones, increasing my data for each. All combined, I collected over an hour and a half of recordings. The recordings were then transcribed following standard conventions for conversation analysis (see Levinson, 1983, Ch. 6). In addition to transcribing data myself, I employed a research assistant and worked with him to create his version of the same

[3] Blom & Gumperz actually define their two terms as 'situational switching' and 'metaphorical switching', the first being social, and the second linguistic. Their definitions differ slightly from my own, namely in that mine allow for a broader spectrum of uses.

transcriptions. The two transcriptions were then compiled into a final set, giving preference to my assistant's data when available.

The transcriptions were then marked for each instance of code-switching and morphological simplification. The code-switches were each given a tentative explanation or cause, and the instances of simplification were grouped into different types and patterns. Thus quantitative data was collected on both the number of code-switches and instances/types of morphological simplification per minute of conversation for each participant. Finally, this data was correlated to the data from the language attitude surveys.

My participants were all residents of Mombasa for extended periods of time, aged 21-34 (with one outlier at 53), and had high exposure to English. The dialect studied was the Mombasa variety of Swahili known as Kimvita, which in various times and places has been considered 'Standard' Swahili. The majority of subjects were tourist workers (i.e. tour guides, shop owners, or even beach boys), while others had regular interactions with native speakers of English (usually the students at SIT).

The first participant (P1) became my research assistant after I had already finished collecting data, and thus was of invaluable help in transcribing the conversations, as he was present for most of them (a number of other participants completed their speech recordings by talking to P1). At the same time, his transcriptions had to be carefully scrutinized, as sometimes his memory or perception of the conversation did not match the actual recording. But by comparison with my own transcriptions and the recordings, extremely accurate transcriptions were eventually produced. All in all, I had reliable data for all participants, with a comprehensive in-depth analysis of one in particular (P1).

Limitations

This project went generally as planned with few hitches. As always, it would have been nice to have collected more data, but producing twenty-eight pages of transcriptions was more than enough to occupy my time. As already stated, a number of my conversations were recorded in conjunction with another participant, and sometimes even surveys were conducted two at a time. This I would have changed, as I feel the answers of one participant may have affected the answers of another. It might also have been a good idea to elicit storys from the participants, instead of conversations, as this would have created a more controlled setting. I also think my data would have benefited if the amount of recording time for each participant had been the same, although this was compensated for by creating ratios to time for each participant.

Finally, I would have liked to do a test-run on my survey with several participants before conducting the survey interviews. In the end I was somewhat dissatisfied with the ability of my survey to produce good predicative quantitative data on language attitudes, although the qualitative data was excellent.

§5. DATA ANALYSIS

Language Attitudes

Our first research goal was to examine the language attitudes of the participants. This was done through the use of a 50-question survey which asked such questions as 'Do you think the Swahili of the past is better than Swahili today?' or 'Do you think people should be allowed to mix languages?'. (For the complete survey in both English and Swahili, see Appendix I.) Before analyzing the numerical data, let us first qualitatively examine the trends found in speakers' attitudes.

Kenyans are very practical when it comes to language, and have to be, as their government's language policy leaves plenty of room for confusion. It has created a situation where Kenyans would have a great deal of difficulty communicating with each other, if not for its two lingua francas. One lingua franca is not enough. Swahili, for example, is spoken by everyone on the Coast, and known elsewhere in the country as a second language. But the Swahili of the villages is merely functional, and the Swahili of Nairobi is so nonstandard as to be incomprehensible to some people on the Coast. That latter gap is filled by English, because almost all Nairobi residents know the language well, as do many people in urban centers on the Coast (though this does not necessarily hold for older generations of the Coast, who know only Swahili). The English in the villages, however, is sorely lacking, despite a standardized nationwide education instituted primarily in English. So both English and Swahili are required as lingua francas to pull together this linguistically fractured nation of over 42 separate languages.

So the important factor for Kenyans is comprehensibility of various speech varieties. Kenyans as a whole generally disapprove of Sheng, the linguistically mixed dialect from Nairobi, because it is a private code not meant to be understood by any but the youth that know it.

Poor education and language policy has meant that Kenyans don't have a particularly advanced grasp of Swahili, especially in the urban centers. Specifically, they lack a great deal of he vocabulary. Ask any Mombasa resident what the word for 'bridge' is in Swahili and over half the time they will be unable to tell you. I attribute this to English's position as the language of instruction in schools. Often students will learn an English word before they learn the Swahili equivalent, if they learn it at all.

How do Kenyans compensate for this? They code-switch, using English when they lack the word or phrase in Swahili. Even when they do know the Swahili, English is frequently used to provide a gloss or clarification of uncertain words, or words that are particularly salient and thus important enough to require extra explication (usually the current discourse topic). So code-switching is a tool that uses English to abet one's ability in Swahili.

Kenyans realize this, and while they perhaps disapprove of the necessity of it (most participants agreed that 'mixing' was a bad thing), they all code-switch regularly, and acknowledge that they do so. During all my surveys, I got a sense of resignation to the fact that code-switching has become necessary. Code-switching, and in fact even a mixed Swahili-English code, is Kenya's response to the ambiguous language policy and its poor implementation.

In the case of P9, who had generally prescriptive attitudes, he was recorded during his speech sample talking about the word 'handbag' with P1. P9 had used the word casually in his speech, and P1 tauntingly pointed it out to him. P9 then became frustrated at his inability to find the right Swahili word: 'There has to be a way to say it in Swahili, but I don't know it.'

