AN ANALYSIS OF CODE SWITCHING IN THE NAMIBIAN PARLIAMENT

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH STUDIES

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA

BY

SUSSANA IIPINGE
201306231

APRIL 2019

MAIN SUPERVISOR: DR R. MAKAMANI
CO-SUPERVISOR: MS S. ASHIKUTI

Abstract

The focus of this study was on code switching that occurred in the Namibian Parliament as observed from the volumes of parliamentary Hansards from the year 2015 to 2017. This was a desktop study that employed a qualitative design to determine the patterns and reasons for code switching in the Namibian Parliament. Content analysis was used to analyse data collected from the 10 volumes of printed parliamentary Hansards. Data was further interpreted using Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame Model (MLF) and the Markedness Model (MM).

Although English is the official language in Namibia, the parliamentarians still make use of other languages in the parliamentary discourse which leads to code switching. Code switching in Parliament can either facilitate or create a communication barrier among parliamentarians as some of the parliamentarians do not understand some of the languages that are used for code switching. The findings revealed that the Namibian parliamentarians used intra-sentential code switching more frequently compared to tag- and inter-sentential switching. The findings further indicated that parliamentarians often code-switched during interjections and interventions. Code switching was thus used as a rhetorical device in parliamentary discourse. Other reasons for code switching in Parliament are quoting, tone-softening, humour, real lexical need, expression of identity, to strengthen a request and untranslatability of words. The study further revealed that functions and reasons for code switching, can be used interchangeably. Moreover, the findings of the study showed that parliamentarians' code switched because English does not have some of the words that the indigenous languages have, and in wanting to be precise the parliamentarians used culturally correct terms thereby negatively affecting effective communication in parliament. In addition, the findings revealed that translation makes code switching more effective in facilitating communication among the parliamentarians.

From the findings of the study it can therefore be concluded that, although code switching creates a communication barrier among parliamentarians, it can also be used as a communicative strategy that facilitates effective communication amongst the parliamentarians. It can further be concluded that code switching makes it easier for the parliamentarians to express themselves freely without being confined to English as the official language. It is therefore recommended that, parliamentarians may make use of code switching in Parliament given that they are able to translate their utterances into English and in cases where the speakers cannot translate their own utterances translation services should be availed to the parliamentarians for effective communication in Parliament.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank the Almighty God who makes everything possible. My utmost gratitude and appreciation goes to my main supervisor Dr. Rewai Makamani for availing his time and knowledge in order for me to complete this study. His constructive feedbacks, suggestions and ideas have been of great help. The completion of this study would not have been possible if it were not for his guidance.

I would also like to thank my co-supervisor, Ms Selma Ashikuti, for always availing herself whenever I needed help. I highly appreciate her encouragements, feedbacks and constructive ideas; they indeed paved way for the successful completion of this study. My profound appreciation also goes to my Research Design lecturer, Dr. Nelson Mlambo, for his mentorship, guidance and support throughout this study, I am forever grateful.

I would also like to thank the staff members at the Namibian Parliament who deal with the Hansards for making sure that I obtained the documents. Finally, I would like to thank my MAES 2017/ 2018 classmates and friends especially Angelina Nashipeta and Penelope T Midzi for always motivating and encouraging each other throughout this journey. To friends, family and everyone who encouraged and helped me in one way or the other and made valuable contributions to the completion of this study, am forever indebted to you. All I can say is “Thank You Very Much”. I am forever grateful.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my entire family.

Declarations

I, Sussana Iipinge, hereby declare that this study is my own work and is a true reflection of my research, and that this work, or any part thereof has not been submitted for a degree at any other institution.

…… …… ……

Name of Student Signature Date

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

After Namibia gained its independence in 1990, English was chosen as the official language of the country, despite having a multicultural society where many different indigenous languages are spoken. Despite English being the official language, other languages are also used in different domains. Therefore, the linguistic phenomenon of code switching is used as a tool of communication and conversing by many. This chapter discusses the preliminary issues of the study such as the background, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study, the limitations of the study as well as the delimitation.

1.2 Background of the study

For effective communication to take place, one should be able to understand the language that is being used to transmit the message. In most of the societies where people speak more than one language, people tend to mix different languages in the same conversation. There is constant exposure to different languages in a single conversation or within a single utterance. This is what is called code switching (CS) or code mixing. Code switching is seen as a conventional method of communication in any bilingual or multilingual society (Myers- Scotton, 1993a). Namibia is a country with a relatively small population but with diverse languages. According to Frydman (2011) "thirteen languages have been recognized as national languages, that is 10 indigenous African languages which are spoken by 87.8% of the population and 3 Indo-European languages spoken by 11.2% of the population" (p. 181). Although this is the composition of languages spoken in Namibia, after independence, English which has a relatively small percentage of 0.8 first language speakers in Namibia was chosen as the official language which is used in public and official domains (Brock- Utne, as cited in Frydman, 2011). Frydman (2011) states that as the

official language, English is the language of administration, government and national politics. Because of the linguistic diversity in Namibia, it is not surprising that code switching constitutes a widespread practice among the population (Zähres, 2016). The portion of this population make up the members of Parliament, which means that as parliamentarians, they also engage in code switching.

Dzahene- Quarshie (2011) states that many Parliaments in Africa have adopted English only policies in their Parliaments whilst allowing the use of several indigenous languages for convenience sake due to the highly multilingual situation in which they find themselves and Namibia is no exception to such a linguistic situation. With English being the official language, the use of other languages in different domains is not entirely restricted and the support of the use of the indigenous languages is made clear in the constitution which states that, although English is the official language, "nothing hereof shall preclude legislation by Parliament which permits the use of a language other than English for legislative, administrative and judicial purposes in regions or areas where such other language or languages are spoken by a substantial component of the population" (The Constitution of the Republic of Namibia, 1990, p. 2). So, parliamentarians are not compelled to speak English only during their sessions in Parliament and this results in codeswitching which is the focus of this study.

Codeswitching is defined as "the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of linguistic forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterance of a matrix variety during same conversation" (Myers-Scotton, 1993a, p. 3). According to Legère (2001), "while the exclusive use of the official language is strictly observed for written material, oral communication runs counter to this stipulation, as many of the national languages are frequently spoken by public servants" (p. 58). This is similar in the Namibian Parliament, as the parliamentarians hardly code switch when

they are reading from a prepared speech, but when they are engaging with each other in discussions and debates, code switching occurs which makes the Parliament a great domain to study this linguistic phenomenon as it occurs more often in conversations than in writing.

Parliament is the place where the legislators meet to discuss and consult with each other on political, social and economic issues regarding the nation. There are 104 members in the National Assembly which consists of ninety-six elected members (voting members) and eight (non-voting members) as appointed by the president (Parliament Republic of Namibia, 2017). All the parliamentary sessions and events are audio recorded and then later transcribed into a document that is called the Hansard. The Hansard is the name of the official publication of the verbatim proceedings of a parliamentary body. It is the document that contains the exact words spoken by the members of Parliament during a parliamentary session. The parliamentary discourse includes debates, question and answer sessions, as well as ministerial statements and speeches. The Hansards also consists of translations of the parliamentary sessions focusing on the discussions covering a wide variety of topics, and the speaking styles range from prepared speeches by a single speaker to more interactive discussions and debates. Therefore, codeswitching and more generally language choices in Parliament can reveal an interesting range of multilingual practices in Parliament. So, this study aimed at looking at the phenomena of codeswitching in the Namibian Parliament.

1.3 Statement of the problem

Although there are previous studies done in Namibia on codeswitching by Kamati (2011), Simasiku (2014, 2016) and Aukongo (2015), such studies focused on different domains rather than the Parliament, which this present study sought to analyse. Kamati (2011) and Simasiku (2014, 2016) focused on the phenomenon of code switching in the classroom or the learning

environment, while Aukongo (2015) focused on code switching as a communication strategy between the residents of Outapi and the Public officials. Although these findings of the previous studies contribute to the field of code switching in Namibia, their findings may not be generalised to code switching in Parliament as it is a different domain.

It is interesting to see how this phenomenon of codeswitching occurs not only in daily informal conversations, but also in Parliament. Parliament is a multilingual setting in which the parliamentarians speak different first languages and therefore codeswitching affects effective communication amongst parliamentarians. The Parliament, being a public and formal setting, one would think that code switching does not occur as the parliamentarians are the law makers and they are supposed to uphold the language policy of the country, but this is not the case. The parliamentarians are also quite comfortable with code switching, despite them being aware that some fellow parliamentarians do not actually speak or understand the language which they use when code switching.

Therefore, the effect of code switching is visible in Parliament as parliamentarians that do not understand the language used for code switching interrupt their fellow parliamentarians to either explain or translate to them what exactly was said or what was meant when code switching occurred. Thus, code switching also causes an interruption in parliamentary sessions. So, it is important to investigate the circumstances under which parliamentarians' code switch and establish possible reasons why they code switch. This study therefore sought to investigate and analyse the different patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament thereby contributing to the existing body of knowledge on code switching in Namibia.

1.4 Research questions

This research attempted to answer the following questions:

1.4.1 What are the possible reasons that influence the parliamentarians to codeswitch?

1.4.2 What are the code-switching patterns that emerge in the Namibian parliamentary proceedings?

1.4.3 What function does codeswitching provide on the framing of parliamentary discourse?

1.5 Significance of the study

This study is significant as it may contribute to the field of code switching in Namibia, by focusing on the role of code switching in the Namibian Parliament. This study might help in understanding why parliamentarians code switch, by identifying the different patterns of code switching that occur in Parliament. This research may further help generate discussions on the use of different languages in Parliament.

1.6 Limitation of the study

Only the Namibian Parliamentary Hansards that are deemed representative of the data of code switching have been selected. Therefore, the findings of this research cannot be generalised to other countries' Parliaments. A further limitation could be that, since the Hansards being used as sources for collecting data contain already transcribed text, the transcription process might have removed pauses, repetitions and other language disfluencies which might have been important in the analysis of the linguistic phenomenon of code switching which was of interest for the study. Making use of only the available printed Hansards could mean that some of the Hansards that were not available as hard copies might have been overlooked as sources of data that could have

contained rich information in the form of code switching data that could have contributed to the study.

1.7 Delimitation of the study

This study only focused on the instances of code switching in the printed Namibian Parliamentary Hansards dated from the year 2015 until 2017 as this allowed for an in-depth study.

1.8 Layout of the study

Chapter 1 introduced the research topic, by providing the background of the study, statement of the problem, significance of the study and finally it looked at the research questions on which the study was based.

Chapter 2 deals with the literature review that is related to the scope of the study. Additionally, it focuses on the theoretical framework, Myers- Scottons (1993a) Markedness model as well as the Matrix Language framework. Moreover, various aspects related to CS, such as the types of code switching, and the functions of code switching are explored as well as the distinct reasons for CS.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used for this research. The methodology includes the research approach, research design, research instruments, and the data collection procedures. Besides, it also provides information on how data was analysed and ethical considerations of the study are also stated.

Chapter 4 presents the data analysis, the findings and the discussions of the parliamentary discourse as informed by the reviewed literature and lastly Chapter 5 gives a brief conclusion of

the research findings, limitations of the study, suggestions for future researchers and recommendations based on the findings.

1.9 Chapter summary

This chapter oriented the study by discussing the background of the study, statement of the problem, significance of the study as well as the research questions. The limitations of the study and the delimitations were also considered.

The next chapter, Chapter 2, looks at the literature review with regards to code switching and other terminologies that are relevant to the study.

Chapter 2: Literature review and theoretical framework

2.1 Introduction

Code switching as a research topic has grown over the years and different scholars have given their views regarding the topic. Code switching has become a prominent feature of everyday conversations without people even knowing how important this linguistic phenomenon is. Given the prominence of code switching in everyday conversations, one would think that this is only part of daily normal conversations, but this is not the case as it is also observed in the formal setting of the Namibian Parliament where parliamentarians are mostly expected to use English the official language of the country.

This chapter therefore sets to review previous studies that have contributed to the body of knowledge on code switching in Namibia, and elsewhere in the world that are deemed relevant to this study. The review of the topic is presented in the following format; first it looks at the definition of code switching and other linguistic terms that are related to code switching. This is followed by the functions and the possible reasons for code switching. Additionally, previous studies on code switching are considered and finally reviewing literature on linguistic theories that are framing this study.

2.2 Code switching defined

Different scholars have defined the term code switching such as Gumperz (as cited in Milroy & Muysken, 1995, p. 10) who defines code switching as the "juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to different grammatical systems or subsystems". Code switching can also be defined as "the use of two or more languages in the same utterance" (Coupland & Jaworski, as cited in Smit 2011, p. 71). Code switching is further defined as "the

selection by bilinguals or multi-linguals of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation" (Myers- Scotton, 1993a, p. 3).

This linguistic phenomenon is not only observable in daily conversations, but it is also observable in official settings such as the Namibian Parliament. People tend to code switch without being aware of the term of this linguistic behaviour. When dealing with code switching, one can not entirely talk about code switching without talking about code mixing as these linguistic terms are closely related and often they are used in the same context. Code switching is the alternating between two or more languages, or language varieties in the context of a single conversation, while code mixing refers to language mixing within the phrase or utterance. The phenomenon of moving between distinct varieties of languages is known as code switching or code mixing (Meyerhoff, 2011). Despite having two different terms to describe these two language phenomena, most authors do not differentiate between code switching and code mixing. These two terms are rather used interchangeably to refer to the same phenomenon. It is therefore against this background that; the term code switching was used as the umbrella term to account for the switches or mixing of languages that happen in the Namibian Parliament.

Code switching is viewed to take place at any level of linguistic differentiation such as different languages, styles or dialects and registers. However, this study only concentrated on instances of code switching in Parliament between different languages. The use of different dialects of the same language in a conversation was not considered as code switching.

2.3 Types of code switching

There are different types of code switching to be considered when dealing with the subject matter of code switching. Milroy and Muysken (1995) state that code switching can at times occur between the turns of different speakers in the conversation, and sometimes between

utterances within a single utterance. Poplack (as cited in Mabule, 2015, p. 10) classified code switching as either intra-sentential, inter-sentential or tag switching. These types of code switching are important for this study to try and identify the different patterns of code switching that occur in the Namibian Parliament as depicted in the Hansards.

2.3.1 Inter- sentential switching

This type of code switching occurs between two utterances spoken by the same speaker. According to Poplack (as cited in Milroy & Muysken, 1995), this kind of code switching involves a switch at a clause or sentence boundary where each clause or sentence is in one language or another and it may also occur between speaker turns. So, it is for switches between sentences as it allows speakers to switch from one type of interaction to another. Al Heetia and Al Abdely (2016) describe it as involving switching at sentential boundaries where one clause or sentence is in one language and the next clause or sentence is in the other language.

2.3.2 Intra-sentential switching

This type of code switching is used for switches within the sentence or clause. The shift is done in the middle of a sentence, with no interruptions, hesitations, or pauses indicating a shift. The speaker is usually unaware of the switch, until after the fact (Kaspercyzk, 2015). Intra- sentential switching involves arguably the most complex syntactic risk and as a result it is avoided by most people that are not fluent bilinguals.

2.3.3 Tag switching

This includes exclamations, tags, and parenthetical explanations uttered in a different language than that used for the rest of the sentence. Kaspercyzk (2015) explains it by verbalising that it is when “a word or phrase from another language is tagged in the conversation” (p. 7). Exclamation is a short sound, word or phrase which is emphasising something or expressing sudden surprise

and pain. A parenthesis is a word, phrase or sentence which is inserted as an extra explanation or idea into a passage. This type of code switching occurs the most easily since tags typically contain minimal syntactic restrictions and therefore they do not break the syntactic rules of the first language (L1) when inserted into a sentence (Stockwell, as cited in Kastori, 2017). Tags include interjections, fillers and idiomatic expressions. According to Trisulichartini (2014) this type of code switching entails fluency in both languages, in the way that the speaker is able to follow the rules of the two languages.

2.4 Previous studies

Code switching focuses on the social motivations and the functions of code switching which are the phenomena that this study sought to explore when it comes to code switching in the Namibian Parliament. This research was done based on some previous studies which were carried out on code switching in the Namibian context as well as other studies from different countries that are closely related to this study.

