

Ebonyi Journal of Language and Literary Studies

Volume 1 No. 4: 46-62 (2018)

ISSN 9091 4582 7142

**Code Switching among Mende, Temne and Limba
Refugees in Oru Camp, Nigeria****Osita Gerald NWAGBO****osynwagbo@gmail.com**Department of Linguistics, African and Asian Studies
University of Lagos, Nigeria**Abstract**

Refugees are usually faced with identity dilemma, due to their peculiar circumstances as minorities within a dominant ethno linguistic group. The concern of this study is to examine the manifestations of identity among Liberian refugees in Oru camp, in the course of discourse. This is with a view to delineating the identities they actually preferred in relation to their indigenous languages, Yoruba (the host community language), Krio (Sierra Leonean Pidgin) and English. The Ethno linguistic Identity Theory was used as guide while interviews and participant observation were adopted to elicit data from 30 adult respondents. The result revealed that code switching among the respondents was motivated by greetings, emphatic expressions, formal situations, emotional outbursts and proverbs. The trajectory of the switches, were from Krio to indigenous language, and English to indigenous language. The respondents also manifested identities through code mixing, that is intra-sentential alternations, involving their indigenous tongues, Krio and English. Liberian refugees in Oru camp are bilinguals and manifest multiple linguistic identities and in this way indicated their psychological belonging to multiple spheres and groups in the camp. However, the pattern or trajectory of their code switching revealed that they identified more with Krio and English, and less with their indigenous languages, and least with Yoruba, the language of the host community. In this way, they underlined their preference for a metropolitan and modern identity, over an ethnic identity. It is recommended that refugees should identify more with their indigenous languages and the host community language for reasons of language vitality, inclusion and the benefits of diversity.

Keywords: refugees, linguistic identity, code switching, Face, ethno linguistics.

Introduction

The concern of this study is to investigate the place of language in the construction of multifarious identities among Liberian refugees in Oru refugee camp, Ogun State, Nigeria. It is acknowledged that refugees are confronted with numerous challenges, ranging from food, healthcare, shelter, resettlement, etc. However, this study is specifically on the language and identity question in the experience of refugees. The reason for opting to study the language proposition,

among all other inconveniences encountered by refugees is because language is central in the lives of individuals as a veritable means of identification and solidarity within and across cultures (Kim, 2001; Berry, 2008). This is especially so as the refugees in this study have emerged from a hostile situation where survival partly depended on the language or identity one expressed (Ed-zar-zar, 2002). Of course, this is not a submission that inter-ethnic hostilities are provoked by linguistic disparities; instead, it is other socio-political paroxysms which dislocate the equilibrium of society (Fishman 1968; Romaine 2003). However, irrespective of the remoteness of language factors from the socio-political antecedents which precipitate some of these cataclysmic conditions, one of the consequences is that the citizens of the affected countries, like the ones in this study, are often conscious of the primacy of ethno linguistic identity in their daily lives; that is, their own language and culture in contrast to the language and culture of others.

However, refugees who live among a different ethno linguistic group often find themselves in a cultural dilemma. According to Albrecht (2001) life as a refugee is problematic as it adversely affects one's sense of identity. Apart from material challenges, language barriers also frequently pose a difficulty as refugees struggle with issues of identity and belonging in a completely different ethno linguistic environment (UNHCR 2008). They are usually presented with a bouquet of linguistic alternatives which often persuade them to re-negotiate their identities. The question is, should they retain their heritage linguistic identity or should they adjust and identify with their host's culture. Whichever option they adopt has benefits and challenges; if they choose to maintain their indigenous languages they benefit from perpetuating their language and culture through transmission to subsequent generations, and also a maintenance of ethnic identity, but they might lose face with the host community. On the other hand, if they opt to acculturate by adopting the language of their hosts, they enjoy some instrumental benefits, depending on the utilitarian values of the host's language, but risk losing their ethnic culture depending on the degree and pattern of acculturation.

In this study, attention is focused on how respondents manifested various identities in the camp in the course of interaction. Interaction, in this module is limited to verbal exchanges between or among participants. Franceschini (in Guerini 2005) defines interaction as a hyperonym designating all the verbal activities normally carried out by human beings; one of these activities is conversation, that is to say, face-to-face interaction taking place at the simultaneous (physical) presence of all the participants. Taylor (1994) posits that it is not just language but also discourse which is important in the formation and shaping of identity, which arises out of interaction. The purpose of interaction, among other things, is to give and receive information and also to project a face or image; to show other participants who you are and how you want to be seen. Code switching is examined in this study as a linguistic device through which identity is constructed. Through the system of code switching speakers identify with a culture or cultures and by this means construct their own identities, and/or

other identities. Based on the foregoing, the general objective of this study is the investigation of the strategies adopted by Liberian refugees in Oru camp to manifest different identities and faces. Specifically, the study aims at evaluating the motivations for code switching among the sampled participants in Oru camp. Additionally, the study aims at examining the pattern and trajectories of code switching, and their implications for identity projection.