So Kenyans (and now specifically we turn to our participants) usually have strong opinions on nonstandard uses of Swahili, but take a pragmatic approach and accept them as necessary. Thus I received several very ironic answers from my participants. When P1 was questioned on his stance on 'mixing languages', he replied that it's bad because "uta-confuse watu" ('you will confuse people').[4] Or later, when P(articipant)6 was explaining why it would be best to get rid of all Arabic and English words in Swahili, "kwa sababu they mix" ('because they [people] mix [the

[4] All participant comments in this section are translated from Swahili, unless placed in double quotes.

languages]'), and clearly considered this to be undesirable. In both cases, the participant voiced his or her opinion against code-switching by using an instance of code-switching itself.

There is also evidence from the surveys to support the idea that what Kenyans consider acceptable is what can be understood (again, their practical response to linguistic uncertainty). Participants explained that Swahili in the past was better than Swahili today because it has many words that are 'hard to understand'. One participant even said that the reason past Swahili was better was because there wasn't any Sheng then.

Likewise, my earlier research showed that S.S. or *Kiswahili Sanifu* was consistently viewed as being 'hard' and not easy to understand (Hieber, 2006). On the other end of the spectrum is Sheng. Nearly across the board, participants agreed that Sheng is 'bad language' (except for one who said 'it's not bad, it's just that people can't understand it'). Why? Because participants say nobody can understand it (except, obviously, the youth who speak it). Parents are disconcerted by the idea that their kids can speak in ways they can't understand. Speakers of Sheng in turn do this on purpose, as Sheng forms a marker of solidarity (as does any language; but Sheng is an especially acute case - see Abelson (2005) for a discussion on Sheng as a tool for youth empowerment). This is reflected by participants' consistent disapproval of Sheng, and the un-prompted comment received by almost all subjects that 'the youth are ruining Swahili'. P6 added the comment that 'in every generation it gets worse'. And there was also the interesting case where P1 in his interview specifically stated 'the youth are destroying the language', but during his speech recording twenty minutes later, when the topic again came up naturally, he emphatically replied to the same comment with, 'No, it's not that they're destroying it. They're just out with their friends.' This participant, though, had some of the most descriptive language attitudes out of my sample.

Whatever the case, Kenyans avoid these extremes of language - standard or nonstandard - and go for the middle ground, utilizing code-switching to be understood by all. Their number one criteron for determining 'acceptable' speech is understandability. This is exemplified succinctly by P10's responses to several questions, all of which had an 'understanding constraint'. Consider the statements below:

(12) 'You can speak Swahili however you want, as long as people understand.'
(13) 'People shouldn't mix languages because they won't be understood.'
(14) 'Sheng is bad language because people can't understand it.'
(15) 'You don't need to speak Sanifu if people can understand you.'

Note that we have already shown how (13) is not true, and that code-switching actually abets ease of comprehension in Kenya. But the point here is that (13), and others like him, talk about understandability as their primary concern.

There were, however, a few participants who refused to qualify language as bad, but rather stated that 'people just talk differently', although this would conflict with some of their other responses. P1 described it as 'laziness', which likely refers to the natural process of morphological simplification.

Other prescriptivist views were common. A majority of participants said it would be better if languages didn't change, and many agreed to the statement that some languages have no grammar (P3 even going so far as to point out Sheng as an example).

* * *

Now we turn to a more quantitative analysis of the survey data. Of the 50 questions, 40 were opinion-based questions concerning the speaker's beliefs about language, and 10 were self-reported data on the speaker's speech patterns (e.g. 'Do you mix languages frequently?'). As

always, self-reports of language use are questionable, and this was taken into consideration during the analysis. Plus, with the transcriptions available, I was able to compare the self-reports with actual patterns of language use. Unfortunately, there were no clear correlations between reported use and actual use, other than to say that participants generally overestimated their use of Standard Swahili, although this was to be expected.

The 50 questions were used to examine participants on two different scales: prescriptivism v. descriptivism, and likelihood of linguistic advancement v. regression (as explained earlier, the two sets do not necessarily go hand in hand). Participants' responses for each question were marked first as either prescriptivist (P) or descriptivist (D), as well as advancing (A) or regressing (R). The 10 self-reports, however, were only marked as A or R, as these were not beliefs that could be judged on a prescriptivist-descriptivist scale. The responses could then be tallied for the number of each P, D, A and R.

First, each participant was given a P-D rating from 0-4, with 0 being the most descriptive, and 4 the most prescriptive. Total number of P or D responses out of 40 was also considered. All participants were ranked as either a 2 or 3 on the P-D rating.

At first, no correlation was seen between the P-D rating and the total A-responses. Because of the discrepancies involved with the self-reports on advancement which we already discussed, total A was divided into two categories: number of A-responses based on opinion questions (out of 40), and number of self-reported A responses (out of 10). Then the correlations became clear.

First, self-reported A-responses varied regardless of P-D rating, and were found to have no correlation to any other survey data. As such, self-reported A-responses are not considered from this point forward.

However, it was found that those with a P-D rating of 2 (more descriptive) also averaged 20 out of 40 on opinion-based A-responses, while those with a P-D rating of 3 averaged only 11 out of 40 A-responses. This means that those participants with more descriptive opinions are approximately twice as likely to be agents of linguistic change in the language than those with prescriptive ones. While obvious, it was important to establish this correlation early on.

Based on this data, we see two possible predictors of language use: self-reported A-responses, which have already been shown to be unreliable, and indeed later it will turn out they have only weak correlations to actual patterns of language use; and either opinion-based A-responses and/or the participants' P-D rating. Which of the two we choose shouldn't matter, as there is a direct correlation between them.

Other potential predictors based on demographic data are age, sex, whether or not Swahili was the subject's first language, the time the participant has lived in Mombasa, and education level. These five demographic predictors, plus the two attitude-based predictors above, will be compared to patterns of language use later to look for correlations.