2.4.1 Studies done in Namibia

Kamati (2011) focused on the prevalence of code switching in the Junior Secondary Physical Science classroom in the Oshana Education Region. The study sought to establish the reasons why code switching occurred in the Physical Science classrooms and the impact it had on teaching and learning of this subject. Additionally, it also explored how the teachers perceived code switching. the study found that, despite English being the language used as a medium of instruction, code switching was prevalent in the Oshana Education Region Junior Secondary Physical Science classrooms. Kamati (2011) states that code switching was found to be used by the teachers as a strategy to make their learners understand better and to also make up for both the teachers and learners' lack of English language proficiency in the classrooms.

The findings further revealed that teachers had different perceptions regarding the use of code switching and as a result some teachers avoided code switching as a preventative measure to prevent the students from code switching in the exams as it would contribute to the learners performing poorly. Kamati (2011) observed that in some instances the teachers avoided code switching, as the subject and the language policies did not allow for them to code switch. Code switching was established to be beneficial to the teaching and learning of Physical Science as a subject although it had some disadvantages when it comes to the learners' performance in the examinations and also the perfection of the English language.

Another researcher that contributes to the field of code switching in Namibia is Simasiku (2014, 2016). Simasiku's (2014) study focused on the perceptions of Grade 10 English second language teachers on the effects of code switching in their classrooms in the Caprivi Education Region of Namibia. Unlike Kamati (2011) who focused on the use of code switching in the Physical Science classroom, Simasiku focused on code switching in the classrooms with English being the subject. The findings revealed that there was no guiding framework or policies on the use of code switching in schools, and this is similar to the Namibian Parliament whereby there is no guiding framework of whether code switching is acceptable in Parliament or not. The lack of a framework or guiding policies caused uncertainty among teachers whether to code switch or not. The findings also revealed that the language policy did not empower the teachers to use the language as the situation dictated. Nonetheless, it rather gave them directives of what to use and this was found to be the reason why the teachers hesitated to code switch in the presence of ministerial officials when they were present in the classrooms. However, when the officials had left their classrooms the teachers reverted to code switching using their mother tongues.

Simasiku (2016) further did a similar study on code switching, by looking at the impact of code switching on learners' participation during classroom practice. The objective of the study was to investigate whether the use of mother tongue in English medium classrooms can enhance classroom participation. The findings revealed that the use of mother tongue in the English medium classroom did not constrain the learners understanding of the learning content, but it rather facilitated the learners' classroom participation. The findings further revealed that the Grade 10 English 2nd language teachers agreed that code switching benefited learners' participation in English medium classrooms.

The last study to be reviewed for this study that was carried out on code switching in the Namibian context is that done by Aukongo (2015). Aukongo's focus was on the role that code switching between English and Oshiwambo played in the lives of the Outapi residents and the public officials when conducting public affairs in the bank, clinic, and post office. The data was interpreted using the Markedness Model and Matrix Language Frame Model (MLF) which are also the two underlying theories for this study.

Aukongo (2015) found that just like Kamati (2011) and Simasiku (2014, 2016) code switching facilitated communication in Outapi in order for the speakers to attain their communication goals. The study indicated that various strategies of code switching such as code mixing, and borrowing were used to make communication possible and successful. She found that, people code switched in order to maintain the cultural norms of their communities because of the believe that some of the cultural expressions are untranslatable. Code switching was found to have enriched the Oshiwambo language in terms of vocabulary, although it was seen to have a disadvantage as it also contributed to language death of indigenous languages, Oshiwambo in particular.

2.4.2 Studies done on code switching outside Namibia

Al Heetia and Al Abdely (2016) carried out a research on code switching where they were interested in analysing the English language that Iraqi doctors used in formal setting, by identifying the types of code switching found. Their study was entitled *Types and functions of code-switching in the English Language used by Iraqi doctors in formal setting*. This study is important to the present study in helping to identify the different types and the functions of code switching in the Namibian Parliament, since it is a formal setting. Their findings revealed that the Iraqi doctors used intra-sentential code switching more frequently than the other types of code switching, this was despite that this type of code switching requires more knowledge in the Second language (L2) which is English in this case.

It is therefore important to see whether the results of the types of code switching in the Namibian Parliament will differ, because although English is spoken as a L2 in Namibia it is the official language and it is the required language to be used in official or formal settings such as in Parliament. In support of the studies carried out in Namibia on code switching by Kamati (2011), Simasiku (2014, 2016) and Aukongo (2015), Al Heetia and Al Abdely (2016) also found that the main reason for the doctors to code switch was that English was used for communicative purposes by the doctors.

This study attempted to answer some of the similar questions to this study such as, what are the types of code switching used by the Iraqi doctors in formal setting? What are the functions these doctors try to achieve by code switching from their first language (L1) to their L2? Their findings highlighted that the most important reason that the doctors code switched into English was because the doctors find English to be more expressive than their mother tongue, as they sometimes find it difficult to use Arabic words to name a disease, to describe a case or to

prescribe a drug. The doctors also felt obligated to code switch to the L2 since there are no exact words in Arabic that correspond to the one they need to state, so it was necessary to use words or idioms from the other language. The use of English was found to be more expressive and informative than Arabic.

Surenthiraraj and Tissera (2015) analysed the ideological implications of code switching as a discursive strategy by probing the Sri Lankan Hansards. They state that the issue of language policy in Sri Lanka has been an ethno-nationalist issue of contention. Because of the linguistic history in Sri Lanka the Parliament which is the locale where national policy is debated and formulated, is also a space where the language choices both upholds and creates ideologies to which the languages are linked. They find code switching noteworthy in a locale such as the Parliament, as it is a performance of linguistic choice.

Surenthiraraj and Tissera (2015) examined code switching as a local practice that index a wide range of ideologies by using the parliamentary Hansard records of Sri Lanka. Using qualitative conversation analysis, the study focused on the larger socio-political implications that undergird code switching practices by looking at the functions that code switching played in the parliamentary discourse and what comment code switching provides for the framing of discussions in the Parliament. The findings of the study were that in addition to functioning as rhetorical devices, language choices both originates from and reinforces linguistic ideologies in Sri Lanka. The research also revealed that situated code choice practice can function as a commentary on wider social ideologies.

Carpuat (2014) focused on the Canadian Hansard by automatically detecting mixed language segments based on simple corpus-based rules and an existing word-level language tagger. The method of automatic detection varies significantly depending on the primary language. Carpuat

(2014) discovered that using this method only achieved 95% precision when the original language is French. Common words that cannot be differentiated as to which language they belong, generate many false positives which hurt the precision in English. This was not the case in this study as code switching in the Namibian parliamentary Hansards were detected manually and the focus was on more than one language that is used by parliamentarians to code switch unlike Carpuat's (2014) study that only dealt with code switching between English and French as they are both used as languages for communication in the Canadian Parliament. According to Carpuat (2014), the Canadian constitution strictly states that only English or French is to be used by any person in the debates of the House of Parliament and as a result intervention can be made in French or English and they can switch between the two languages. The Namibian constitution does not however, state which other languages are to be used by parliamentarians during their debates or submissions leaving it up to the speakers themselves to make use of any other language in addition to English which is the official language.

The findings revealed that code switching occurred within the mixed languages examples detected in the Canadian Hansard and that code switching was used differently by the French and English speakers. Carpuat (2014) suggested that the Hansard can be an important source for studying multilingual practices including code switching which is the focus of this study. A straight forward strategy to detect mixed language in the Canadian Hansard by using constraints based on the parallel nature of the corpus and a state of the art language detection technique.

The final study to be reviewed for the purpose of this study is that done by Dzahene- Quarshie (2011) which examined the advantages and disadvantages of the checkered nature of language use in the Tanzanian Parliament. The main focus was on language policy, language choice and the practicality of language use in parliamentary discourse. In Tanzania, Swahili is the medium

of communication in Parliament, although the parliamentarians still have an option of either using Swahili or English, nonetheless the parliamentarians still prefer Swahili.

It was observed that, language contact phenomena such as various forms of alternation between Swahili and English occurred quite regularly in parliamentary debates and submissions. However, it was also observed that although Swahili was the main language, the different documents used in Parliament were drafted in English. The situation in the Tanzanian Parliament is similar to that of Namibia in that, although code switching occurs which entails the use of other languages rather than English, the other languages are not used for any documentation in Parliament. Dzahene-Quarshie (2011) made use of the issues of Tanzanian parliamentary Hansard to analyse the particular linguistic choices, the advantages and disadvantages of those choices and the impact that those choices have on Swahili.

Kamati (2011), Simasiku (2014, 2016) and Aukongo (2015) are some of the researchers that contribute to the code-switching literature in Namibia as reviewed in this study. However, there is dearth in literature when it comes to code switching in public domains such as the Namibian Parliament which this study focused on. Kamati (2011) and Simasiku (2014, 2016), both focused on code switching in the learning and classroom domains, while Aukongo (2015) focused on code switching between the residents and the public officials in the bank, post office and the clinics. Therefore, their findings cannot be generalised to the parliamentary setting as the context differs, leaving a gap to determine the aspect of code switching in Parliament which this study investigated. The way code switching is utilised by teachers and learners or by community members can differ from the way parliamentarians use it. There is therefore a gap in literature on code switching when it comes to the domain of the Namibian Parliament. This study therefore

sought to fill up the gap in code switching literature in Namibia by looking at code switching in the Namibian Parliament as depicted in the Hansards.

These literary works reviewed for this study (Kamati, 2011; Simasiku 2014, 2016; Aukongo, 2015; Al Heetia & Al Abdely, 2016; Surenthiraraj & Tissera, 2015; Carpuat, 2014 and Dzahene-Quarshie, 2011) all form a basis on which this study was carried out. All these studies show that code switching plays an important role in daily communication, whether in schools, formal settings such as the hospitals, in daily informal conversations and as well as in parliamentary discourse. Although they highlight positives that come with these linguistic phenomena, they also indicate that there are some disadvantages of code switching. Findings such as that of Kamati (2011) and Simasiku (2014, 2016) that state that, code switching as a language practice supports classroom communication and it is a useful tool in learning and teaching in the Namibian context, are vital in looking whether the same goals are reached by the parliamentarians when they code switch or not. Since most of the code-switching findings in different domains are positive, it may not be assumed that it is similar in Parliament that is why this study sought to fill this gap of knowledge by particularly investigating code switching in the Namibian Parliament. Al Heetia and Al Abdely's (2016) study is also important in highlighting that code switching does not only occur in the settings where English is the official language, but rather that English can also be used as a language for code switching by those that have a different official language.

Although similar studies were carried out in Canada and Tanzania the researchers took a different approach in addressing the issue of code switching in Parliament than this study. This study therefore sets the basis on which further studies on code switching in the Namibia parliamentary domain can be carried out by future researchers. This study addresses the issue of

code switching in the Namibian Parliament to see whether the use of code switching in Parliament is similar or it differs from the different domains where studies were carried out on the same linguistic aspect of code switching.

2.5 Functions of code switching

Although code switching is a widespread linguistic phenomenon, at times people tend to think of it as a sign of the bilingual speaker not having sufficient knowledge of both languages, which is not the case always. So, to appreciate code switching as part of bilingual or multi-lingual conversations, it is important to understand the different functions that code switching is set to play in different communications.

The functions of code switching are mainly framed around the social, linguistic and the psychological motivation of speakers. Shin (2010) states that code switching is usually utilised by bilingual speakers to accomplish specific communicative intentions in the conversation. Social motivation is seen as the main cause for code switching since speakers try to negotiate the social distance between themselves and the other participants in the conversation. According to Myers-Scotton (1993a) social conditions determine the use of certain languages in certain communities.

Being able to code switch is a skill, which is mostly used for making communication easier between the speaker and the listener. The speaker does not only code switch for the sake of code switching to show proficiency in different languages, but they want to also make sure that whatever they are trying to communicate is well understood. Communicative efficiency plays a crucial role when it comes to code switching. Depending on the situation, the context or the person being addressed the functions of code switching will differ.

Appel and Muysken (1987), identified six functions of code switching as proposed by Jokobson (as cited in Yankova & Vassileva, 2013, pp. 109-110). These functions of code switching are:

1. The referential function which entails a case where the speakers switch languages either because they are not able to find the right word, or the word does not exist. This function saves the speaker time and efforts to find the exact word in the current language spoken (Yankova & Vassileva, 2013)
2. The directive and integrative function: "By using standard greetings, conventional modes of address, imperatives, exclamations, and questions contacts are made with others and enough of an interactive structure is created to ensure cooperation" (Appel & Muysken, as cited in Yankova & Vassileva, 2013, p. 110).
3. The expressive function by which the speaker makes their feelings known and in the process one present oneself to others as a unique individual.
4. The phatic function which is observed when the speaker tries to keep communication channels open with the addressee.
5. The metalinguistic function refers to the case when the speaker makes explicit references to one of the languages involved.
6. The poetic function denotes cases where speakers change the language when they tell jokes or use word-play in another language, or when they try to avoid taboo words and phrases in the main language used in the particular conversation.

In addition to the six functions of code switching, Hoffman (1991) also proposed ten functions of code switching (as cited in Al Heeti & Abdely, 2016, p. 12) as follows:

1. To talk about a particular topic
2. To quote somebody else

3. To provide emphasis about something

4. To make an interjection

5. To repeat in order to clarify

6. To express group identity

7. To show intention of clarifying speech content for interlocutor

8. To soften or strengthen a request or command

9. To meet a real lexical need or to compensate for lack of an equal translation

10. To exclude others when a comment is intended for an exclusive audience.

The classification of the functions of code switching by Appel and Muysken are used along with the functions proposed by Hoffman in identifying the functions of code switching in the Namibian Parliament.

2.6. Reasons for code switching

According to Chivero (2012) code switching in Parliament is also used to stimulate either positive or negative emotions and to make appeals to other members of Parliament.

Here are some of the possible reasons for code switching as identified by Holmes (2001) and Smit (2011).

1. *Expression of identity*

When there is change in the social situation or there is a new comer in the conversation, a person might code switch to accommodate the other person, even if the switching is only a greeting in order to express solidarity status with each other. The switch reflects change in the social situation and takes positive account of the presence of a new participant. Code switching is seen as a sign of solidarity within a group.

2. *Ethnic identity marker*

A group of people might choose to communicate in a different language as a way for them to express their identity to each other and to bond during conversations. Even if the speaker is not fluent in the language they use for code switching, they may use short words or phrases just to express their ethnic identity with the people they are speaking too. People feel close to each other when they can speak the same language.

3. *Changing of the topic*

Code switching also reflects a change in the type of interaction that is taking place. It might be in a formal situation where a serious topic is being discussed and therefore there is no room for the speaker to code switch as the listeners might not get the message as intended. So, depending on the topic discussed, or the setting of the conversation, whether formal or informal will also determine whether the speaker will code switch or not.

4. *To quote someone*

To show originality, a speaker repeats the exact word or language used when talking about a conversation or something that they already heard. The switch therefore acts like a set of quotation marks. The speaker gives an expression which may or may not be accurate that they were the exact words used by the original speaker of what is being quoted. A speaker might as well code switch to quote a proverb or a well-known saying in another language.

5. *As a sign of respect shown by the speaker*

The speaker may decide to speak in their strongest language as they feel that it shows respect to the other people that they are speaking too. This also involves the use of titles or names that are deemed to be as a sign of showing respect in a certain language.

6. *Code switching is used as a way to ease tension and bring humour into conversation*

Communication in some languages is more intense and as such code switching helps to bring a sense of humour and alleviate the tension caused using certain words and phrases in some languages. Code switching sometimes shows how a speaker feels depending on what they are uttering. Feelings are also expressed through code switching and at times the listener does not have to understand the meaning of what is being said, but they can sense whether the speaker is happy, excited, sad, angry or mocking the hearer. This reason for code switching shows that code switching also has an affective function.

7. *To help clarify a point/ emphasise meaning*

The speaker might speak in one language, and then repeat the same instructions in a different language to make sure they are well understood, and the message has been received. Code switching helps stress the meaning if the listener did not understand or did not get what the speaker means.

8. *To reinforce a request*

When a person is trying to request something and thinks that the other person is not really paying attention, they might code switch to reinforce their request.

9. *People code switch when they do not know a word or phrase in one language*

People code switch because of the lack of words or phrases in a certain language. A person might know a word in one language, but they might not have an equivalent or they might not at all know the word in that certain language. Therefore, they make use of the words or phrases which they know, leading to code switching.

10. *Meaning is lost through translation*

Somethings are better expressed in a different language as the words in the two languages may not have the exact meaning and therefore if translated they lose meaning. Keeping the original word in a certain language can lead to code switching.

11. *Interjection (inserting sentence filler or sentence connectors)*

People sometimes code switch when they mark an interjection or sentence connector, which may be intentional or unintentional.

12. *To exclude other people when a comment is intended for only limited audience*

At times speakers only want to communicate to certain people and for them to avoid other people from interfering in their conversations, they code switch knowing that not everyone understands what they are saying.

From the literature reviewed it was observed that functions of code switching and reasons for code switching refer to similar linguistics features, the difference being only in the labels used by different scholars.

2.7 Theoretical framework

Different theories or models of code switching have been proposed, and this includes the Markedness Model and the Matrix Language Frame. These were the two underlying theories for this study. To account for code switching in the Parliament, the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model and the Markedness Model were used as proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993a). The Matrix Language Frame Model identifies the matrix language and the embedded language in code switching, and it was used to account for the structural aspects of codeswitching as it occurs in Parliament. The Markedness Model explains why codeswitching occurs, therefore it was used to provide possible reasons behind codeswitching in the Namibian Parliament without linking these reasons to a specific individual.

2.7.1 Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model

The Matrix Language Frame Model is a linguistic model proposed by Myers-Scottons and associates. This model has two crucial aspects which suggests that CS is envisioned as taking place within the constraints of a conceptual frame, and that the frame is largely set by semantic and morphosyntactic procedures dictated by only one of the two (or more) languages participating in CS. This is the Matrix Language (ML). The ML is the main "language in CS utterances in a number of ways" (Myers-Scottons, 1993a, p. 3). This model argues that the ML sets the morphosyntactic frame of sentences showing CS. The term 'embedded language' (EL) is the other languages which also participate in CS, but with a lesser role.

Another important claim of the MLF model is the systems and the content morpheme hierarchy. System morphemes are important as they build constituent frames, and only one source of system morpheme can control constituent frame formation at one point in time (Milroy & Muysken, 1995). The MLF model views intra-sentential CS specifically as a Complement Phrase (CP) or a 'sentence bar' containing at least one constituent with morphemes from two or more languages. ML sets the sentence frame when CS occurs. According to Myers-Scotton (1993a), the speaker must be relatively proficient in the ML, since it will supply the morpho-syntactic frame of mixed constituents; although there are as well cases where the speaker's first language is the EL and not the ML.

The MLF model has two main goals. The first one is that it seeks to predict the form of CS utterances. It predicts which utterances containing CS forms will be considered well-formed and which of such utterances are not well-formed and, therefore, will not occur, unless they are stylistically marked. Most of the times the ML is associated with solidarity-building functions for speakers. The persons involved in CS can identify which language is the ML. Within the same

interaction, the ML can change when there is an adjustment in situational factors (for instance, a new topic or an added participant.

The MLF model views the frame of any sentence as a set of structural specifications. The hypothesis of the ML is to explain what goes into the frame building of mixed CS constituents and that languages in bilingual speech production, one is more activated than the other (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). Even though EL content morphemes may be inserted into these ML frames, only an EL content morpheme congruent with morphosyntactic specifications of an ML entry in the mental lexicon is allowed.

This model plays a significant role when it comes to CS. It shows that different languages can be used in a conversation without actually violating the Matrix Language syntactic structure. When CS people also make sure that the language they are using is understandable and it makes sense.

2.7.2 The Markedness Model of Codeswitching (MM)

In order to explain speakers' socio-psychological motivations when they engage in CS, Myers-Scotton (1993b) developed the MM theory. This theory proposes that speakers are aware of the normal (unmarked) language expected to be used in any interaction, but the speakers choose the language they think is appropriate to speak, based on the relationship or setting in which they are communicating. The language that the speaker is expected to speak is the unmarked choice, while the marked choice is the language that one chooses to communicate based on the relationship one has with the person they are communicating with. Kaschula and Anthonissen (2001) state that unmarked forms are words that are basic, natural and more frequent than others, while marked forms are words that are considered to deviate from the basic, natural and frequently used (unmarked) forms.

In the parliamentary setting, English is the unmarked choice, while any other language used for code switching in Parliament is the marked choice. Speakers assess the potential costs and rewards of all alternative choices and make their decisions typically unconsciously (Myers-Scotton, 1993b). So, to some extent, parliamentarians make marked choices to communicate specific meanings. In a naturally occurring conversation the speaker has a choice to make of which language to use but in the Parliament, is different as English is the expected language of communication, despite there being an allowance of the use of other languages, but just for minimum functions. It is however expected that when CS is an unmarked choice, it takes place in casual, in group interaction between peers who positively evaluate their own identification with both the identities indexed by the two or more languages involved in CS (Myers- Scotton, 1993b).

Myers-Scotton (as cited in Matras, 2009, p. 7), emphasises that "markedness can be an individual's choice of language and not just a social property". Speakers almost always have multiple identities. A linguistics choice is also seen as a representation of one's identity rather than the other. Myers-Scotton speaks of three "filters": the external filter that makes a judgement of the language choices against the social meanings of the code and the social conventions of the code choice. An internal filter that draws on the individual speakers' experience and helps assess priorities and code choice meaning at the local level. The final filter is the rationality filter that helps the speaker decide how to act most effectively in order to achieve particular goals.

Apart from the linguistic filters, this model consists of two most important assumptions that it makes regarding CS. The first assumption is the negotiation principle which was modelled after Grice's 'co-operative principle' which is seen as underlying all code choices. The negotiation principle guides speakers to select the suitable language for communication. This principle is the

central claim of the theory, Markedness Model of Codeswitching, that all code choices can be explained in terms of speaker motivations.

The second assumption of the MM is the maxims that flow from the negotiation principle. These are:

(a) CS as an unmarked choice

The unmarked choice maxim states that speakers should make their code choice the unmarked index of the unmarked Right of Obligation (RO) set in conversations when they wish to establish or affirm the RO set. Rose (as cited in Aukongo, 2015) defines Right of obligation (RO) as a theoretical construct of the so called "right of obligation" which guides speakers to put their expectations in a provided interactional setting in their communities.

Sequential unmarked CS

This is when situational factors change within the course of a conversation. The RO of the unmarked choice might also change, and this is quite common in conversations, as well as when the topic is shifted.

CS itself as the unmarked choice (unmarked CS)

Speaking two languages in the same conversation is a way of following the unmarked choice maxim for speakers in many bi/multilingual communities in an interaction. Speakers engage in the usage of two or more languages continuously; the switching being intra-sentential and sometimes within the same word (Myers-Scotton, 1993b).

(b) CS as a marked choice

This maxim entails that the conversation takes place in a relatively conventionalised interaction, for which an unmarked code choice to index the RO set between participants is clear. It directs

speakers to switch between codes in order not to comply with the social or contextual norms which are expected (Aukongo, 2015).

(c) CS as an exploratory choice (exploratory CS)

The third maxim stipulates that speakers may employ CS when they themselves are not sure of the expected or optimal communicative intent, or at least not sure which one will help achieve their social goals (Myers-Scotton, 1993b).

(d) The virtuosity maxim

When any participants in the conversation do not have a linguistic ability in the unmarked choice, they can switch to whatever language that is necessary to carry on the conversation or accommodate the participation of all speakers present.

According to Myers-Scotton (1993b), "a marked choice is used to negotiate a change in the expected social distance between participants, either increasing this distance or decreasing it" (p. 114). People choose to use a certain language in order to leave the utmost effect on the audience as possible, without really putting in much effort and code switching makes it easier. So, in Parliament at times the parliamentarians will either code switch intentionally or unintentionally depending on the effect that the speaker wants to make or depending on the topic under discussion.

2.8 Chapter summary

This chapter has shown how CS as a research phenomenon has developed over the years by looking

at different factors that play a vital role in code switching as a linguistic phenomenon. Literatures by different researchers were reviewed to show the gap in literature of the field of code switching, especially in Namibia and also possible reasons why people code switch in

everyday life were reviewed. Finally, this chapter discussed the two linguistics models, the Markedness Model (MM) (1993b) and the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model (1993a) of Myers-Scotton which were used as the basis of analysis for this study to help find out how code switching is utilised in the Namibian Parliament as shown in the Hansards.

The next chapter is the methodology, which discusses the different procedures that were used for collecting and analysing data.

Chapter 3: Research methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter gives an outline of the research design that was used for the study including the population studied, the sampling procedures and the research instruments that were used for collecting data. The chapter furthermore sheds light on the methodology employed for gathering and analysing data. For the data to be useful in a research, the right approach should be used for it to make sense. If a wrong approach is used, the data may not serve the purpose they were intended for in the research. Therefore, this chapter looks at how the data was collected and analysed to get the most appropriate outcomes of the study. Finally, it looks at the ethical aspects considered in this study.

3.2. Research design

This study employed a qualitative approach as it aimed at an in-depth study of the phenomena of code switching in the Namibian Parliament as depicted in the parliamentary Hansards. Qualitative research collects data that will be analysed as words and it is concerned with the subjective assessment of attitudes, opinions and behaviour (Kothari, 2004). A qualitative research approach allows the researcher to study the phenomenon in its natural setting without manipulating it. Ritchie and Lewis (2013) describe a qualitative research as "a naturalistic, interpretative approach which is concerned with understanding the meanings which people attach to the phenomena (actions, decisions, beliefs, values) within their social world" (p. 3).

It is because of these underlying features that the qualitative approach was chosen for this study as the researcher sought to find out about the different patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament as depicted in the Hansards. The Parliament is a natural setting where parliamentarians code switch without the manipulation or involvement of the researcher. When

the parliamentarians code switched in Parliament as depicted in the Hansards they were not aware that the Hansards that contains their parliamentary engagements might be used to study a linguistic phenomenon such as code switching. Although Hansards are already transcribed documents of the parliamentary happenings, it is believed that the instances of code switching that are observed in the Hansards reflect the true happenings of the parliamentary sessions and they are not lost in transcription through translation.

A qualitative approach provides an in-depth and an interpreted understanding of the social world. A qualitative approach is therefore appropriate for gathering and analysing the data from the Namibian parliamentary Hansards by exploring for the instances of code switching as depicted in the Hansards. It is also important to note that, often qualitative research does not try to generalise results to large groups, but rather tries to represent the experiences, outcomes, behaviours, opinions, language and other elements about the group being studied (Lune & Berg, 2017). In this case, a qualitative approach is deemed relevant to this study of language use in the Namibian. Parliament, by more specifically looking at the linguistic phenomenon of code switching.

This study was conducted through a desktop research design as the researcher only made use of the Hansard documents to carry out the research. The researcher did not go out in the field to further probe the issue of language use in the Namibian Parliament by looking at the different patterns of code switching, but only made use of the Hansards as the sources of information and data collection instruments to carry out the research.

3.3 Population

A population or a research population as it is often referred to, is generally a collection of individuals or objects that are the main focus of a research being carried out. According to

Explorable.com (2009) a research population is also known as a well-defined collection of individuals or objects known to have similar characteristics or traits. Bhattacherjee (2012) states that a population can be defined as "all people or items (units of analysis) with the characteristics that one wishes to study" (p. 65). Therefore, the population of this study consisted of all the printed Namibian parliamentary Hansards. The Hansard is a document of the verbatim transcription of every speech event in Parliament.

3.4 Sample

When conducting research, it is usually impractical for the researcher to study an entire population and therefore the researcher draws a sample from the population which they deem representative. For this study the researcher used the non-probability method of sampling by specifically using the purposive sampling in selecting the Hansards used for data collection. With purposive sampling, the researcher intentionally selects individuals and sites, to learn or understand the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2012). In using the non-probability sampling technique, it generally implies that not every element of the population has an opportunity of being included in the sample. According to Creswell (2012) when using non-probability sampling technique, "the researcher selects the individuals because they are available, convenient and represent some characteristics that the investigator seeks to study" (p. 145). In this study, therefore, not all Hansards had a chance of being selected as some of the issues were not available as hard copies.

For this study, a total of 10 Hansards were sampled. The sample was made up of two Hansards (2015), two Hansards (2016) and six Hansards (2017). The Hansards that were selected were the ones that the researcher deemed representative enough of the Hansard population by depicting the phenomenon of code switching in the Namibian Parliament. The selection of the Hansards to

form part of the sample also depends on whether the issue of the Hansard is available to the researcher as a hard copy as some of the issues of the Hansards were out of stock and therefore they were not available for sampling. Using purposive sampling is also important in choosing the right sample for the study as some Hansards contain no instances of code switching or they only contain few instances of code switching which might limit the data of the study if such Hansards are to be chosen.

According to Lune and Berg (2017), the reason for using a sample of subjects is to make inferences about the larger population from a smaller one- the sample. Therefore, for the inference to succeed the sample needs to be a true representative of the population from where the sample is drawn. The sample of this study was determined by the judgement of the researcher by making sure that the Hansards sampled for the study really depict the phenomenon of code switching in the Namibian Parliament.

3.5 Research instruments

3.5.1 The researcher

According to Creswell (2009) the researcher is the key instrument in a qualitative study as the researcher collects the data through examining documents, observing behaviour or interviewing participants. The researcher might use different instruments for collecting data, but the researchers are the ones that eventually gather the information. As researchers, "they do not tend to use or rely on questionnaires or instruments developed by other researchers" (Creswell, 2009, p. 175).

In this study the researcher played a key role in the collection of the data as the researcher thoroughly examined the Hansards for the data on code switching that was used in the study. So, the researcher is regarded as the key instrument in the study as the researcher dictates how to

collect the data and how that data is used as intended for the study to get the desired outcomes for the study.

3.5.2 The Hansard (document)

The parliamentary Hansards were used as the research instruments in the form of documents. According to Creswell (2012), documents provide valuable information in helping the researcher to understand the central phenomena in qualitative studies. In this study the Hansards were the main sources of data collection where the instances of code switching data were collected as it occurs in the Namibian Parliament. The Hansard contains the transcription of all the verbal communications that takes place in the Parliament, from the parliamentary openings, state of the nation address, ministerial statements, question and answer sessions, the debates on different issues that are affecting the nation with the interventions and interjections, the passing of different bills until the adjournment of the parliamentary proceedings.

Using the Hansard as a research instrument was an advantage to the researcher as the researcher no longer needed to transcribe the data as it was already transcribed. As Creswell (2012) states that, documents provide an advantage of being in the language and words of the participants, who have usually given thoughtful attention to them. The documents are also ready for analysis without the necessary transcriptions that is required with observations or interviews (Cresswell, 2012, p. 223). The researcher therefore only has to identify the information needed for the research, and in this case the researcher had to identify the instances of code switching as it occurs in Parliament which is directly reflected in the Hansards. Using the Hansards as the source of data collection for the instances of code switching is effortless since the other languages that are used in Parliament apart from the official one which is English, are italicised

in the Hansard which makes it easier to identify it as an instance of code switching which is the data that is needed for the study.

The Hansards were therefore well-suited for the study of the multilingual interactions in the Parliament, since the transcriptions are annotated with the original language for each intervention. However, a disadvantage of using an already transcribed text is that during the transcription process some pauses, repetitions and other disfluencies that might be of importance to the study might be removed and therefore they are left out of the study.

3.6 Procedure

The data collection methods according to Iipinge (2013) is the procedures which a researcher uses to gather or to collect the data within the set frame of the study. For this study documentation was used as the data collection procedure. Data was drawn from 10 issues of the Namibian parliamentary Hansards. The researcher chose the Hansards that are dated from the year 2015 until 2017. These years' Hansards were chosen just for the sake of not using too outdated information.

After identifying the years of the Hansards to be used for data collection purposes, the researcher visited the Namibian Parliament to enquire on how to get hold of these documents. These documents are not restricted for public use and as such the researcher just had to state the purpose of seeking such documents in order to receive assistance from those who handle the Hansards. The researcher decided to only use the printed Hansards, as these made it easy for the researcher to skim and scan through for the instances of code switching. Random number of issues of the Hansards of the year 2015 until 2017 were acquired from the Namibian Parliament depending on their availability. The numbers of the issues were not in a consecutive order as

some issues of the Hansards were out of stock and therefore the researcher only got the issues of the Hansards that were available if they ranged between those years.

The Hansards were then manually searched for the instances of code switching. Through the manual search of code switching instances, the researcher observed the number of the instances of code switching in each Hansard to decide which Hansards to select as some Hansards rarely contain the instances of code switching, and therefore those Hansards were not considered for data collection. The instances of code switching were then transcribed to a separate document by the researcher, so that the data of code switching was separated from the rest of the Hansards transcriptions that did not contain instances of code switching for easier analysis of the data.