Next I chose a number of the survey questions which I thought were most representative of a subject's linguistic attitudes (aiming for approximately 10), and attempted to scale the responses using the same type of implicational scale discussed earlier. The resulting chart is given in Fig. 1, and the selected questions are listed in Table 1. The asteriks in the chart represent the cells which deviate from perfect scalability. While this scale does not meet the accepted standard for scalability (generally 85%, whereas this scale is only 79.54%), it does show a relatively smooth curve predicting speakers' language attitudes. What this tells us is that a speaker is more likely to give an A-response for Question 2 than for Question 33, and a person who gives an A-response to Question 35 will imply that he also gives an A-response to all the questions that come before

it. It shows, in a sense, the progression of linguistic attitudes from descriptive to prescriptive (the P-D value and A-R value for each of these questions happen to be the same, so this chart could alternatively list P and D instead of A and R).

Participants I, H, G, and D coincidentally had the same set of responses for these questions, and ordinarily would be treated as only one set of data, perhaps increasing scalability. Those cells with a • would no longer be considered deviant. Unfortunately, this does not greatly increase the overall scalability.

Despite its limitations, the implicational scale in Fig. 1 is useful for what it tells us, for example that if a person shows descriptivist attitudes towards Sheng or the rules of language, he is likely to show descriptive attitudes towards all facets of language. Correspondingly, descriptivist attitudes about Sheng are the least likely to occur.

One final anectedote about language attitudes before moving on to language use. During a survey interview with P5 and P6, P5 responded to the question 'Do you often make up words in Swahili?' by saying yes, to which P6 immediately turned to him and said 'Now you're even ruining Swahili!'. Let us then see if this is actually the case, and examine the speech data for ourselves.

Morphological Complexity

As noted earlier, morphological complexity comes in many forms. Usually our earlier rule about the number of morphemes used is sufficient to pick out cases of morphological simplification. (16) and (17) are instances of a common, morphologically simplified construction seen regularly in the conversations:

(16) ***kama unaenda***

kama	u-	na-	enda
if	you	PRES	go

'if you go'

(17) *kama we' ni Muslim*
kama we’ ni Muslim
if you COP Muslim
'if you are a Muslim'

Both are grammatically correct, but the same constructions may also be formed as in (18)-(20). (Notice too the presence of the code-switched word 'Muslim', rather than the Swahili Mwislamu.)

(18) *ukienda*
u- ki- enda
you COND go
'if you go'

(19) *ukiwa Mwislamu*
u- ki- wa Mwislamu
you COND be Muslim
'if you are a Muslim'

(20) *kama ukienda*
kama u- ki- enda
if you COND go
'if you go'

These three examples each use the conditional tense, prefixing the tense affix *-ki-* onto the verb, a more complex construction than simply externalizing the conditional by use of the word *kama* 'if'. Even more complex is the use of both *-ki-* and *kama*, although this changes the meaning somewhat by providing extra emphasis on the conditional.

Thus by counting the number of morphemes utilized for each word, it is clear that (16) and (17) are morphologically simpler. These instances by themselves say little about a speaker's language use, because both alternatives are correct usage. Continuous preference of the simpler form, however, would indicate a tendency towards morphological simplification in that construction. And in fact, (16) and (17) above both come from the same participant, who used only one *-ki-* construction in over 20 minutes of conversation. Additionally, the use of *kama*

instead of *-ki-* with the verb 'be' as in (17) is an especially simplified, and rather uncommon, construction.

The number-of-morphemes-used rule thus provides us with a number of types of simplification. We can also take this rule in a much broader sense, to mean the number of different morphemes utilized, for example using both *-ki-* and *kama* in (20), rather than just one or the other. Take another *-ki-* construction, as in (21), from the same participant as before:

(21) *kama unaenda Somalia unapoteza maisha*

kama	u-	na-	enda	Somalia	u-	na-	poteza	maisha
if	you	PRES	go	Somalia	you	PRES	lose	life

'if you go to Somalia, you will lose your life'

As in English, a conditional verb such as *kama unaenda* here is typically followed by a future tense or imperative verb. The secondary verb in (21) is present tense. While Swahili grammar books will tell you to use the future or imperative here, Swahili does have a documented trend of using the present tense when the context already makes the tense clear. Swahili grammarians will say, for instance, that the present tense should only be used when the action is currently happening, so that the Swahili equivalent of 'I'm going tomorrow' would not use the present, as in English, but the future tense marker *-ta-*. In Modern Swahili Grammar, M.A. Mohammed (2001) shows that this is not true as long as the verb co-occurs with adverbial markers, making the Swahili equivalent of 'I'm going tomorrow' an acceptable construction.

In (21), there is no adverbial marker, although the tense is clear from context. So while the preference of the present tense marker *-na-* over other tenses is a common and acceptable trend in Swahili, it is still an instance of morphological simplification, especially when a speaker shows systematic preference for present tense constructions, as this participant does. He is therefore utilizing fewer morphemes than he would otherwise (in this case, by a tendency not to utilize the *-ta-* morpheme). If we imagine that a speaker has only a limited number of

morphemes at his disposal, and then say that he shows a tendency to prefer one of them over several others, the total number of different morphemes he utilizes has been lessened, and his morphological performance has been simplified.

Between these two conceptions of morphological simplification we can account for every type of simplification noted in the transcriptions, and likely any other form of simplification as well. I was able to group all instances of simplification into twelve features, given in Table 2. Only a tiny few of the marked instances of simplification did not fall under one of these categories, although still adhered to our definitions of morphological simplification.

Each speaker's conversations were analyzed for the total number of instances of simplification, as well as the number of occurrences of each feature. That data is given in Appendix II. The features were found to be entirely unscalable, so it seems we are unable to predict the order in which these nonstandard features entered the language (though perhaps with more data across social classes, this would become clear).

The total number of instances of simplification was divided by the number of minutes of speech for each participant to get a simplification ratio (instances of simplification per minute). Some speakers showed drastically more cases of simplification than others: a ratio of 3.662 for some and a mere 0.985 for others, with the average ratio being 2.218 instances per minute. The ratio for each participant can now be compared to their survey data for correlations (see Appendix III for a complete chart of all participants' various data).

The most common simplification trend was improper noun agreement, and indeed there are few speakers in Kenya who do not struggle with this at times. Swahili has a complex system of twelve noun classes (though this number varies depending on how you group the nouns), each with its own set of prefixes and agreements. Even within a single noun class, the agreement

prefixes for verbs and adjectives, for example, are different. Improper noun agreement (or noun discord) is a case of morphological simplification because it leans towards a reduction in the number of noun classes (it is worth noting here that Swahili already has fewer noun classes than many of its cousins in the Bantu family of languages). Traditionally, nouns were grouped into classes based on certain semantic categories, such as 'animate' or 'plant'. Today it is clear that speakers have begun to shy away from this semantic class categorization and have adopted instead a natural class organization scheme (much like English's natural gender). Thus the N-class is now generally used to non-animates, and the M-/WA-class to refer to animates, with a few others falling into the KI-/VI-class, being mostly objects and things. Noun discord consistently involves use of prefixes from one of these classes as they begin to swallow up more and more words from other classes. Additionally, loanwords are typically assigned to N-class, and almost all of Swahili's new nouns come from English. The N-class has seen a huge surge in its membership because of this, and speakers regularly fall back on N-class agreement prefixes for any word of which they are unsure.

The second most common trend was dropping prefixes from the beginning of a noun (feature C), and a preference for present tense (discussed above) was also common.

As to the question raised earlier about the potential syntactic elaboration of Swahili via morphological simplification, we turn to the data in Appendix II. The only two features which might be said to allow for greater syntactic flexibility are features E and H. For the same reasons as the *amba-* relative, feature E (externalizing a potential suffix, e.g. the use of *kama* for *-ki-* as discussed earlier) broadens the syntactic options of a speaker. Feature H (the use of *si* to negate verbs rather than the usual negative prefixes) is simply a special case of feature E. While feature E had a relatively high number of occurrences (39, with the highest being feature B at 48), H had

the fewest at four. Together they account for approximately one-fifth of the instances of simplification.

Another question raised earlier was whether morphological simplification might be related to code-switching. The analysis of code-switching by itself was relatively easy. Each conversation was marked for instances of its occurrence, and a total tally was given to each participant. Code-switches which were for the sake of my understanding were excluded from this total. Then a code-switch ratio of number of occurrences per minute was found for each participant.

There were no direct correlations between morphological simplification (the simplification ratio) and code-switching (the code-switch ratio). However, it was observed that all participants used code-switching a great deal more often than they used morphologically simplified forms (two exceptions to this were P5 and P6, who exhibited only one instance of code-switching each, due I believe to the everyday nature of the topic discussed (the weather); however, they also had the lowest simplification counts of the sample, so the correlation still seems to hold). In general, code-switching was fairly frequent for all users, with an average code-switch ratio of 2.885 per minute (with P5 and P6's data included; the ratio is 3.450 without their data).

We have also already noted how the massive influx of English words may be contributing to the simplification of the noun class system. Additionally, instances of code-switched verbs very frequently look like (22) below. Two alternative forms of the same construction in S.S. are given in (23) and (24), with the verb *-sema* 'to say' in place of 'record':

(22) *how unarecordi vipi?*
how u- na- recordi vipi
you PRES record how
'how do you record?'

(23) *unasemaje?*
u- na- sema- je
you PRES say how
'how do you say?'

(24) *unasema vipi?*
u- na- sema vipi
you PRES say how
'how do you say?'

The *-je* of (23) is a question particle easily attached to the end of Swahili verbs and accompanied by rising intonation. (24) is a less complex equivalent, using instead the interrogative *vipi* 'how?'. Yet this speaker, instead of using the *-je* particle, used both the Swahili and English equivalents to express the same meaning, creating a morphologically simple construction. So it may be that code-switching triggers or at least correlates to morphological simplification, perhaps due to the expense of processing and adapting foreign words while at the same time attempting to apply grammar rules from the L1.

At the same time, one often hears constructions like (25):

(25) *wanicompare mimi na Bob?*
wa- ni- compare mimi na Bob
you-PRES DO compare me and Bob
'you're comparing me and Bob?'

This speaker has no problem utilizing normal morphology (infixing of the object marker -ni-; use of an inflectional agglutinative form indicating both tense and person) in the presence of code-switching, even though the word 'compare' was pronounced with full English phonology and the usual enunciation placed on a code-switch for Swahili speakers. Most likely, it is simply a matter of 'getting used to' the English words before they can fully utilize Swahili morphology, such as the participant who started his speech turn talking about a 'hijacking' and by the end of his turn was using the form *ilihajikiwa* presented earlier.

Drawing Correlations

At last we have everything we need to draw the correlations necessary to complete the objective of this paper. It will be remembered that at the outset we looked to find the correlations between language attitudes and (a) morphological simplification, and (b) code-switching. Our quantitative predictors for language attitude were self-reported A-responses (though these were found to be unreliable) and opinion-based A-responses (or a speaker's P-D rating, alternatively). Other demographic predictors were age, sex, Swahili competency, time in Mombasa, and education. Let us see how these correlate to the code-switch and simplification ratios for our participants.