3.7 Data analysis

After collecting the data that was deemed sufficient from the sampled Hansards, the researcher further analysed the data using the method of content analysis. Content analysis was used to analyse the different patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament as depicted in the Hansards. According to some scholars, Berg, Latin; Leedy, Ormrod; and Neuendorf (as cited in Lune & Berg, 2017, p. 182) content analysis "is a careful, detailed, systematic examination and interpretation of a body of material in an effort to identify patterns, themes, assumptions and meanings". In this study the Hansards were the main source of data and as such they were examined for the different patterns of code switching that occur in the Namibian Parliament.

Content analysis is used for analysing any form of human communication which includes permutations of written documents, and the Hansards is a written document that contain the communications that happen in the Namibian Parliament between the parliamentarians. Therefore, content analysis is a befitting method of analysis in this study, in trying to identify the

different patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament and the function that this linguistic phenomenon provides on the framing of parliamentary discourse.

The analysis is designed to 'code' the content as data in a form that can be used to address the research questions (Lune & Berg, 2017). Content analysis is chiefly a coding operation and data interpreting process (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Bhattacherjee (2012) notes that content analysis is an intellectual process of categorising qualitative textual data into clusters of similar entities, or conceptual categories to identify consistent patterns and relationships between variables or themes (p. 120). Content analysis helped the researcher in clustering and identifying the patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament.

The data was further analysed according to the two underlying theories in this study, the Matrix Language Frame model and the Markedness Model. The Matrix Language Frame Model identifies the matrix language and the embedded language in code switching, and it was used to account for the structural aspects of code switching as it occurs in Parliament. The Markedness Model explains why code switching occurs, and therefore it was used to provide possible reasons behind code switching in the Namibian Parliament without linking these reasons to specific individuals as these are some possible reasons why people code switch in general without involving the speakers themselves to elaborate to the researcher why they code switch.

Just because Hansards were already transcribed documents, it did not mean the researcher was not to transcribe the data again. This study's main focus was on code switching in Parliament, and therefore the researcher had to identify the instances of code switching in the Hansards and transcribed them separately from the whole document as a way of collecting code switching data. The data was coded and presented under emerging themes which was informed by the reviewed

literature. The data was presented descriptively with verbatim quotations from the collected data of code switching from parliamentarians' speeches and debates.

4. Research ethics

Ethics is defined by Webster's dictionary as conformance to the standards of conduct of a given profession or group (Bhattacherjee, 2012, p. 137). Pattch and Newhart (2018) further state that ethical considerations in research are associated with matters of right and wrong when research is being conducted on people or animals (p. 32). In this study the researcher made use of the printed parliamentary Hansards which are available for public use, and as such no permission was sought.

The researcher did not use the parliamentarians' names when using the verbatim expressions where code switching was involved although the parliamentarians' names do appear in the Hansards being used. The researcher was able to identify which parliamentarians said what with the identification of their names, but the researcher instead, labeled the parliamentarians as speaker A, B or C when the data was presented with the exceptions where the name of individuals were mentioned by the speakers in the middle of their conversation where code switching occurred. The researcher did not ridicule any person involved in the parliamentary process with regards to the data of codeswitching that was collected from the Hansards. The researcher acknowledged all the sources used in the study and sought ethical clearance from the University of Namibia Research and Ethics Committee.

5. Conclusion

In this chapter, different methodology processes that were used in this study were explicated. This study used a qualitative approach with a desktop research design. Content analysis method was used along with the Matrix Language Frame model and the Markedness Model for data

analysis. The Hansards were used as the main source of data collection and finally, the ethical considerations that were considered when the study was carried out were discussed. The next chapter presents the findings of the study.

Chapter 4: Presentation of data and analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and discusses the data which was extracted from the corpus of the code-switched items from 10 issues of the Namibian Parliamentary Hansards dated between 2015 and 2017. All the extracted instances of code switching in the parliamentary submissions were verbatim as the Hansards readily contains the verbatim transcriptions of all the speech events in the Parliament. The data was extracted as natural occurring data from the conversations in Parliament without any influence from the researcher.

These data gathered from the Hansards are analysed and discussed in this chapter in trying to answer the research questions. This study sought to answer the questions such as: What are the possible reasons that influence the parliamentarians to code switch? What patterns of code switching are used in Parliament? and What function does code switching provide on the framing of parliamentary discourse? For the analysis of these data, the term code switching was used as the umbrella term for both the linguistic aspects considered either as 'code mixing' or 'code switching'.

4.2 Discussion of the observation of the data

This study sought to establish the different patterns of code switching that emerges in the Namibian Parliament, the role that code-switching plays in the framing of the discussions or the speech events in Parliament and to establish the possible reasons why the parliamentarians code switch. To answer these research questions, different themes were observed from the extracted data from the Hansards and these themes were used to analyse the data by presenting it in seven (7) categories as informed by the reviewed literature for the study. The data is presented as follows:

Category 1: Languages used for code switching in the Parliament;

Category 2: Patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament;

Category 3: Types of code switching observed;

Category 4: Markedness Model (MM);

Category 5: Matrix Language Frame model (MLF);

Category 6: Reasons and functions of code switching; and,

Category 7: Translation in the parliamentary context.

4.3 Languages used

To account for the code switching that takes place in the Namibian Parliament, it was vital to identify the languages that was used in the parliamentary discourse apart from English that accounts for the code switching that happens in Parliament. From the data that was collected different languages were observed in the Hansards. The languages that were observed include the local languages as well as some international languages.

It was observed in the Hansards that the official language, English, is the most frequently used language in the Namibian Parliament. The dominance of the use of the English language whether in speeches or written documents is evident in the Hansards as reflected in volumes 194 (23-30 March2017) and 177B (15-28 October 2015) that were at the disposal of the researcher but did not contain any single word or phrases of code switching. This shows that although the parliamentarians have an option of speaking their mother tongues or local languages in Parliament, they often opt not to, and rather stick to the official language. Furthermore, most of the parliamentary documents represented in the Hansards, such as ministerial speeches or documents were written in English. Although English dominates the Hansards, the use of other

languages was observed, which showed that the linguistic aspect of code switching does indeed occur in the Namibian Parliament.

Namibia being a multilingual country one would expect to see a variety of languages used for code switching in the Namibian Parliament. In the data collected different languages were observed. Here are some of the examples of the words, sentences or phrases of the different languages as observed in the data from the Hansards. (**NB**: Non-English words are in **bold** and the translation is written in italics)

Extract 1

(a) Afrikaans

Yes, I am- **ek slaap by die huis, nie by die werk nie jong** (*I sleep at home, not at work*). [08 April 2015, p. 89]

In extract (a) the speaker code switches from English to Afrikaans in response to a question that was posed to him by the fellow parliamentarian regarding whether they were aware of the Growth at Home Policy.

(b) Otjiherero

There is no difference between him and this person**, Twa sana atuhe** *(We are all the same),* all the probabilities are the same. [11 March 2015, p. 34]

Extract (b) is an example of code switching from English to Otjiherero. The parliamentarian uses the Otjiherero phrase in trying to explain that there is nothing special about the different ethnic descendants in Namibia, and because of that all the people should be treated the same.

(c) Oshiwambo

Honourable Chairperson, **Onda pandula** (*Thank you*) [18 April 2017, p. 217]

The Parliamentarian in the above extract (c) uses the Oshiwambo phrase to thank the Chairperson who oversaw the parliamentary session.

(d) German

Is there any other Rosa? No, Rosa Luxemburg, I will first quote in German- **"Freiheit ist immer die Freiheit des Anders denkenden"** *(Freedom is always, and exclusively freedom for the one who thinks differently) denken* is to think in the German language, and **anders** means other. [09 March 2016, p. 214]

In extract (d) German was observed to be used for code switching in the Namibian Parliament. In this extract (d) German was used for direct quotation.

(e) Khoekhoegowab

#nu, #nu, man! (*Sit down; Sit down man*!) [13 April 2017, p. 128]

In extract (e) the speaker utters words in Khoekhoegowab, to remind a fellow parliamentarian that they should take their seat and let him finish his statement.

(f) Rukwangali

Mema (*the water*) is there and we have communities living alongside the river. [18 April 2017, p. 227]

In extract (f) the speaker wanted to directly communicate to the people that live close to the river that was up for discussion, and as a result, the speaker chose to speak Rukwangali in order to show that the people he was referring to, speak Rukwangali

(g) French

Once again comrade speaker- I do not want to take too much time, I congratulate the Minister of Finance and his team for tabling the 2016/ 2017 National budget. **Merci beaucoup** (*Thank you very much*) [03 March 2016, p. 94]

In (g) French was used for code switching when the speaker ended his speech in which he was congratulating the colleagues who had set up the National budget. The speaker ends his speech by thanking the presider of the Parliamentary session for granting him permission to say something regarding the budget.

(h) Portuguese

> I would like to join my Colleagues who gave us their wisdom and stand here as **stukkend kop** (*broken head*). **Cabeça nâo trabalho! (***Head-does-not-work)* [19 March 2015, p. 363]
>
> In extract (h), the speaker uses Portuguese for code switching by translating what his nickname 'broken head' meant during war.

Extract 1 (a) to (h) shows the languages that were observed to be spoken or used in the Namibian Parliament as depicted by the data. The researcher was able to distinctively identify these eight languages from the parliamentary Hansards. The identification of the languages showed that different languages are used in the Namibian Parliament hence code switching is in inevitable.

4.3.1 Dominant languages

In collecting the data, the researcher found that the usage of different languages for the purpose of code switching in the Parliament differs significantly. Otjiherero was observed to be the most frequently used language in the Namibian Parliament. The instances of Otjiherero code switching were in a form of complete sentences, phrases or just a single word utterance. However, the frequency of the usage of the Otjiherero language does not directly correlate with the number of the first language speakers of the language in Parliament.

The data further revealed that the Oshiwambo language accounts for the second most used language for code switching in the Parliament. However, the instances of code switching that are in Oshiwambo were observed to be more in the form of single word utterances and phrases rather than complete sentences as in the case of the Otjiherero language.

The data also further revealed that Afrikaans is also commonly used for code switching in the Namibian Parliament. Often, Afrikaans is seen to compete with English as it is mostly used in many formal settings in Namibia. The researcher further found out that sometimes when Afrikaans was spoken in Parliament, it acted as the host language or the Matrix language as described by Myers-Scotton (1993b) (see 2.7.1). The data also revealed that the languages that dominate the linguistic aspect of code switching in Parliament are the ones that are considered as local languages by many Namibians and as such, they are widely spoken in Namibia. The researcher also found it important to note that not all the parliamentarians that code switched in these dominant languages are fluent speakers or users of these languages, but it was observed that they make use of words, phrases or sentences in these languages that they know without being fluent speakers of those languages.

4.3.2 Other languages

Although the Otjiherero, Oshiwambo and Afrikaans languages were observed to be dominantly used by parliamentarians for code switching, it is different when it comes to the usage of other languages such as Khoekhoegowab, Rukwangali, German, French and Portuguese that were as well observed in the data.

The following extract (2) shows a rare example of the use of Khokhoegowab in the parliamentary discourse as displayed in the Hansard.

Extract 2

> But the building will remain the national asset of the Nation, let us not deny the right of owning national assets to the Nation. In conclusion, Honourable Speaker- **!Gǿi tu bahe-hǿ /Ninis gera /Gana…Ne !hub #gae-#guis ge !igǿiba !oa ge daba tsi datse khao-oa tite ai sa oa /gui ni /gei.** *[9 March 2016, p. 226]*

Extract 2 shows some sentences and phrases that were identified in the data to have been spoken in Khoekhoegowab. Khoekhoegowab as a language, although it is spoken in Parliament by some parliamentarians it is hardly used, and on this occasion, it was found to only have been used a number of times considering the number of Hansards used for the collection of data. As detected from the data, the researcher observed that on both occasions that Khoekhoegowab was spoken in Parliament, it was only spoken by the same parliamentarian although it was used on separate occasions.

Rukwangali as a local language has quite a number of first language speakers in the Parliament but it was only found to have been used on two occasions to refer to water (**Mema**) and to also say, 'Thank you' (**Mpandu**). So, the impact of the usage of Rukwangali as a local language in the Namibian Parliament is quite minimum as revealed by the data.

Other languages such as German, French and Portuguese that were also observed to be least used in the Namibian Parliament were also identified in the data extracted from a corpus drawn from the issues of the Namibian parliamentary Hansard. These languages are hardly noticed to have no contribution to the parliamentary discourse as the parliamentarians do not make use of them as often as they use the other languages. German was identified in the data to have been used for

quoting by the parliamentarians and both French and Portuguese were used in saying common phrases in these two languages that most speakers could be able to understand. Here are the examples of how these three languages were used by parliamentarians as identified in the Hansard corpus.

(1) **"Freiheit ist immer die Freiheit des Anders denkenden"** (German)

(2) **Merci beaucop** (French)

(3) **Cabeca nao trabalho**! (Portuguese)

The above examples from (1-3) show how the three languages, German, French and Portuguese were used by parliamentarians in the parliamentary discourse for code switching. With German the speaker quoted, and they immediately translated what they were saying into English for other parliamentarians that could not understand what they said. These were the exact words used by the speaker in translating the German phrase, "*denken* is to think in the German language, and *anders* means other. In English- Freedom is always, and exclusively freedom for the one who thinks differently". In the instance where Portuguese was used no translation was provided by the speaker. When French was used, it was used in conjunction with other languages, *Merci beaucoup, mbatja dankie*, thank you very much, *okuhepa!* So, the speaker did not need to translate what they said.

It was very important for this research to identify the different types of languages that are used in the Namibian Parliament in order to be able to identify whether local languages are even used by parliamentarians in Parliament for the purpose of code switching considering that Namibia only has English as the official language and that the constitution makes provision for other languages to be used in Parliament. The results showed that different languages are used in the Namibian Parliament. By identifying the different languages that are used in the Namibian Parliament the

researcher found that the frequency of usage of these different languages differs very much. The data showed that although all these languages are used in the Namibian Parliament all the speeches and documents are written in English and therefore, the researcher concludes that the usage of other languages in Parliament are mostly verbal. The findings therefore, revealed that a minimum of local languages are used in the Namibian Parliament which is not reflective of the multi-lingual communities that live in Namibia. It is evident from the data that parliamentarians still prefer the usage of the English as the official language more than the use of other languages in Parliament which leads to code switching.

4.3 Patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament

To ascertain that the linguistic phenomenon of code switching does indeed take place in the Namibian Parliament, this category was vital in identifying the patterns of code switching that occurs in Parliament as displayed in the parliamentary Hansards.

The Hansards used for the collection of data contain all the events that take place in the Namibian Parliament, from speeches which are more formal that are mainly written, and the debates and discussions that happen in Parliament that can be considered as less formal as topics are up for discussions and every parliamentarian can air their views. The Parliament being an official setting, one would expect that only the official language which is English, is used in the parliamentary discourse. Looking at some Hansards, one would even think that code switching does not at all occur in the Namibian Parliament, but the findings revealed that code switching is used in the Namibian Parliament as a strategy of communication by the Parliamentarians.

The researcher observed from the collected data that most of the parliamentary discourses are mainly discussed in the English language which acts as the unmarked code choice (see 2.2), which shows that the parliamentarians mostly make use of English which is the official language

of the country that is supposed to be used in most of the official settings. Although the usage of the English language dominates the parliamentary discourse, this does not stop parliamentarians from using other languages which leads to the linguistic phenomenon of code switching. The following are some of the examples that were taken from different discussions in Parliament that have the elements of code switching.

(4) There is no difference between him and this person, **Twa sana atuhe** (*we are all the same*), all probabilities are the same. *[11 March 2015, p. 34]*

(5) It agrees with the language of Von Trotha that if you find an armed or unarmed Herero with or without arms, child or woman, you must push them to their people. **Kalese otji marihee!** (*That is what it implies go and tread it*). Where are you pushing the ancestors that you are coming with? Where are you pushing them to? To hell or to heaven? It is illegal, it is uncalled for; it is shameful, and it's a shame- **Mave nyanda ku naami mba** (*they are playing with me here*). *[11 March 2015, p. 33]*

(6) I was young, but today, some people are asking us -who are you? **Owa dja peni ano?** (*where are you from?*) I think this must come to an end. [*19 April 2017, p. 126*]

(7) **Asseblief tog** (*please*), my mother, we need to use the money to follow up on corruption cases, not to sit comfortably with Tv's and whatever in our offices. [*31 March 2017, p. 92*]

Examples (4-7) all show that the linguistic aspect of code switching does occur in the Namibian Parliament. The examples also show that English is the unmarked code in the parliamentary discourse, while the other languages are the marked code choices when code switching occurs in Parliament. The examples depict a picture of how parliamentarians code switch, either in the middle of the sentence, to start a new sentence or even to start a different sentence in different languages. So, the researcher observed that code switching can either occur from English to the

other languages, or from the other languages into English. Therefore, code switching can be observed in the Namibian Parliament.

4.4 Types of code switching observed

In order to answer the research question about the patterns of code switching that are used in the Namibian Parliament, it was very important for the researcher to observe the data and identify the different patterns of code switching by identifying the types of code switching that occur in the Namibian Parliament.

In the literature of code switching, Milroy and Muysken (see 2.3) distinguishes between three types of code switching. The three types of code switching are inter-sentential, intra-sentential and tag switching (2.3.1- 2.3.3). From the observation of the data all the three types of code switching were observed, and the researcher further observed that the types of code switching in the Namibian Parliament vary considerably in terms of frequency of occurrence. The data collected was grouped into the three types of code switching and the frequency of occurrence of each type of code switching was determined by numerically counting the code-switched phrases and utterances under each type of code switching to determine the difference of occurrence of these types of code switching in the Namibian Parliament. The data revealed that intra-sentential code switching was the most frequent type of code switching that was used by the parliamentarians, tag switching was the second and inter-sentential switching was the least type of code switching used in the Namibian Parliament.

The different types of code switching are discussed in detail as observed in the data from the Namibian Parliament.

4.4.1 Intra-sentential code switching

As mentioned in Chapter 2 (see 2.3.2), intra-sentential code switching takes place when the switch occurs within a single discourse, between two different languages. This type of code switching occurs within a clause or sentence boundary. In this section, the findings of the data collected on intra-sentential code switching are discussed as it is the most frequently type of code switch identified in the data collected on code switching in the Namibian Parliament. Examples extracted from the data are presented and discussed below. (Note: translation not in brackets, was translated by the speakers themselves and translation done by the transcribers of the Hansards are italicised in bracket).

Example 8 shows an example of the use of intra-sentential code switching in Parliament to complete an English utterance.

(8) I will call you to stand to attention, you must be careful **verstaan jy**? (*do you understand?) [31March 2017, p. 77]*

The speaker starts to speak in English and then ends off the sentence by uttering the Afrikaans phrase (**verstaan jy**?). The speaker utters these words as a way of showing his annoyance with the other member of Parliament that seems not to give him his attention, and as a result the speaker used the Afrikaans phrase that is in a question format, although the speaker did not really expect to get an answer back. If the speaker would have used the English phrase '*do you understand*' it would have been more of a statement and it would not have the same impact as using the Afrikaans phrase. So, this example shows how intra-sentential code switching was used in Parliament. The following example 9 shows intra-sentential code switching by using a pronoun.

(9) From the Estimates of Revenue, Income and Expenditure on page 22. We are budgeting for them every year. Why are we doing this? Are we waiting for the **Niggie** to come [**Niggie** (*Niece*) – **Neef** (*Nephew*)] [*31 March 2017, p. 81*]

This example was taken from the discussion in Parliament at the committee stage where the parliamentarians were discussing and posing their questions to different ministers regarding the allocation of the budget to the different sectors. This example was the question of one of the parliamentary members to the minister about the government programme called NEEF. The word **Niggie** is an Afrikaans word used to refer to one's niece as translated above. However, in this instance one can see that the use of the word **Niggie** was used to sarcastically mock the programme called New Equitable Economic Empowerment Framework (NEEF) as the speaker did not really see the purpose of allocating money to this programme that was yielding no good results. So, the speaker code switched from English to Afrikaans by inserting the Afrikaans noun "Niggie" because it is closely related to the acronym NEEF which is pronounced the same as the pronoun "**Neef**" in the Afrikaans language which is translated as nephew in English. This is also a way in which intra-sentential code switching can be used. In example 10 the speaker ode switches in order to seek clarity about what the fellow parliamentarian said.

(10) Please; I rose here for you to explain to me, so just explain that scenario- **mbi puratene, okutjavi hapo?!** (*so that I can understand, what is it*?!) *[27 April 2017, p. 407]*

The above example shows the alternation of English and the Otjiherero language as one of the most used language for code switching in the Namibian Parliament. The speaker wants some clarification of what the other speaker said, and to emphasise that they do not understand the scenario that the fellow parliamentarian is explaining the speaker uses the Otjiherero phrase to show that he will be paying attention to the explanation of the scenario as he personally did not

understand. The use of the Otjiherero phrase draws attention from the speaker that needs to explain the scenario clearly for the understanding of the parliamentarian that made the statement. The use of the pronoun '**mbi**' (I) also draws attention to that single speaker rather than the rest of the parliamentarians that are also in Parliament. Intra-sentential code switching was also observed to be used for quotation as in example 11 in order to bring humour into a conversation.

(11) I have heard some people say GRN stands for **Gaan Rhy Net** (*just drive*) (laughter)

In this example the speaker code switched because the speaker was talking about what he heard from other people. Through quoting what other people said, he used the same language as the people that uttered the phrase in order to keep its originality because he really wanted to make a point of how people refer to the government. By quoting, the speaker invoked the reaction of laughter from the audience giving the usage of code switching in this instance a humorous function, that would have been not the case if the speaker did not quote the code-switched phrase.

(12) Honourable Deputy speaker, may I ask my Honourable **Mbushe**, a question? [12 March 2015, p. 112]

In this instance the speaker code switched by inserting an Oshiwambo pronoun "Mbushe". The word translated into English means *namesake*. So, in this instance the addresser uses the word "Mbushe" to refer to the addressee that he wants to pose the question to, in order to show solidarity that they share the same name. *Mbushe* is a popular word among the Oshiwambo speaking people that they use it for calling or to refer to someone that they share the same name with, without mentioning their name. The use of this word by the speaker also shows that they know their addressee to some extent and they are not total strangers. The following example 13

also shows intra-sentential code switching by starting an utterance with a single word of a language that is different from the language that is spoken to complete the whole utterance.

(13) **Mwameme** (Brother) do not hide the truth, because when we hide the truth, it looks as if we are sanctioning these things. When we have a problem with ourselves, let us deal with the problem. [*15 March 2017, p. 297*]

This example illustrates intra-sentential code switching whereby the marked choice starts the sentence, by an insertion of a single word and the rest of the sentence is spoken in the unmarked choice. The use of this kind of intra-sentential code switching can be associated as a way of a speaker trying to get their addressees' attention, by starting a sentence in a language that is less expected in a situation or setting. The parliamentarians were not expecting this speaker to start with the Oshiwambo word '*mwameme*' which although translated in the Hansard as referring to '*brother*' it is generally used to refer to anyone that one considers as a sibling. It is also a friendly word to soften the situation and not get much retaliation from your addressee as by uttering that word you are depicting to them that you regard them as your family.

In this example the speaker code switches in order to insert a noun in the utterance.

(14) I know it is **omagongo** time. During **omagongo** time, people are being pardoned, even if they violate of rules here. [*2 March 2017, p. 374*]

Example 14 shows intra-sentential code switching being used by inserting an Oshiwambo noun "' *'omagongo'* into both the English phrase as well as the sentence. In this instance the word 'omagongo' is repeated as it is the name given to the traditional marula wine that is made from the marula fruits. So, the speaker code switches only to mention the type of drink he is referring to by using the familiar word they know, rather than translating it into English. In example 15 the

speakers involved in the conversation directly inserts words in their sentences, which is classified as intra-sentential code switching.

(15) **Speaker A**: My uncle is saying the **efundja** will pass, but I think they are destroying quite a number of species in the flood water.

Speaker B: Let me start with the **Kashushus**- the soil fish that comes with the floods or the **efundjas**, as they say. It is a very difficult issue or situation for us to exercise monitoring controls or surveillance. I was in the Ohangwena Region, I saw people catching this fish from the **efundjas** or flood waters coming from Angola. *[19 April 2017, p. 107]*

In the last example of the intra-sentential code switching, there are two speakers involved in the conversation. Firstly, speaker A, code switches by inserting the Oshiwambo word '*efundja*' in the first clause of their sentence, which if translated to English would mean the same as the last phrase 'flood water' that ended the sentence. Although, the speaker knew the English words used to refer to '*efundja*' the speaker initially preferred to use the vernacular language as during the rainy season when there are flood waters troubling different communities in Namibia, the word '*efundja*' is used to refer to the flood waters, and without even any translation even the non-Oshiwambo speakers would exactly understand, what is meant by 'efundja'.

In response to what speaker A said, speaker B tries to give a response and therefore, code switches from English to Oshiwambo in the middle of the sentences by using the words such as '*Kashushus'* and *'efundjas*' which are nouns. These words used by the speaker are recognised to be part of the Oshiwambo language although in this instance the speaker adds the English suffix -s to each word for the words to sound as part of the English grammar which is the unmarked choice for the interaction. The speakers in this example both notices that they are code switching,

that is why they both self-translated the code-switched items into English to make it easier for other parliamentarians that could perhaps not have understood the non-English words.

These are the few examples that were extracted from the data that was collected from the Hansards. It is important to note that the occurrence of the intra-sentential code switching in Parliament occurs differently depending on the speakers that are involved, although this type of code switching only occurs within a sentence or clause level.

4.4.2 Inter-sentential code switching

This is the second type of code switching that was identified in the Hansard corpus as used in the Namibian Parliament by the parliamentarians. Compared to Intra-sentential and Tag switching, this type of code switching occurs only a few times in the data, making it the least type of code switching used in Parliament. Inter-sentential code switching denotes to the switching that occurs between two linguistic codes at the clause or sentence level (see 2.4). The speaker should be able to follow the rules of both languages that they use, so this type of code switching is used by speakers that are fluent in both languages that they are using. From the observation of the data, the researcher observed that this type of code switching majority of the times occurred from English into the other languages. The following are some of the examples as extracted from the data as forms of inter-sentential code switching in the parliamentary discourse. Inter-sentential code switching involves two languages being spoken by one speaker in the same utterance, but each language is used for a different phrase or sentence and this is shown in example 16.

(16) I can even look at her and speak through her and I am currently speaking through her. **Mbuae tjiri, tjiri, mamu moroza oruveze ruandje** (*You are really wasting my time*). [*5 April 2017, p. 324*]

In example 16, the speaker code switched from English to Otjiherero. The parliamentarian's first sentence that is in English, is being sarcastic by stating that they are speaking through the other member of Parliament. So, the switch into Otjiherero which is translated as *you are really wasting my time* shows a change of tone in the speakers' voice, it is showing that the speaker is serious now and would like to continue with his speech without interruptions from the other parliamentarian that is wasting his time by intervening in the speakers' speech. Inter-sentential code switching in the Namibian Parliament occurs in different languages and example 17 is one of the examples that depicts one of the languages used by parliamentarians for inter-sentential code switching.

(17) I see that you are becoming better now. **Onda pandula mmati gwandje!** (Laughter)

[27 April 2017, p. 369]

Example 17, also serves as an example of inter-sentential code witching with the switch from English to Oshiwambo. The English clause serves as a compliment that the speaker is extending to the fellow parliamentarian which is then ended with an Oshiwambo clause translated as "*Am thankful my boy*" which envokes laughter from the rest of the Parliamentarians as the speaker is not a fluent Oshiwambo speaker and to refer to another member of Parliament as 'my boy' is hilarious and it is seen as un-parliamentary. Inter-sentential code switching can occur as a continuation of the same subject being discussed by the same speaker in two languages as indicated in example 18.

(18) I cannot hear you. **Yera eraka** (*speak louder*). [*8 March 2016, p. 117*]

Example 18, shows another instance of inter-sentential code switching whereby the speaker also switches from English to Otjiherero. In this instance, although the speaker uses two different languages the Otjiherero phrase **yera eraka** *(speak louder)* echoes or continues the speakers first

clause in English that they cannot hear and as such the speaker then requests the fellow parliamentarian to speak louder. When parliamentarians code switch, it can be voluntarily or involuntarily. Example 19 shows an example of inter-sentential code switching as being involuntarily as the speaker directly quotes what was said in a different language.

(19) Let me quote an sms from the Republikein dated 28 January 2016, from a frustrated customer. "**Wat gaan aan by Telecom? My Internet- Wi-Fi konneksie werk al vir 3 weke nie. Ek maak 20 oproepe per dag, maar daar is geen 'Technisians' om my te help nie, swakste diens in Namibia**." [*1 March 2016, p. 10*]

In the final example 19 of inter-sentential code switching the researcher also observed from the extracted data from the Hansard that inter-sentential code switching can also occur in Parliament because of quotation. This example depicts inter-sentential code switching from English to Afrikaans. The quotation in the example was read out by the member of Parliament as it occurs in the Republikein newspaper. It is considered as inter-sentential code switching as the speaker firstly makes their statement in English before reading the quote from the newspaper. The Republikein newspaper is predominantly an Afrikaans written newspaper. As the quotation was extracted from the Hansard, the speaker that read out the quotation did not translate what the quotation meant, also the transcribers of the Hansards did not provide the translation for this quotation. Translated this quotation means: *What is going on at Telecom? My internet – WIFI connection are all not working for three weeks. I make twenty calls per day, but there are no technicians to help me, boring living in Namibia*. The parliamentarian quotes this customer in order to show how frustrated this customer is with Telecom in order for the parliamentarian to show the slow pace at which Namibia is moving when it comes to technology, and also the service delivery by Telecom as a national telecommunication service provider. The quotation

intensifies the picture that the speaker is trying to show of the customer service at this organisation.

All the examples 16-19 show that, inter-sentential code switching in the data collected only occurred from English to other languages. The findings revealed that although it is stated that in order for a speaker to make use of inter-sentential code switching, they should have fluency in both languages, this is not the case in the Namibian Parliament as speakers do make use of languages that they only have a certain level of competency without being fluent speakers.

4.4.3 Tag switching

As the third type of code switching identified by Poplack (1980), tag switching was observed to be the second most commonly used type of code switching in the Namibian Parliament as depicted by the data collected. Tag switching involves inserting a tag or short phrase in one language into an utterance that is entirely uttered in a different language (see 2.5). Given the definition of tag switching, it is easy to confuse tag switching with intra-sentential code switching but in this research the researcher considered the use of single words or short phrases from other languages that was tagged in a conversation that was entirely in a different language as the examples for tag switching. The use of exclamation marks was also used as an effortless way to identify tag switching. The following are some of the examples as extracted from the collected data. Example 21 depicts tag switching in the middle of a sentence.

(21) However, our bank here is; this paper, this paper, that paper and then the fellow comes- I even decided **kutja** (*that*) I am taking you to the farm. I put him in my private car, drove him there and said **tara**, look, look! I came back…(intervention) [*18 April 2017, p. 228*]

In the above example (21) of tag switching the speaker uses two Oshiwambo tags in the middle of English sentences. The first tag '**kutja'** is used as a connector between the two English

clauses while the second tag word '**tara**' is used as an exclamation in association with repetition of the same word in English as a way of translating the tag word. The use of the tag word as an exclamation draws immediate attention from the audience in order for them to continue listening to what the speaker is narrating. In example 22 the speaker uses the tag word right at the beginning of the utterance.

(22) **Iyaloo!** Rumour mongers! [*23 February 2017, p. 226*]

This tag switching is identified as an Oshiwambo to English tag switching, because the Oshiwambo exclamation **Iyaloo**! was used first before the English exclamation "*rumour mongers!*'. This double use of exclamations in the Parliament are not quite common although they are used by the parliamentarians in some instances. In this instance, the speaker uses tag switching to show his astonishment to the behaviours of the other parliamentarians. Using tag switching in a conversation can also be influenced by the speakers that are involved in the conversation and example 23 shows how the parliamentarian uses a tag word to code switch in order to agree with what was previously said by the other speaker.