The quantitative correlations were, unfortunately, few in number. First, there was a good correlation between the code-switch ratio of each participant and their time spent living in Mombasa. The longer a participant had stayed in Mombasa, the higher their code-switch ratio was likely to be. There is one interesting case where I expected the participant, a 53 year-old man, to produce relatively standard Swahili, as the elderly are known for their proper Swahili. Instead, he code-switched more than any other participant, averaging 5.847 switches a minute. This value seemed outside the range for other participants, and I got the sense that the subject was switching for my benefit during the conversation, though these instances were never overt enough to be excluded from the tally. So I returned to the transcription and tossed out all suspectible instances of code-switching. Even then, his code-switch ratio averaged over three instances per minute, which is considered on the high end of the range of my data. The other participants exhibited a similar trend.

Why should code-switching correlate to time in Mombasa? Most likely, it is simply because Mombasa is an urban center, with a high prevalence of English in use with business and media. Additionally, the participants all had regular interaction with English speakers in Mombasa

(being in the tourist industry), while they likely didn't have that same level of interaction before arriving in Mombasa.

We have already stated that the code-switch ratio is consistently higher than the simplification ratio, indicating that code-switching is a much more prominent process of change in Swahili. Lastly, it was seen that the number of opinion-based A-responses correlated to the number of A-responses from the representative sample of twelve which we implicationally scaled earlier. This tells us that the representative sample was indeed a good predictor for participants' attitudes overall.

Despite the reliability of that prediction, no other significant correlations were found using quantitative data. The qualitative data was however a little more helpful.

When participants were judged simply (and subjectively) based on the accompanying discussion to their survey data, some strong correlations to their language use were found. Unfortunately, not all participants gave me a good sense of their level of prescriptivism or descriptivism, as information offered beyond answers to the survey questions was sometimes sparse.

There were several excellent examples of correlations, however. P11 had some very liberal explanations, which correlated nicely to his rather high simplification and code-switch ratios (3.273 and 4.966, respectively). Conversely, P6 had the most prescriptive set of beliefs out of any participant, and this was specifically emphasized in my field notes from her interview. P6 had the lowest number of code-switches (totaling 9) and a code-switch ratio of 2.022 (low, but not the lowest). But most exceptionally, she code-switched only once during her recording sample, giving her a code-switch ratio of only 0.225 - the lowest by far.

P8 was described in my notes as "surprisingly descriptive for his age and demographic," as he was the 53 year-old participant of the sample. His inordinate amount of code-switching and high 3.273 simplification ratio reflected this. P1 too had several insightful descriptive opinions that marked his interview as unique, and correlate to a moderately high code-switch ratio of 2.044.

It must be remembered that these correlations are entirely subjective, but it is my belief that they are strong correlations. These correlations do not hold for every participant. Consider P3, who showed the highest levels of morphological simplicity and extremely high levels of code-switching, but had more prescriptivist views towards language. I explain his data by noting he is the only participant to have no education aside from one or two years of primary school. It would be easy to see how this would cause both morphological simplicity (having lacked the opportunity to study S.S. in school), and high levels of prescriptivism (stemming from lack of education about language-related issues; after all, most prejudices can be attributed to lack of knowledge).

To conclude this section then, it seems there's a correlation between a qualitative analysis of the survey data, and participants' language use, but these correlations do not hold with the quantitative data. The most probably cause for this discrepancy is a poorly-constructed survey. While the twelve-question representative sample was shown to be a good predictor of participants' responses, it was not patterns of language use they were predicting. That did not, however, prevent us from gaining valuable insights into the beliefs and attitudes of the participants, and discovering a potential implicational hierarchy for those beliefs.

§6. ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS:

-ko Constructions

We would now like to share a few additional findings, by applying all we have learned regarding linguistic variation and change in Swahili to a case-study of a single phenomenon - locative *-ko* constructions in Mombasa Swahili.

-ko constructions are of particular interest to me and of particular relevance to this project because they were the first systematic use of a nonstandard form which I noticed in the language. It was the driving motivation for all further studies of linguistic change in Swahili, eventually developing into the paper you are reading now. They are, as I will try to show, having a major influence on the direction of linguistic change in Swahili.

In Standard Swahili, *-ko* is a locative particle comprised of two parts: a particle *-ku-* indicating an indefinite location, and what is known as the -o of reference. Thus *-ko* is di-morphemic (/*-ku-* + *-o*/). It is used in two different ways. It can be attached to the particle *hu-* to indicate location, as in the words *huko* 'there' and *huku* 'here' (with significant variation in both use and meaning), or used in conjunction with the subject prefixes to serve as a locative copula or form of 'be'. Examples of the latter are *yuko* 'he's there', or *alikuwako* 'he was there'.

Alongside *-ku-* are two other locative particles, *-pa-* and *-mu-*, referring to definite and internal locations, respectively. So in Standard Swahili there is a three-way system of location, providing a variety of locative, referential, temporal, and proximal/distal demonstratives.

As we have seen though, Standard Swahili and the way people talk are two entirely different things. In most dialects of Kenyan Swahili, the *-mu-* and *-pa-* particles have dropped out of use, particularly in the locative copula. This is due mostly to the process of economy, as speakers are still able to adequately talk about location by using only the *-ko* form of the locative. Such uses

as *alikuwako* are no longer in use, replaced instead by the simple regular form of 'be' conjugated in the appropriate tense. This means that *-ko* constructions now only exist in present tense forms. The demonstrative uses have also been simplified and their meanings have fossilized somewhat, so for example *hapa* now means 'here', whether or not the reference is definite as it is supposed to be.[5]

What these two trends have done is to make locative agreement unnecessary in the language. *-ko* is now for many people the sole form used to talk about being in a location, and the demonstrative locatives have gained fixed meanings independent of their agreement. So while (26) represents the Swahili of say 50 years ago, (27) is a sample from P2 in modern day:

(26) *ipo hapo*
i- po ha- po
it DEF DIST DEF
'it is there (def.)'