(23) **Ii!** (*yes!*) it is a process- we must know what the parents did, *ah* (intervention)

The example above is considered as a switch from Otjiherero to English. The word "Ii" in this clause is an Otjiherero tag word that is used in an entirely English clause which makes it to be identified as a tag switching. It can be observed from the example that '*Ii*!' is used as an exclamation that is emphasising the speakers' response in agreeing to what was said by another speaker. The exclamation '**Ii!'** is translated as *yes*! in English. From the collected data it was observed that most of the tag words that are used for code switching in the Namibian Parliament are from other languages and not English. However, only the example 24 contained an English tag word, as the phrase was uttered in Afrikaans.

(24) **Die Groot Trekkers**, *yes*. [*11 March 2015, p. 22*]

This example can be identified as an Afrikaans to English code switching. This example as a form of tag switching uses the English tag word '**yes**' at the end of the Afrikaans phrase. The Afrikaans words die Groot Trekkers in this instance is a proper noun that refers to a group of trekkers from different countries translated as the Big Trekkers. The speaker in this instance confirms the name of the trekkers that was said by another speaker, so this speaker repeats what was said, and then adds the English tag to agree. From the corpus this was the only English tag word used. Tag switching was also observed to have been used by parliamentarians for pleading with the fellow parliamentarians as shown in example 25.

(25) Stop wasting money on the failed Mass Housing Project**, asseblief** (*please*).

[*16 March 2017, p. 394*]

This is an example of tag switching from English to Afrikaans. In this example the Afrikaans tag is used at the end of the English clause in order for the speaker to emphasise the point they are trying to make. In this instance, the speaker is emphasising to the fellow parliamentarians that money should stop being wasted on the failed Mass Housing Project and the speaker's choice of tag implores for understanding from the fellow parliamentarians as the word '**asseblief**' translated as *please* in English which is used for begging someone. Tag switching can also occur as a result of quoting or saying a common phrase or statement as in example 26.

(26) Those who have invested locally in properties and in bonds can attest that returns have been better here at home. As the saying goes, "*local*" is indeed "**lekker.**"

[*9 March 2016, p. 199*]

Example 26, shows tag switching in a form of a quote. In this example the speakers phrase is in English, but because the speaker is referring to the widely used Afrikaans phrase "**local is**

lekker" they code switched. Although the speaker makes use of the English word 'local' the speaker still maintains the Afrikaans word 'lekker' making it to be identified as an Afrikaans tag in the English Phrase. The phrase in the example, if translated would mean '*local is indeed nice'*. The use of well-known phrases or words in a certain language can lead to code switching and, in this example, it can also be identified as tag switching. In example 27, the speaker uses tag switching in order to ask a question.

(27) **Wazuu?** -did you hear? (*Laughter*) [*9 March 2016, p. 227*]

The last example of tag switching is in the form of a tag question posed in Otjiherero. It is tag switching because the question is posed in Otjiherero then in English although making it a repetition of the same tag question. It is a rhetorical question that the parliamentarian asks, in order to get a response whether the other parliamentarians heard what the speaker said. This tag question, evokes laughter in Parliament as other parliamentarians know why the speaker is asking in such a way. The tag question was asked after one of the parliamentarians addressed the house using the vernacular language, so the speaker in the above example uses a tag question to ask if the fellow parliamentarians understood what was uttered.

Although Al Heeti and Al Abdelys' (2016) findings revealed that the Iraqi doctors used tag code switching the least although it is easily incorporated in the sentence it was observed to be the opposite for this study as tag code switching was the second most used type of code switching in the Namibian Parliament. Since this type of code switching occurs easily because it involves minimal syntactic restrictions, it can be attributed to the reason that the parliamentarians do often make use of this type of switching. Tags can be used almost anywhere in the conversation or speech without violating any grammatical rules. Therefore, parliamentarians are at ease when using this type of code switching. Tag switching in the Namibian Parliament was observed to be

used by parliamentarians mostly for interjections, interventions and for emphasising. The findings also revealed that although a number of exclamations and interjections were identified in the corpus, they were made in other languages, but they did not depict the linguistic phenomenon of code switching as they were used as single words or phrases on their own, they were not tagged into a different language conversation.

The next categories (4.5- 4.6) discussed, are the theoretical frame works used for the analysis of the collected data as informed by the reviewed literature.

4.5 Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model

This unit of analysis focused on the data that showed how the languages that are involved in code switching in Parliament are used in the conversations by the parliamentarians. The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model identifies the language that sets the syntax and the grammar of the sentence (Myers- Scotton, 1993b) (see 2.7.1). This model identifies the languages involved in code switching one being the Matrix language and the other language as the Embedded language. The Matrix language is the dominant language in the utterance, and this language contributes more abstractly to the structure. The embedded language contributes less to the abstract structure and therefore it is the language that is inserted into the Matrix language

The findings revealed that English is the dominant language used in the Namibian Parliament by the parliamentarians and therefore it is identified as the matrix language in most of the instances of code switching in the Namibian Parliament, while the other languages are the embedded languages. From the observation of the data collected, the following are some of the examples that are used to explain the phenomenon of the matrix and the embedded languages as the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model entails.

Examples

(28) At the funeral you would find the plates of meat, then you would hear, **ovarumendu kave yaria** (*the men have not eaten*). Whether you are the Prime Minister or not, you will wait for your turn. [*24 February 2016, p. 316*]

(29) I then decided to get this Ovambo stamp- **Okakarata**, that would enable one to look for work. [*19 March 2015, p. 364*]

(30) It is quite very urgent, my mother, **meme gwandje**. [*9 March 2016, p. 176*]

(31) Yes, I am- **ek slap by die huis, nie by die werk nie jong** (*I sleep at home, not at work*). [*8 April 2015, p. 89*]

(32) However, I honestly speaking, respect Comrade Kazenambo Kazenambo **tjinene uriri** (very much). **Omuano mbo omundu tjeripura kutja tjimatu hakaene ozongomi ndumazeumbwa** (*to the contrary, one would expect that when we meet we would be exchanging blows*). [*19 March 2015, p. 372*]

In the above examples insertional code switching occurs because lexical items from one language is inserted into the structure of another language. In example 28-30, English is the matrix language as the utterances contain more English morphemes than the morphemes in the other languages. In example 28, English is the matrix language while Otjiherero is the embedded language. In both examples 29 and 30, English is the matrix language while Oshiwambo is the embedded language. These examples 28-30 are the most common type of code switching that occurs in the Namibian Parliament that is accounted for by the MLF model whereby English dominates most of the parliamentary discourses, making English to be the matrix language of most of the code-switched instances that occur in Parliament.

In example 31-32, English is the embedded language as the utterances are dominated by other languages. In example 31, Afrikaans is the matrix language as it dominates the utterance and English is the embedded language. Similar to example 31, English is also the embedded language while the Otjiherero language is the matrix language of the conversation when code switching occurred. This code-switched instance whereby English is the embedded language as revealed in the collected data are very rare in the Namibian Parliament. The findings therefore revealed that the rare occurrence of English as the embedded language is because most of the parliamentarians use English as the dominant language in their interactions in Parliament. Although, code switching occurs in Parliament, English sets the grammatical and the syntactical structures in the parliamentary discourses.

4.6 Markedness Model (MM)

According to the Markedness Model, all the linguistic choices are indications of the social negotiation of rights and obligations that exist between participants in a conversation, and this phenomenon applies to code switching as well (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). The status of the people involved in the conversation, the topic of discussion and the setting also plays a role on the linguistic choice of the people involved in the conversation. So, the linguistic choice is chosen or used when it is regarded as appropriate for the conversation, situation or topic. For this research the appropriateness of the linguistic choice depended only on one setting, which is the Parliament, but the status of those involved in the conversation differed as some of the members of Parliament are ministers, while others are just members of Parliament from different political parties. The research findings concur with the Markedness Model theory that the speaker is aware of the normal (unmarked) language that is expected to be used in the interaction, but the speakers make their choice based on the cost and benefit phenomenon. This theory being used to

identify the speakers' motivation of choosing one language over the other in a conversation, helped the researcher in identifying some of the possible reasons behind code switching in the Namibian Parliament by looking at the data that was collected from the Hansards.

It was observed from the collected data that code switching occurred in a conversation that is in a dialogue format b. Myers- Scotton (1993a) states that code switching, and the use of different linguistic codes can be unmarked if both the audience and the speaker expect it and they agree that there should be code switching. If there is such an agreement between the speaker and the audience, then code switching will be an unmarked choice and therefore it does not have any motivation in such a case. The absence of code switching in such a situation would be the marked choice. This code-switching phenomenon was observed in the collected data in the form of a dialogue between two parliamentarians. Although this was observed in the data the researcher observed that it was a very rare occurrence. Here is the extract that depicts code switching as the unmarked choice;

Extract 3

Speaker A: I heard the lady who just posed a question, Madam //Gowases was speaking Afrikaans and I want to say that, if you go to other countries, in Afrikaans- **die vleis smaak soos 'n lap. Daar is geen smaak nie, jy kan sous insit, of wat insit, maar dit smaak net soos 'n lap. 'N mens kan dit nie eet nie. So, ons het die beste vleis!** For those who never had the opportunity to study Afrikaans **die bombastiese taal**

*Speaker B***: Afrikaans die lewende taal!**

*Speaker A***: Afrikaans die lewende taal,** yes.

*Speaker B***: Afrikaans ons Moeder Taal!**

Speaker A: **Nie ons Moeder Taal nie, ander mense se Moeder Taal.**

[1 March 2016, p. 15-16]

In the above extract code switching is depicted as an unmarked code choice since the speaker indicates to the audience that they are going to code switch by switching to Afrikaans. The two speakers involved in the conversation therefore continue to converse in Afrikaans as expected by the audience. However, when the speakers use the phrases and the tag word 'yes' from English, then English becomes the marked code choice as it was used in the middle of the conversation that was in Afrikaans. As observed in the data, in such a case Afrikaans becomes the unmarked code choice, while English the marked choice.

The findings on the Markedness model reveal that the languages used for code switching is not only marked when it is unexpected, but it can also be marked when it is expected but the speaker uses it with a discourse function and a motivation in mind and this can be observed in the data especially in the form of interjections, interventions, quoting and idiomatic expressions. In such instances it is observed that the parliamentarians choose to code switch in order to leave an utmost effect on the audience without putting in much effort in what they are saying. The data used for the analysis of the Markedness model were observed to be in the form of monologues in which the researcher observed that code switching in Parliament takes place more in monologues than in dialogues and as a result the speaker most of the times has the power over the audience and they make their own choice of which languages to use when code switching. The findings further revealed that there is more linguistic negotiation in dialogues than in monologues in the parliamentary setting.

The following category discussed and analysed the reasons for code switching in the Namibian Parliament as depicted by the collected data.

4.7 Reasons for code switching in Parliament

This part of the research sought to answer the research question about the possible reasons that influence the parliamentarians to code switch as well as the functions that code switching provide on the framing of the parliamentary discourse (see 2.6). As stated in the reviewed literature, there seem to be no difference between the functions of code switching and the reasons of code switching. Therefore, reasons of code switching were used as the umbrella term to refer to what some authors would refer to as functions of code switching while others would refer to the exact same thing as reasons for code switching. For this study 12 possible reasons were proposed as identified by Poplack (1980), Holmes (2001) and Smit (2011) (see 2.6.1). Although 12 reasons were proposed for this study, only some reasons were observed in the corpus of the study. The following are the possible reasons and some of the examples that influence parliamentarians to code switching as observed in the corpus.

4.7.1 Code switching to soften or strengthen a request

The researcher observed from the data that most of the times code switching is used in Parliament to soften or strengthen a request. Given the parliamentary setting, the parliamentarians engage with each other and in the process, they make requests, air their opinions and make different suggestions for different things that are discussed in Parliament and therefore for them to be polite when making different requests it was observed that parliamentarians code switch instead. This function of code switching was observed to be used by the speakers in order to reinforce their request when they felt that their fellow parliamentarians were not paying much attention, or they were requesting immediate attention from the parliamentarians when there was an intervention in the middle of their speech. Example

33 and 34 indicate how the speakers code switch for the reason of either softening or strengthening a request in the Namibian Parliament.

Examples

(33) Yes, we need to look at how we must support infrastructure development on these farms, and I agree with you that there is a dependency syndrome that has developed in our country and we want government to do everything. **Ohoromende ngai tare nawa imbo** or **Epangelo nali talepo nawa** (*the Government must look into that*) So we have all these challenges. [6 April 2017, p. 133]

(34) I will allow you to have your say but let me have my way. **Kurama uriri – just wait. Kurama katiti uriri,** I will allow you to have your say, let me have my way.

[10 March 2016, p. 247]

In example (33) code switching is being used to strengthen a request. The speaker in that example code switches from English to Otjiherero and Oshiwambo in order to strenghten what they are saying. The speaker is trying to make a point that the government should look into to the situation that is creating the dependency syndrome and to reinforce this request they code switch which draws more attention to what they are saying.

However, in example 34 the speaker code switches from English to Otjiherero in trying to soften their request. In this example, the speaker is trying to be polite in requesting fellow parliamentarians to not disrupt them in the middle of their speech. Therefore, code switching in these two examples depicts that parliamentarians code switch for the functions of softening and strengthening their request in Parliament.

4.7.2 Code switching to make an interjection (inserting sentence fillers)

Code switching to make an interjection in Parliament was observed to be very prevalent in the collected data. It was observed that in most cases when the parliamentarians interject, they use other languages and not English. Interjection in Parliament was observed to be part of the parliamentary discourse as most of the parliamentarians interrupt other speakers while speaking. The following are some of the examples as observed in the data.

(35) *Speaker A*: I do not want to mention those places because of the sensitivity of the matter.

Speaker B: **Veraera!** (Tell them!) [*9 March 2017, p. 174*]

(36) *Speaker A*: I therefore, thank you very much Honourable Members. Silence means consent.

Speaker B: **Iyaloo!** [*15 March 2017, p. 348*]

In both examples 35 and 36, code switching was used for interjection. What was observed from data is that, when code switching was used for interjection, two speakers were involved in the conversation and the speaker that interjected was the one that code switched or uttered words from a different language than that of the first speaker in the conversation. Interjection in Parliament was observed to be part of the parliamentary discourse as parliamentarians used interjections very often in their parliamentary sessions whether for encouraging other parliamentarians, agreeing to what the other parliamentarians had said or for interrupting their fellow parliamentarians in the middle of their speeches.

4.7.3 Code switching as a sign of respect

Parliament is an official setting and it is therefore important that parliamentarians show respect to each other whether they agree or disagree on different issues that are being discussed. When

code switching is used as a sign of respect by the parliamentarians, it was observed that it was mostly used in the form of titles that are deemed as a sign of showing respect in a certain language.

The corpus yielded mostly the titles from the Oshiwambo language such as **Tate** (*Father*), **Meme** (*Mother*) and a single instance of the titles **Tate kulu** (*grandfather*) and **Meme kulu** (*grandmother*) were used to refer to the elderly that get pension. The use of the Otjiherero title **Mitiri (***Mr***)** and the Afrikaans **Meneer** (*Mr*) were each only observed to have been used once in the Parliament as observed from the corpus. The use of these titles in Parliament although they are in different mother tongues, they were used by parliamentarians of different first languages speakers and not only by the first language speakers of the languages in which the titles were said. The following are some instances where code switching was used as a sign of respect in the form of titles.

(37) From Dr Sam Nujoma, **Tate** Pohamba to **Tate** Geingob, our delegation never minced their words. [*16 March 2017, p. 412*]

(38) We went to the Soviet Union. **Meme** Pendukeni and the other group.
[15 March 2017, p. 308]

(39) They are at times shown nice jackpots machines and told- **Meme kulu** or **Tate kulu** just play here, and before they know it their money is gone.
[*17 February 2016, p. 165*]

(40) To my **Mitiri**, particularly the Senior Citizen of Namibia, Comrade Angula you have been my mentor all along. [*19 March 2015, p. 391*]

(41) Whose rules are they following? **Meneer** please. [*31 March 2017, p. 77*]

The above examples (37- 41) show that parliamentarians made use of code switching as a sign of respect in Parliament by using titles from other languages rather than English to refer to each other in parliamentary discourse. The findings revealed that these titles were often used by the younger parliamentarians when they were referring to an elderly parliamentarian in order to show their respect. It was further observed that code switching in the form of titles in the Namibian Parliament had become a norm and as such these titles were not translated as it was understood that the words were used for titles and it showed respect.