(27) *iko hapo?*
i- ko hapo
it- LOC there
'is it there?'

Note the concord of *-po* in (26), and its discord in (27), because *hapo* no longer requires locative agreement. Example (27) also shows how *hapo* has become fossilized in its meaning of 'there' - questions about location by nature are indefinite, and in S.S. would require the use of the indefinite *-ko*. Instead *hapo* has come to mean 'there', regardless of definiteness.

This particular analysis represents the ideolect of only a single speaker, P2. The variation on these forms is immense - likely more so than any other construction in the language. But one can safely say that a few things are constant. (1) *-ko* has become the dominant mode of speaking about location, in both verbal and demonstrative constructions. (2) The locative demonstratives

[5] Not all uses of the word 'here' must be definite. 'Here' is indefinite when used to refer to such general locations as the country the speaker is currently in.

have become simplified in their use and meaning, although uses vary from speaker to speaker. (3) Locatives no longer require agreement to other locatives - only to deictic information about the context.

Already we have seen several processes of linguistic change. First was economy, by reducing the types of locatives used; the second was morphological simplification, by reducing the system of locative demonstratives. These in turn have perhaps elaborated the syntactic abilities of Swahili. The locative demonstratives now have a much greater freedom of use, and can be used in more positions of time and reference than before.

This was just the first step. Next came a process of semantic expansion by metaphor, or change stemming from the motivation of expressiveness. With *-ko* now functioning as the primary means of expressing location, it wasn't long before speakers began thinking about location in time as well. New constructions came into play alongside the original locative ones. Consider the uses in (28)-(30):

(28) yuko hapo	'he's over there'
(29) iko hapo	'it's there/it exists'
(30) uko tayari?	'are you ready?'

Example (28) is purely locative. Example (29) could be locative, or is it existential? It is a frequent response the the question 'Is there any x?', the response being *iko* 'it's there' (it exists). Then it is only a short step from physical location to location in time, so we get uses like (30) which serve as a temporary form of the verb 'be'.

If that were the end of the story, the situation would be relatively simple: Swahili would be developing a second form of the verb 'be', to be used for any temporary descriptions, while the existing verb *kuwa* would become restricted to permanent descriptions (much like the contrast in Spanish between *estar* and *ser*). But more nonstandard forms involving *-ko* keep appearing. If we

look at the uses in (31) we see that the uses of *-ko* have clearly gone beyond mere temporary descriptions. Again, all examples are taken from transcriptions.

(31)

(a) ninyi Waswahili mko hivyo	'you Swahilis are this way'
(b) ilikuwa iko hivyo	'it was this way (for a period of time)
(c) kila mta yuko na religion yake	'each person has his (own) religion'
(d) unaenda kuko na gari yako	'you're going to be with/to have your car'
(e) sasa yuko na kufanya kazi	'now he has work'
(f) wako watajiri	'they're rich'
(g) yuko na siku nyingine-wana siku nyingine	'the other day he was-the other day he was'
(h) nilikuwa na...niko	'I was...I was having'
(i) nilikuwa niko mbele huko Malindi	'I was (being) far away there in Malindi'

What is going on here? There's every construction from simple permanent description (f), (c), habituals and continuous uses in the present and other tenses (i), (a), (b), forms of 'to have' (e), self-corrections changing both to and from *-ko* (g), (h), even an infinitive verb (d).

The first change was probably the adoption of the use meaning 'to have'. *-ko* must be 'conjugated' and occur with the preposition *na* 'and/with' in order to use this form, and it looks like (3e). It came about again through metaphor or expressiveness. One can be in 'the state of being with something', utilizing the temporary meaning of *-ko*, and it comes to mean 'to have'.

It is also a process of analogy, because this exactly mirrors the ordinary Swahili verb 'have', which consists of a form of the verb *kuwa* 'to be' and the word *na* 'and'/with. In fact, it seems these new uses of *-ko* are entirely motivated by analogy to the verb *kuwa*. Look what happens when we replace each instance of *-ko* in the above examples with the correct form of the verb *kuwa*.

(32)
(a) ninyi Waswahili ni hivyo
(b) ilikuwa ni hivyo
(c) kila mta a-na religion yake
(d) unaenda kuwa na gari yako
(e) sasa a-na kufanya kazi
(f) ni watajiri
(g) a-na siku nyingine-wana siku nyingine
(h) nilikuwa na

(i) nilikuwa ni mbele huko Malindi

Every one of the examples in (32) is the exact S.S. equivalent of the examples in (31). The only difference: where S.S. uses a form of 'be' in the present tense in every instance, the uses in (32) all use *-ko* in its place.

This is the trend that has developed in Kimvita Swahili - the present tense form of the verb 'be' is now *-ko*, whereas in the past it was either the copula *ni* or an archaic form (*ni-*, *u-*, *a-*, etc.) when accompanied by the preposition *na*.

Notice what this allows Swahili to do. With *ni* as the present tense form of *kuwa*, the subject always required clarification, because *ni* is a copula that doesn't change based on person or number. But with *-ko,* the subject is explicit in the verb (e.g. *niko, uko, yuko,* etc.). It is a direct result of the motivations of analogy (to other forms of *kuwa*) and expressiveness.

I think it is fair to predict that *-ko* constructions will take over and eventually become the present tense form of 'be' in Kimvita Swahili, erasing the last traces of the archaic form of the verb, and eliminating a potentially confusing ambiguous copula from the language. What started as a process of simplification has now added another level of complexity to Swahili, and arguably has increased the morphological complexity of the most common word in the language - 'be'. In pulling together all the various processes examined throughout this paper, we have shown how metaphorical simplification is both a process of destruction and creation, through a case-study of contemporary examples from Swahili.

§7. CONCLUSION

In opening this paper, we set out an overarching objective of correlation language attitudes to both morphological complexity and code-switching. This has been accomplished, though with tentative results in terms of correlations and conclusions. More broadly, we have examined the

processes of linguistic change at work in Swahili today. In §3, we explained the several facets of linguistic change, and laid out the framework for studying that process in §4. In §5, we methodically examined language attitudes, morphological complexity, and code-switching independently before drawing correlations between them. It was found that while quantitative data about language attitudes showed little correlation to patterns of language use, quantitative data did, if subjectively. Finally, §6 drew upon the processes examined in §3 and other observations from §5 to examine comprehensively one example of linguistic change in Kimvita Swahili today.

§8. Recommendations for Further Study

This project could now be taken in a number of directions. Most obviously, one might create an alternative language attitude survey, or utilize an already accepted standard survey on language attitudes. The study could then be repeated to see if quantitative correlations exist. An entire project could also be done on transcription data alone, examining perhaps the evolution of *–ko* constructions in-depth, looking for further patterns and overall theories of morphological simplification, or an analysis of speakers' reasons and uses of code-switching. There is still much more work to be done in all these areas.

~ APPENDIX I ~

Language Attitude Survey – English

1 Are people who know two languages smarter than those who only know one?
2 Should everybody learn a second language?
3 Are the mother tongues inferior languages?
4 Is English a better language than Swahili?
5 Do you feel inferior when a Kenyan speaks better Swahili than you?
6 Is Swahili's grammar more advanced than the mother tongues'?
7 Do most people in Kenya speak broken or dirty Swahili?
8 Is Swahili as good at saying things as English is?
9 Does Swahili not have certain words or ways of talking about many things?
10 Should all new Swahili words come from Bantu?
11 Do you think Swahili should get rid of all the Arabic and English words?
12 Do you feel inferior when an mzungu speaks better Swahili than you?
13 Is the Swahili of the past better than Swahili today?
14 Are people who speak old-fashioned Swahili uncool?.
15 Do some languages have no grammar?
16 Is it true that languages are always finding new and creative ways of saying things?
17 Is it true that there's only one correct way to speak a language?
18 It is true that language is always deteriorating?
19 Is it true that language is always improving?
20 Should people be allowed to mix languages?
21 Is it true that people on the Coast speak good Swahili?
22 Is it true that people in Tanzania speak good Swahili?
23 Is it true that people in Nairobi speak good Swahili?
24 Is it true that people in the villages speak good Swahili?
25 Is it true that the wazee speak good Swahili?
26 Is it too hard to learn Sanifu?
27 Do people need to learn Sanifu?
28 Is Sheng bad language?
29 Is it okay when people use words from their mother tongues when speaking Swahili?
30 Is it okay to use English words when you can't think of or don't know the Swahili?
31 Are people who use English when speaking Swahili smarter than those who don't?
32 Are people who know Sanifu smarter than those that don't?
33 Do languages change over time?
34 Should a language change over time?
35 Should languages have rules and standards that everybody follows?
36 Should the rules and standards of language be flexible?
37 Should everybody speak Sanifu, instead of other dialects?
38 Is Sheng ruining Swahili?
39 Is Sheng a real language?
40 Do you think that borrowing words from other languages improves Swahili?
41 Do you speak Swahili Sanifu?
42 Is Swahili your best language?
43 Do you prefer speaking English to Swahili?
44 Do you mix languages frequently?
45 Do most people speak better Swahili than you?
46 Do you speak broken or dirty Swahili?
47 Are you creative when you use language?
48 Do people with good Swahili sometimes have trouble understanding you?
49 Do you sometimes make up words so that other people can't understand your Swahili?
50 Does English have a significant impact on your Swahili?