4.7.4 Code switching to meet a real lexical need or compensate for a word or phrase they do not know in one language

This reason of code switching in Parliament occurs when there is no exact word in English that the parliamentarian wants to use or does not know the English word or phrase and therefore the speaker makes use of the words or phrases in the language that they know. The use of code switching to meet the lexical need or to compensate for a word or phrase that the speaker does not know, makes code switching to occur from English into the other languages in Parliament and this reasoning for code switching was observed in the collected data.

(42) **Speaker A**: On Health- Honourable Speaker, when one goes to the Hospitals or Clinics, you have to take **padkos** along, that signifies how long you will wait in those queues.

Speaker B: What is **padkos**?

Speaker A: **Padkos** is food that one prepares and take with when embarking upon a long journey. In this case, one has to take **padkos** with as well, to eat while you are waiting to be attended to. *[10 March 2016, p. 259- 260]*

(43) I am saying this, because when some men get their salaries, they go to **Kambashus**, play jackpot and what have you, while the women are always concerned about their husbands and children. *[19 April 2017, p. 103]*

Example (42) and (43) showcase how parliamentarians code switched because of real lexical need and in trying to compensate for words they do not know in English. In example (42) speaker A code switched from English to Afrikaans by inserting the Afrikaans word **padkos** to fill the lexical need for what the speaker wanted to talk about. Speaker A knew exactly what she was talking about by using the word **padkos** in her utterance, but the audience which is speaker B made it clear that they did not understand what the word meant. By the explanation that speaker B gave, it is evident that the speaker chose to use the appropriate word for the context she was referring to and the Afrikaans word can be deemed as the only appropriate straight forward word that the speaker could use as in the explanation that the speaker gave for the meaning of the word, it shows that the English language does not have an exact equivalent word to describe food that one takes with when embarking upon a journey.

Similarly, in example 43 the speaker uses an Oshiwambo noun in the middle an English utterance in order to refer to the structures of the bars that are built using corrugated iron. The speaker code switched since he did not know or there was no English word that he could use. It was observed in the data that the use of non-English words for lexical compensation especially when it came to nouns or when not knowing the word in English caused parliamentarians to code switch.

4.7.5 Meaning is lost through translation

The researcher also inferred from the collected data that the parliamentarians seem to code switch as some words or phrases from other languages cannot be translated into English or even

if they were translated the meaning would be lost. So, the parliamentarians chose to code switch to retain the meaning and the originality of the word or phrase without translating it into English. Here is an example;

(44) Firstly, I want to thank **Karunga Kanangombe, Kalunga koo kuku** followed by my father and my teacher. *[19 March 2015, p.363]*

Another reason of code switching that was observed from the data is that parliamentarian indeed code switched as they wanted to be able to express an exact meaning when they uttered a word or even a phrase. For this reason, the parliamentarians chose to code switch to the language that they felt offered the vocabulary that was fit for how they wanted to express themselves as they themselves felt, that even if they translated to English the exact meaning of the words or the expressions would be lost. Example (44) is one of those code-switching instances where the parliamentarian code switched from English to Oshiwambo by inserting an Oshiwambo phrase in an English sentence. It can be said that the speaker chose to express themselves in such a way as the Oshiwambo phrase could not be translated into English as it would lose its meaning. The code switch in Oshiwambo can be regarded as an idiomatic expression that is used to praise God. In this example the parliamentarian chose to praise God in Oshiwambo as he felt the Oshiwambo expression did justice to how he wanted to express themselves by using his mother tongue. Untranslatability of words plays a role in the decision of the parliamentarians to code switch.

4.7.6 Code switching for quotation

The use of code switching to quote was also observed in the data. The researcher observed that the parliamentarians code switched by directly quoting what was said by someone else, or by quoting proverbs or idiomatic expressions or even uttering a well-known saying in their mother

tongues. The following are some of the examples as observed from the corpus that depict that parliamentarians code switch for the reason of quoting.

(45) We were reading your contributions through the Republikein. Every time that something happened at the United Nations, they wrote – "**Theo- Ben Gurirab het by die Verenigde Volke gepraat**," and that was inspirational for the younger people. There were few that we thought we knew, Pieter Katjavivi- "**Die Herero man van SWAPO het in London gepraat**." These things were like dreams to us. *[19 March 2015, p. 359]*

(46) Let me start off with a saying in one of the vernaculars that says- **wapandula noyaka**, means that if you do not appreciate the efforts of others then you are doomed.

[20 March 2015, p. 21]

(47) How would one expect the Commissioner to undertake an investigation into, for example, that Minister if he or she was the one who effectively nominated him to that position? Julle ken Afrikaans **"jy kan nie die hand met jou voet skop nie," of so iets**. This is what I mean by in- built potential conflicts of interest. *[22 February 2017, p. 165]*

In the above examples (45-47) parliamentarians code switched for the reason of quoting. In the first example (45) the speaker directly quoted what was written in the newspaper 'Republikein' which is an Afrikaans newspaper and therefore by quoting the headlines as they were written in the newspaper caused the speaker to code switch from English to Afrikaans. The speaker wanted to be exact about what was written in the newspaper to show that those were not his own words.

In both examples 46 and 47, the switch acts like a set of quotation to quote a proverb and a well-known expression in another language. It was discovered in the corpus that parliamentarians

uttered the proverbs and the idiomatic expression in their mother tongues. The switching gives an impression of the importance of the proverb or the expression in the speech of the speaker. Code switching captivates the attention of the listeners as they try and relate the code-switched item to the context in which it was said. In example 46, the speaker code switched by stating an Oshiwambo proverb in order to say the proverb accurately without tempering with the norm of how the proverb is uttered. Although the speaker went on to explain the meaning of the proverb, the speaker captured the originality of the proverb by saying it in the vernacular language. Example 47 depicts how code switching is used by parliamentarians to quote a well-known saying. In this example the parliamentarian uttered a well-known saying in Afrikaans and even before she uttered the saying, she states in Afrikaans that the fellow parliamentarians knew Afrikaans and the saying meant that you cannot kick the hand with your foot, although she seemed unsure of the saying she knew in the Afrikaans language that there is a well-known saying that goes like that.

These three examples show the different ways in which the Parliamentarians use quoting as a reason for code switching in the Parliament in different ways.

4.7.7 Code switching for tone-softening and humour

The mood in the parliamentary setting can get very intense, especially when the parliamentarians disagree on certain issues and they both have strong opinions about a certain subject matter. The researcher observed from the collected data that parliamentarians in turn code switch in order to ease the tension in Parliament by softening the tone which is used by the different speakers and at times by softening the tone. The Parliamentarians' code switching brings humour to the situation making the whole Parliament erupt in laughter. It was observed that in some situations, it is an effective way to save faces by code-switching to soften the tone of words or sentences

used by the speakers. Some words and phrases are seen as harsh when said in English and therefore deemed not acceptable to be uttered in Parliament, but when they are said in a different language, then they set a different tone. Here is an example:

(48) I was warned by the Speaker, apparently, time is a factor. **Olyatoka lyafa uusira**, but the rest Comrade Lucia will conclude when she takes the Floor (*Laughter*). *[21 February 2017, p. 122]*

This is one of the examples (48) from the Parliament in which code switching was used to soften the tone, and at the same time bringing humour to the situation. The parliamentarian in this instance was making light of the situation that they were being warned by the Speaker who was in charge of the Parliament that their time to address the Parliament was up. The speaker then code switched from English to Oshiwambo to add a humorous aspect to their utterance. The code-switched phrase translated means that, since time is a factor it is late, but the direct translation that gives the phrase a humourous aspect is that the speaker used a simile to refer to time as being '*late as flour*'. When the speaker uttered the Oshiwambo phrase, it was observed in the collected data from the Hansard that the fellow parliamentarians laughed.

4.7.8 Code switching for ethnic identity and group identity

It was evident in the data that some parliamentarians only engaged in code switching in order to show their solidarity with other parliamentarians for group identity or for ethnic identity. This reason for code switching was observed as an action of the speaker trying to identify with the parliamentarian that they were addressing or responding to and it was not used as a way of the speaker themselves identifying with their own ethnic group. They show solidarity with their addressee by code switching phrases or words from the addressees' language even if they are not fluent speakers of that language. Here are some of the observed instances from the corpus:

(50) I would like to register my unconditional support for the Budget that was presented by the Minister of Finance, Honourable Calle Schlettwein (laughter) earlier in the House, **Ich spreche gut Deutsch!** *[09 April 2015, p. 129]*

(51) Van Den Heever, yes. **Afrikaans is my taal**. Honourable Tweya. Be that as it may. *[24 February 2016, p. 297]*

In both these examples, there is an expression of solidarity through code switching as the speakers' code switched to the vernacular languages of the parliamentarians whose names are mentioned. The speaker in example 50 associates the name Schletwein to the German language and therefore code switched to German just to express his view that he could speak good German based on his pronunciation of the name Schlettwein. When the speaker switched codes, the speaker expresses solidarity with the parliamentarian whose name is mentioned as the speaker used the parliamentarians first language. This switch can also be identified as being used for ethnic identity as the switching of the code associates the name to the language.

Example 51 also further confirms the use of code switching by parliamentarians for the reason of showing solidarity and as an ethnic identity marker. The speaker code switches to affirm to the audiences that they can pronounce the fellow parliamentarian's name which is considered as an Afrikaans name correctly because Afrikaans is his language. In this example, the speaker therefore identifies himself as being part of the Afrikaans speaking community, although Afrikaans is not his first language based on his knowledge of the language. These are the few examples of how the parliamentarians in the Namibian Parliament code switch for the reason of ethnic identity or group identity.

These are the 8 reasons for code switching in the Namibian Parliament that were observed to be prevalent in the parliamentary discourse as proposed in the reviewed literature.

Lastly, the final category that was observed from the data as a recurring theme is discussed and analysed as observed.

4.8 Translation in the Parliamentary discourse

Translation was observed as a main theme in parliamentary discourse when it comes to code switching. It was very important for the research to show how the parliamentarians deal with code switching in Parliament. In this section extracts were drawn from the corpus as evidence on how code switching is dealt with or made use of in the Namibian Parliament, especially when it came to the translation of the other languages, apart from English, that are used for code switching in Parliament.

From the data collected, translation as a way of dealing with code switching in Parliament emerged. The researcher also noticed that, where translation was not given, at times the parliamentarians indicated that they did not understand what was said.

However, the researcher observed from the Hansards that translation is hardly used in the Namibian Parliament. The research findings revealed that in most instances of code switching in Parliament, the parliamentarians do not translate what they code switched into English only a few times it was observed that a parliamentarian would code switch and then immediately translate the meaning of what they had said in a different language into English to make sure everybody in Parliament understood what they said. The translation of the use of other languages in Parliament apart from English is mostly just translated in the Hansard. The translation in the Hansard is done by the transcribers of the parliamentary speech and verbal happenings. Although the transcribers do translate the different languages used in Parliament into English, the researcher further observed that some of the non-English words, phrases, clauses or sentences were not translated in the Hansard.

Here are some of the extracts that show the elements of translation in Parliament. Note that extracts are used as they are written in the Hansards and the phrases or sentence in bold, implies that a different language was used rather than English. The italicised parts that are in brackets show translation that was done by the Hansard transcribers, but the translations that are not in brackets, they are translations that were done by parliamentarians themselves during the parliamentary sessions.

4.8.1 Parliamentary translation

From the observation of the data, it was observed that some of the code-switched utterances were translated during the parliamentary sessions by the speakers themselves. The following extract 4a-c shows how the parliamentarians translate their own code-switched utterances.

Extract 4

(a) I want to aid the speaker Honourable Maamberua is wrong, not by giving a Notice of a Motion, but in his Motion, he is subjecting the Motion to the Amendment of the Constitution (interjection) **Arikana puratenee!** *Let us listen to one another*.

[*16 February 2016, p. 79*]

(b) Teachers for example, are taking what we call **okapaki** in my language, meaning people are taking their package. [*16 February 2016, p. 101*]

(c) The then School Inspector who became the first Governor of the Oshikoto Region after Independence, Mr. Namupala, had a serious talk about the issue of the physically assaulted women. He told us that, when they were growing up, it was unheard of to see boys beating up girls and men beating up women. He said**: aamwandje omikalo dha tya ngaaka dhokudhenga aakadhona, nomaapagani kadhi mo**. Translated, this

means *such behavior is even among the pagan community, unheard of.* [*23 February 2016, p. 261*]

Extract 4a-c shows some examples of the rare actions of the parliamentarians to use repetition or to immediately translate the code-switched part of their conversation in Parliament into English. The findings from the data revealed that only very few parliamentarians translated their code-switched sentences or phrases into English for their fellow parliamentarians without even being asked to do so. From this act, it may be concluded that parliamentarians are indeed aware that most of the times when they code switch some of their fellow parliamentarians do not understand and by translating they are making communication easier. Thus, translating the code-switched sentences and phrases makes code switching an effective tool of communication in Parliament. The researcher observed that if the parliamentarians code switched and did not translate, the researcher termed this action as Hansard translation.

4.8.2 Transcribers translation

It was observed from the data that some of the code-switched utterances were not translated during the parliamentary sessions, but they were only translated in the Hansard by the Hansard transcribers. Extract 5a- d shows the examples as extracted from the data.

Extract 5

(d) It is only foreigners who are apparently providing services. I am not attacking them, but they cannot provide service forever **kauatjiri** (*it is not true*). [17 March 2015, p. 169]

(e) **#nu, #nu, man!** (*sit down, sit down man!*) Honourable Speaker, I am a neighbor- I sit next to Honourable Fleermuys. Honourable *uh* (interjection) [*13 April 2017, p. 128*]

(f) That is my point. Let us close this Debate. He is also provoking- **Hy krap waar dit nie jeuk nie!** (He is scratching where it is not itching) [*6 April 2017, p. 141*]

The above extracts, d-f, are some of the many translated code-switched sentences and phrases from the parliamentary sessions as collected in the data from the already transcribed Parliamentary Hansards. The researcher was able to collect the data of the code-switching instances in parliament without having any knowledge of some of the languages that are used for code switching in parliament since the Hansard transcribers had already translated most of those code-switched instances into the Matrix language, which is English. The translations in the Hansard that are italicised were spoken during the parliamentary sessions and were not translated. As much as the code-switched instances in parliament were translated in the Hansards, it was also observed that there were instances that were neither translated by the parliamentarians or the Hansard transcribers.

4.8.3 No translation

The following examples indicate how some instances of code switching in Parliament are not translated by both the parliamentarians as well as the Hansard transcribers.

(g) I am a citizen of this country and I appreciate the services of these country, and I appreciate the services of these people, **muatje puratena**. [*17 March 2015, p. 167*]

(h) **Meneer** please. [*31 March 2017, p. 77*]

(i) I know this time is the **omagongo** time, I forgive you on that one. [*2 March 2017, p. 359*]

The researcher also observed that the transcribers omitted some of the words, phrases, clauses and sentences without any translation in the Hansards. These parts of the code-switched items were directly written in the Hansards without translating them and from the observation of the data the findings revealed that some omission on translation were made for some popular local non-English phrases, therefore the transcriber might feel that the words or phrases are general

and anyone that comes across them will be able to understand their meanings but this is not the case. Words used as titles and nouns, are among some of the non-translated code-switched items in the Hansards. However, through the researcher's own experience of using the Hansards documents, found that as a reader the researcher could not make out the meaning of all the code-switched items that were not translated. These findings revealed that translation plays a significant role in making code switching an effective tool of communication as well as an effective linguistic phenomenon to the framing of the parliamentary discourse.

4.8.4 Code switching and translation in Parliament

The following extract 6j- k shows the importance of how code switching, and translation should go hand in hand in the Namibian Parliament for code switching to be effective in the parliamentary discourse.

Extract 6

(j) Where management needs directed policy, we should address those causes, rather than criticizing these issues. Well, **ove mohungire Otjihimba, hina kukuzuva** (*you are speaking Himba, I do not understand you*). [*11 April 2017, p. 355*]

(k) The intention of this Law is that, those who are claiming citizenship by descend, their right of descend cannot be generational. It is forever. **Hi toroke moTjiherero po hi hungire vi?** (*Should I translate to Otjiherero or how should I speak?*) [11 March 2015, p. 52]

Extract (j) shows a parliamentarian expressing himself that he did not understand what the fellow parliamentarian had said, since they spoke in Otjihimba. This shows that parliamentarians do not understand some of the code-switched phrases and sentences by their fellow parliamentarians if not translated, which hinders effective communication.