Language Attitudes Survey – Swahili

1. Je, watu wanaojua lugha mbili wana akili zaidi kushinda wanaojua moja tu?
2. Je, ingekuwa bora wakijifunza watu wote lugha mbili?
3. Je, zile lugha za mama ni mbaya kuliko Kiswahili?
4. Je, unafikiri Kiingereza ni bora kuliko Kiswahili?
5. Je, unasikia vibaya wakati Mkenya mwingine anapoongea Kiswahili vizuri kushinda wewe?
6. Je, sarufi ya Kiswahili ni ya kutatanisha – more advanced – kuliko zila matha tongues?
7. Je, wengi hapa Kenya wanaongea Kiswahili kichafu ama Kiswahili kimevunjika?
8. Je, lugha ya Kiswahili inaweza kusema vitu kama vizuri kama Kiingereza?
9. Je, lugha ya Kiswahili haiwezi kusema mambo fulani?
10. Je, unafikiri ni lazima kwamba maneno mapya yote yanatoka lugha za Bantu nyingine?
11. Je, unafikiri ingekuwa bora kama Kiswahili ingejiondolea maneno yote ya Kiingereza na Kiarabu?
12. Je, unasikia vibaya wakati mzungu anapoongea Kiswahili vizuri kushinda wewe?
13. Je, Kiswahili cha zamani ni nzuri kuliko Kiswahili cha leo?
14. Je, watu wanaoongea Kiswahili cha zamani sio poa?
15. Je, ni kweli kwamba lugha nyingine hazina sarufi?
16. Je, ni kweli kwamba kila wakati lugha zinapata namna mpya ya kusema vitu?
17. Je, ni kweli kusema kwamba kuna namna moja tu ya kuongea Kiswahili kizuri – na hakuna nyingine?
18. Je, ni kweli kusema kwamba kila wakati lugha zinaharibiwa ama zinapotewa uzuri?
19. Je, ni kweli kusema kwamba kila wakati lugha zinaendeleza au zinazidi uzuri?
20. Je, ingekuwa bora ikiwa watu waruhuswe kuzichanganya lugha?
21. Je, watu wa Kosti wanaongea Kiswahili kizuri?
22. Je, watu wa Tanzania wanaongea Kiswahili kizuri?
23. Je, watu wa Nairobi wanaongea Kiswahili kizuri?
24. Je, watu kijijini wanaongea Kiswahili kizuri?
25. Je, wazee wanaongea Kiswahili kizuri?
26. Je, ni vigumu mno kujifunza Kiswahili Sanifu?
27. Je, lazima watu wajifunze Kiswahili Sanifu?
28. Je, Sheng ni lugha mbaya?
29. Je, ni sawa wakati watu wachanganya lugha za mama na Kiswahili?
30. Je, ni sawa kutumia Kiingereza wakati mtu anapoongea Kiswahili?
31. Je, watu wanaochanganya Kiingereza katika Kiswahili wana akili zaidi kuliko wasiozichanganya?
32. Je, watu wanaojua Sanifu wana akili kushinda watu wasiokijua?
33. Je, ni kweli kwamba lugha zinabadiliwa kila wakati?
34. Je, unafikiri ni lazima kwamba lugha zinabadiliwa kila wakati?
35. Je, lazima lugha zina kanuni ambazo wote watazifuata?
36. Je, lazima kwamba kanuni za lugha ziwe flexible - za kivyovyote?
37. Je, ingekuwa bora ikiwa watu wote wanaongea Sanifu, na hawaongei aina za Kiswahili nyingine?
38. Je, Sheng inaharibu Kiswahili?
39. Je, Sheng ni lugha ya kweli?
40. Je, unafikiri kuazima ama kukopa maneno kutoka lugha nyingine ingeendeleza Kiswahili?
41. Je, uongea Kiswahili Sanifu?
42. Je, unajua Kiswahili bora kuliko lugha nyingine?
43. Je, unapendelea kuongea Kiingereza kushinda Kiswahili?
44. Je, uzichanganya lugha mara nyingi?
45. Je, watu wengi wanaongea Kiswahili kushinda wewe?
46. Je, uongea Kiswahili kichafu ama kilichovunjika?
47. Je, unataka kutumia lugha kwa namna mpya na inapendeza?
48. Je, ni vigumu mara nyingi kwa watu kukufahamu unapozungumza Kiswahili?
49. Je, mara nyingine utaka kubuni maneno mapya ili wengine hawawezi kukufahamu?
50. Je, Kiingereza kina maudhiko juu ya Kiswahili chako?

~ APPENDIX II ~

Simplification Data

Number of instances of participants' use of simplification types

Feature	P1	P2	P3	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	Totals:
Natural class agreement	5	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	10
Noun discord	3	2	14	2	1	2	2	7	2	13	48
No prefixing	6	3	14	-	1	2	5	1	5	6	43
Irregularity avoidance/ analogy	1	2	-	2	2	-	1	1	-	1	10
Externalizing potential suffix	7	-	16	6	1	-	2	-	3	4	39
Tense discord	2	-	3	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	9
Locative discord	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
***si* for negation**	2		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
Infinitive preference	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	5
Present tense preference	7	-	5	3	1	-	4	1	3	1	26
Lack of relative	4	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	11
Totals:	40	12	60	14	9	7	14	12	13	29	210

~ APPENDIX III ~

Participant Data

Data	P1	P2	P3	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11
-ko ratio	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.9	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.6	1.0
Code-switch ratio	2.0	2.2	2.7	0.2	0.2	3.0	5.8	2.3	5.4	5.0
Simplification ratio	1.7	1.4	2.9	3.1	2.0	1.0	2.1	1.0	3.7	3.3
Self-reported A-responses (of 10)	2	8	6	3	3	8	7	5	7	10
Opinion-based A responses (of 40)	17	20	11	10	13	9	9	13	23	19
Representative A-repsonses (of 12)	6	6	4	2	3	4	4	4	7	7
Age	31	22	26	29	21	34	53	27	30	26
Sex	M	F	M	M	F	M	M	M	M	M
Swahili as L1	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Mombasa	5	22	14	29	5	13	53	7	12	26
Education	High	High	Low	Mid	High	Mid	Mid	Low	Low	High

~ BIBLIOGRAPHY ~

Bonvillain, Nancy. 1995. *Language, culture, and communication: The meaning of messages*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. *The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary approach to language in society*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Githioria, Chege. 2002. Sheng: Peer language, Swahili dialect, or emerging creole? *Journal of African Cultural Studies* 15, no. 2 (Dec): 159-81.

Hieber, Daniel W. 2006. What's in a word?: Code-switching in Mombasa Swahili. Unpublished paper written for SIT Kenya: Swahili Studies & Coastal Cultures (Fall).

Scotton, Carol Myers. 1976. Strategies of neutrality: Language choice in uncertain situations. *Language* 52, no. 4 (Dec): 919-41.

Trudgill, Peter. 1995. *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. 3d ed. London: Penguin Books.

Wilson, Peter M. 1985. *Simplified Swahili*. 2d ed. Essex: Longman.