On the other hand, the expressions in extract (k) shows that translation is not only needed when the parliamentarians code switch into the non-official languages, but also when English which is the official language is used in parliamentary discourse, the parliamentarians might feel that they need to translate what they have said in English into another language that is more understandable to their fellow parliamentarians if the fellow parliamentarians seem not to understand what is being said in English. This shows that translation plays a significant role as part of the use of code switching in the Namibian Parliament. The findings reveal that in order for code switching to be used as an effective tool of communication by the parliamentarians, more translation should be incorporated by the parliamentarians themselves as well as the audiences to get the exact meaning of what is said.

4.9 Chapter summary

This chapter presented and analysed the collected data in relation to the research questions on the practices of code switching in the Namibian Parliament and the reviewed literature. The chapter focused on the language patterns, the patterns of code switching, the types of code switching, the Markedness Model, the Matrix Language frame model, the different reasons for code switching and translation in the parliamentary context. The findings revealed that the Namibian Parliamentarians use intra-sentential code switching more frequently. The results also indicate that there are different reasons why the parliamentarians code switch, but the main reason is for communicative purposes. The findings also revealed the importance of translation in parliamentary discourse when code switching is involved.

The next chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the findings and analysis of code switching in the Namibian Parliament. This chapter, Chapter 5, summarises the findings by presenting them in categories in order to answer the research questions as set out at the beginning of the study. The research questions that this study sought to answer were:

1. What are the possible reasons that influence the parliamentarians to code switch?
2. What are the code-switching patterns that emerge in the Namibian parliamentary proceedings?
3. What function does code switching provide on the framing of parliamentary discourse?

5.2 Languages used

From the observation of the data from the Hansards, it was observed that different languages are used for code switching in the Namibian Parliament. The findings from the observation of the parliamentary Hansards revealed that the most frequently used languages for code switching were Otjiherero, Oshiwambo and Afrikaans. It was noted that different first language (L1) speakers made use of different languages for code switching whether they were fluent speakers or not and not only their first language (L1). A total of eight languages were observed.

5.3 Patterns of code switching

Through the observation of data, it was revealed that code switching is not common in the Namibian Parliament. Although it is not common, the times that code switching is used in the Namibian Parliament is noticeable as the parliamentarians make use of other languages in a setting where English is the expected language of communication. It was observed that the patterns of code switching in the Parliament involves the use of words such as nouns, adjectives,

adverbs and phrases from different languages. The observed pattern of code switching is that of switching from English to other languages.

5.4 Types of code switching

To be more specific about the patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament, it was important to identify the types of code switching. Three types of code switching were identified from the data, namely, intra-sentential, tag switching, and inter-sentential code switching. The findings revealed that the Namibian parliamentarians made use of the intra-sentential code switching more often than the other types of code switching.

5.5 Markedness Model (MM)

The data depicted that English remains the unmarked language choice of the Namibian parliamentarians which showed that the parliamentarians were fully aware of the language that they were expected to speak in Parliament despite the instances of code switching that occur in the parliamentary discourse. The findings of the present study agree with Myers-Scotton (1993a) (see 2.7.2) that because of rationality the speaker chooses the language they think is appropriate for a situation to get maximum benefits and minimum cost.

5.6 Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model

This model as proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993b), accounts for the structural aspects of the languages that are involved in code switching. From the analysis of the data it was revealed that since English is the dominant language spoken by parliamentarians it was considered as the matrix language while the other languages that were observed to be used for code switching in the Namibian Parliament were considered as the embedded languages. Just as reported in Simasiku (2014), that the matrix language sets the grammar and the syntax of communication during code switching, the present study concurs with this statement as it was observed that

English sets the grammar and syntax of the medium of code switching in the Namibian Parliament.

5.7 Possible reasons for code switching

The first question that this research set out to answer was the possible reasons that influenced the parliamentarians to code switch. Despite that twelve possible reasons for code switching were proposed for this study, only eight reasons were observed from the data to have influenced the parliamentarians to code switch. These reasons are: code switching in order to strengthen or soften a request that a speaker is making towards a fellow parliamentarian; code switching for interjection by inserting words or sentence fillers from other languages; code switching to show respect by using titles when addressing a fellow parliamentarian; code switching for real lexical need because the word or phrase does not exist in the English language or the speaker does not know that word or phrase in English; code switching due to untranslatability by which the parliamentarians opt to make use of a new or culturally oriented words or phrases that cannot be translated to English; code switching for quotation, by which the speaker tries to guarantee authenticity by repeating or stating the exact words or phrases that were used. This possible influence of code switching includes the use of euphemisms and idiomatic expressions. Code switching for tone softening and humour is another reason that was observed in the data, this is whereby the speaker could use some harsh words and expressions but still maintain their social status as the language being used softens the tone which can be regarded as even humorous making an uncomfortable situation comfortable for both the speaker and the addressee. The last possible reason the influence parliamentarians to code switch as observed from the data, was code switching for ethnic identity and solidarity by which the speakers code switch in order to

show that they belong to a particular group of language or to show solidarity by speaking the language of their addressee.

Common reasons that influence speakers to code switch such as code switching for exclusion, and code switching for changing a topic do not appear in the data. When the data was analysed, the findings indicated that parliamentarians mostly code switched in order to reinforce or strengthen a request and also for interjections and interventions during the parliamentary sessions. In using all these reasons to code switch in the parliamentary discourse, the parliamentarians feel free and comfortable to express themselves without thinking about the restrictions of having English as the only official language. The use of other languages in the Namibian Parliament shows the diverse languages and cultures that are represented in the Namibian Parliament. The findings revealed that parliamentarians code switch in order to reach their communication goals and to make their interaction in Parliament authentic by expressing their true opinions and feelings on different issues that are discussed in Parliament even if it means using other languages apart from English. So, several reasons were observed to influence the Namibian parliamentarians to code switch.

5.8 Translation in parliamentary context

Translation was observed as one of the emerging themes during the analysis of the data. It was observed that as parliamentarians code switched, and they were aware that some of their fellow parliamentarians did not understand, some parliamentarians took it upon themselves to translate or explain what they had said by using English which is more understood by the parliamentarians and in so doing it was observed that it enhances effective communication amongst the parliamentarians. It was further observed from the data that when the parliamentarians code switch and they immediately translate, the discussions, debates and speeches in Parliament go on

with minimal interventions and interruptions from the parliamentarians that did not comprehend what was said when code switching occurred. In some instances, it was observed that some parliamentarians did not translate what they had code switched and as a result those that did not understand asked for clarification which led to disruption of the parliamentary sessions. The data showed that when translation is not made by the parliamentarians themselves, the Hansard transcribers would do the translations only for the Hansards and those parliamentarians that did not understand the code-switched words or phrases during parliamentary session were left to figure out the supposed meaning.

The data showed that translation services were needed in Parliament for it to enhance the effectiveness and purpose of the use of code switching in the Namibian Parliament. The research concludes that although parliamentarians make use of code switching to reach different communicative goals, code switching is more effective as a communication tool in Parliament when translated for everyone involved in the parliamentary discourse to understand and get the meaning of the utterances uttered in a different language other than English.

5.9 Implications

This study has provided an insight on the use of code switching in the parliamentary discourse of the Namibian Parliament. This research may contribute to the literature of code switching in the Namibian context given the lack of studies on the usage of different languages in an official setting such as the Parliament by focusing on code switching as the linguistic factor. Therefore, this study may be useful to future researchers in acquiring information on code switching in a formal setting such as the Parliament, on which the future researchers can further build on by investigating similar phenomena related to the linguistic phenomenon of code switching.

5.10 Limitations

The collection of data for this study was done by using 10 parliamentary Hansards dated between the year 2015 to 2017. Therefore, the usage of only 10 Hansards for the collection of data can be considered as minimal given the amount of parliamentary sessions that take place in each year and for that reason the patterns observed for this study might not reflect the same patterns of code switching in the Namibian Parliament over a longer period with the inclusion of more Hansards. Besides those limitations, the Hansards selected from the three years were uneven and as a result the data collected contains uneven data from these years and even the Hansards selected contains different amounts of data of code switching which led to the usage of more data from some Hansards that the others.

Furthermore, the reasons and the patterns of codeswitching in this study reflected only the data that was collected from the sampled Hansards. The reasons for code switching were derived directly from the data as depicted in the Hansards and no interviews were conducted with the parliamentarians to get their reasons why they code switch.

5.11 Conclusions

The findings of this study conclude that code switching in Parliament, can be a useful tool for communication. The effectiveness of code switching in Parliament does not only rely on how good the parliamentarians can express themselves effectively using other languages, but it also has to do with how the message is understood and interpreted by other parliamentarians that are involved in the discussions.

The study also supports that the distinct reasons that are used for code switching in Parliament are of importance in the communication and involvement of parliamentarians in the parliamentary discourse. Furthermore, the study established that code switching allows

parliamentarians to express themselves freely and air their views during parliamentary debates and submissions without being limited to the vocabularies and terminologies of the English language. In the Namibian Parliament English is officially meant to be used as the Matrix language. The reality though is that, local languages are often used as *de facto* official languages by Parliamentarians. The privileging of English has more to do with the choice of English as the Official Language of Namibia and due to the vast vocabularies and terminologies of parliamentary discourse that it contains. Code switching can take place knowingly and unknowingly for distinct reasons as shown in the study and therefore the study concludes that these distinct reasons for code switching plays a significant role in the framing of parliamentary discourse.

Non-linguistic factors such as the relationship of the parliamentarians that are engaging in a conversation, the mood that is set in Parliament, as well as the impression which the speaker wants to make, also influences the parliamentarians' linguistic choices during their interactions in Parliament. This study therefore, concludes that translation plays a vital role in parliamentary discourse when code switching is involved.

5.12 Recommendations

The major recommendation for this study as derived from the findings of the study is that translation services should be availed in Parliament to help with the effectiveness of the use of code switching in Parliament. The study further recommends that parliamentarians should be encouraged to make use of their mother tongues as well as other languages in Parliament to express themselves freely and effectively and not be constrained by English as the official language in Namibia. When parliamentarians are encouraged to use their mother tongues, it

might create a platform for empowering other languages in society that are not official languages.

For further studies the researcher recommends that future researchers should involve the parliamentarians and make use of other data collection tools to get the parliamentarians' perceptions on code switching. Also, to get the reasons why the parliamentarians code switch directly from them that are involved in the parliamentary discourse to enhance the findings of the use of code switching in the Namibian Parliament. The study suggests that there is need for more research in this field of code switching which involves public officials for the officials to know the effectiveness and the effects that code switching has on their communications. Further research could also be done to get the perceptions of members of the public on code switching in Parliament since these parliamentary sessions are of public interests and they are televised.

References

Al Heetia, N. H., & Al Abdely, A. A. (2016). Types and functions of code switching in the English language used by Iraqi doctors in formal setting. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Review, 1*(8), 10-18.

Aukongo, I. M. (2015). *The role of code-switching as a communicative strategy between Outapi residents and public officials.* (Master's thesis, University of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia). Retrieved on 20 March 2017 from https://repository.unam.edu.na/bitstream/handle/11070/1464/Aukongo2015.pdf?sequence=1

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: Principles, methods and practices*. Florida, USA.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklens, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Carpuat, M. (2014). *Mixed-language and code- switching in the Canadian Hansard*. Paper presented at the proceedings of the first workshop on Computational Approaches to Code- switching, Doha, Qatar. Retrieved on 7 April 2017 from http://aclweb.org/anthology/w14-3913.

Chivero, E. (2012). *Language and gender: An examination of the linguistic strategies used by male and female members of parliament during parliamentary debates carried out*

between 2005 and 2007 in the house of assembly. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Debates of the National Assembly. 11 March- 19 March 2015. Vol. 167.

Debates of the National Assembly. 20 March- 21 April 2015. Vol. 168.

Debates of the National Assembly. 09 February- 25 February 2016. Vol. 179.

Debates of the National Assembly. 01 March- 15 March 2016. Vol. 180.

Debates of the National Assembly. 14 February- 02 March 2017. Vol. 192.

Debates of the National Assembly. 07 March 2017- 16 March 2017. Vol. 193.

Debates of the National Assembly. 31 March- 05 April 2017. Vol. 195.

Debates of the National Assembly. 06 April- 11 April 2017. Vol. 196.

Debates of the National Assembly. 13 April- 18 April 2017. Vol. 197.

Debates of the National Assembly. 19 April- 27 April 2017. Vol. 198.

Dzahene-Quarshie, J. (2011). Language policy, language choice and language use in the Tanzanian parliament. *Legon Journal of the Humanities, 22,* 27-69. Retrieved on 17 May 2017 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2809782.

Explorable.com (2009). *Research population*. Retrieved March 22, 2018 from Explorable.com: https://explorable.com/research-population.

Frydman, J. (2011). *A critical analysis of Namibia's English-only language policy*. University of Illinois at Urban-Champion. Selected proceedings of the 40th annual conference on African Linguistics.

Holmes, J. (2001). An introduction to sociolinguistics (2nd ed.). Wellington: Longman.

Iipinge, K. (2013). *English lingua franca as language of learning and teaching in Northern Namibia: A report on Oshiwambo teachers' experiences*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Stellenbosch.

Retrieved on 8 April 2018 from http:/hdl.handle.net/10019.1/80357

Kamati, A. M. (2011). *A study of code switching in junior secondary Physical Science classrooms in selected schools in the Oshana education region.* (Master's thesis, University of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia). Retrieved on 20 March from wwwisis.unam.na/theses/kamati2011.pdf

Kaschula, R. H., & Anthonissen, C. (2001). *Communicating across cultures in South Africa: Toward a critical language awareness.* Johannesburg, South Africa: Clyson Printers.

Kaspercyzk, L. A. (2015). *Implementing codeswitching in classrooms.* Retrieved August, 27 from http:/www.slideshare.net/maiye/codes-switching-1352276?next_slideshow=1

Kastori, J. (2017). *Chapter II literature review and the theoretical framework*. Retrieved July 2018, from eprints.uny.ac.id/48278/3/CHAPTER%20II.pdf

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.). New Delhi, India:

New Age International (LTD) Publishers.

Legère, K. (2001). Language policy in Namibia: The situation at the grass roots non-governmental approaches. In R. Trewby & S. Fitchat (Eds.). *Language and development in Southern Africa: Making the right choices*. Windhoek, Namibia: Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers (Pty) Ltd.

Lune, H., & Berg, B. L. (2017). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (9th ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson.

Mabule, D. R. (2015). What is this? Is it code switching, code mixing or language alternating? *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 5*(1), 339-350. Retrieved from citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.665.4246&rep=rep/&type=pdf

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Meyerhoff, M. (2011). *Introducing sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (Eds.). (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross disciplinary perspectives on code-switching.* Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Myers- Scotton, C. (1993a). *Dueling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Social motivations for code switching: Evidence from Africa.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Parliament Republic of Namibia (2017). National assembly. Retrieved 20 April from www.parliament.na

Pattch, M. L., & Newhart, M. (2018). *Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials* (10th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Simasiku, L. (2014). *The perceptions of grade 10 English second language teachers about the effects of code switching in their classrooms in the Caprivi education region. (*Doctoral thesis, University of Namibia, Windhoek, Namibia). Retrieved on 8 April 2017 from repository.unam.edu.na/handle/11070/805

Simasiku, L. (2016). The impact of code switching on learners' participation during classroom practice. *Studies in English Language Teaching, 4*(2), 157-167. Retrieved from www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/selt

Smit, T. C. (2011). *Fundamentals of English language studies.* Windhoek, Namibia: Centre for External Studies.

Surenthiraraj, E., & Tissera, T. (2015, December). *The ideological implications of code switching as discursive strategy: An analysis of Sri Lankan Hansards*. Paper presented at the Faculty of Arts International Research Conference. Retrieved from http://archive.cmb.ac.lk:8080/research/handle/70130/4405

The constitution of the republic of Namibia. (1990). Windhoek, Namibia: Ministry of Justice.

Trisulichartini, R. (2014). *Chapter II literature review and conceptual framework*. Retrieved 20 April 2018, from digitilib.uinsby.ac.id/48/4/Bab%202.pdf

Yankova, D., & Vassileva, I. (2013). *Functions and mechanisms of code switching in Bulgarian Canadians*. Retrieved from https://journals.openedit.ron.org/eccs/254

Zähres, F. (2016). Contact linguistics: A case study of codeswitching in multilingual Namibian keyboard-to-screen communication. *10 Plus 1: Living Linguistics, (2),* 31-45.