Identity and Code Switching

Code switching is the linguistic device employed by bilinguals, to express themselves in different codes given different situations (Holmes 2008; Grosjean 1982). Myers-Scotton (1993:4) views the concept as “the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded language (or languages) in utterances of a matrix language during the same conversation”. In this configuration, the matrix language represents the main or base language, while the embedded language is the secondary language, which plays a lesser role. In his typology of bilinguals Olaoye (1998: 117) explains that a bicultural coordinate bilingual uses a second language for reasons of integration and when he changes to another language sees himself as changing his personality or becoming ‘a different person’. Haugen (in Korth, 2005) posits that language choice is “often a significant indication of the group with which one wishes to identify”. Korth stresses this tendency among bilinguals to identify with both groups whose languages they speak and by so doing emphasise their mixed identity through the use of a mixed code or code-switching. Along the minority-majority spectrum, Korth states that it is often minority language groups who are constrained by socio-cultural factors to adopt and identify with the dominant language group, whereas the dominant language groups feel very adequate and do not feel the need to expand their linguistic identity. Some of the benefits of multilingualism in relation to identity include facilitation of inter-ethnic interaction. Lamy (in Thondhlana, 2005) argues that bilingualism facilitates interaction and that such bilinguals can be mistaken for in-group members. Furthermore, being seen as a member of the other group affects the identity of the speaker. Other benefits include enhancing the understanding of out-groups, removing ethnocentrism, making an individual more cosmopolitan in outlook, etc. (Olaoye 1998). Korth (2005) stresses the tendency among bilinguals to identify with the groups whose languages they speak and in this way highlight a mixed or heterogeneous identity. Thus, the languages involved in code switching represent the identities preferred by the respondents. Code switching therefore remains the primary linguistic means of negotiating other identities because the speaker has a considerable level of knowledge and fluency in the languages involved.

Myers-Scotton (1993) makes a distinction between marked and unmarked code switching. Marked code switching involves languages that are not expected, in the course of a conversation, in a setting. For instance, an educated civil servant switching to English during a conversation (in the local language) with a village kin that has little or no facility in English is unexpected, that is, not proper for that conversation. The civil servant may choose this option for the purpose of

enhancing the social difference between the two interlocutors and to underscore his status. On the contrary, unmarked code switching involves languages that are expected, in the course of a conversation, in a setting. In this case, if the civil servant switches to a pidgin, understood by the village kin, it is expected, that is, proper for that conversation. Essentially, marked code switching is mainly employed to delineate differences, and show power and status, while unmarked code switching is used mainly for reasons of rhetoric.

The use of multiple languages in conversation has implications for divergence and convergence. The very act of switching from one code to another indicates either converging to or identifying with a group or diverging from and distancing oneself away from a group. Gibson (2004) states that code switching could be exclusionary and inclusionary. It is exclusionary when it is employed to distance other persons (outsiders) who do not belong to the same culture. It is inclusionary when it helps to accommodate other persons who do not belong to the same culture.

Identity and Face

Face is actually a term coined by the sociolinguist Goffman (1967 quoted in Carson, 2005) which describes the processes people go through when choosing how to talk to others. Face is all about image or Self-perception, as well as Other-perception. Carson (2005:40) upholds this view by relating language choice to our self-perception as well as the image of other participants in a conversation,

In other words, using one language instead of another is about how we view ourselves, and how we are viewed by others. Self-perception and the perception of the Other is implicit in the language choice of each interlocutor involved.

As a matter of fact, Goffman (in Gibson, 2004) defined identity as the way others identify us, and how we identify ourselves. Gibson (2004) explains that the speaker can assay to influence the way others see him/her but, ultimately, the speaker's identity is formed by the hearer and this identity may be entirely different from the speaker's desired identity. This situation poses a conflict which is exacerbated if the hearer is in a position of power and is capable of imposing a certain image on the speaker. O'Driscoll (in Carson 2005) identifies three faces: polite face, cosmopolitan face and ethno linguistic face. Polite face is related to a consideration of others; a cosmopolitan face is related to the marking of an international image and ethno linguistic face is related to a sense of belonging to a particular ethnic community. A fourth face which I would like to add is the metropolitan face, which is related to a sense of belonging to an urban area instead of a rural community. In terms of language, a polite face is shown when an individual uses an inclusive code; a cosmopolitan face is shown when an individual uses an international language like English; an ethno linguistic face is shown when an individual uses an ethnic language and a metropolitan face is shown when an individual uses a language of wider community like pidgin which is used mainly in urban centres in sub-Saharan Anglo phone countries.

Theoretical Review-Ethno-linguistic Identity Theory (ELIT)

Ethno linguistic identity theory is a social psychological approach proposed by Giles and Johnson in 1981 as an extension of Social Identity Theory (SIT), (Oakes 2001). . Giles and Johnson (1987) hold that as people grow up they also learn to group themselves and other people into social categories which usually use language as a marker for ethnic distinctiveness. Korth (2005) stresses that social categorization often employs language as a marker for ethnic distinctiveness. Additionally she stresses the demand of ELIT that individuals may feel a sense of belonging to a group because they feel that they share the same system of symbols and meanings (language) which implies an Us-feeling; and also the fact that those who identify themselves with a particular group are more likely to use the language of that group. Masaki et al (2010) posit that ELIT is one of the theories which provide explanation for the conceptual link between an individual's language use and cultural adaptation, including ethnic identity. This indicates that as far as ELIT is concerned, language represents a core or primary aspect of an individual's social group identity and to an extent worldview (Giles and Johnson 1987). Contingent with this position, an individual's view of his or her heritage culture against the other cultures is found to correlate with language preference, knowledge and actual use (Phinney et al 2001).

One of the vital revisions made in the ELIT theory is the introduction of the concept of convergence and divergence. Convergence and divergence originated in Accommodation Theory propounded by Giles (1974). Convergence is a method whereby individuals adapt to the communication patterns of each other during interaction (Giles and Coupland 1991). In this instance, individuals from minority groups adopt patterns of the dominant group speech for the purpose of social approval (Hudson 2000). On the other hand, divergence is a communicative devise used to emphasise the language of the minority group for the purpose of marking differences between the in-group and the dominant out-group. It follows that whereas convergence enhances solidarity with the out-group, divergence accentuates difference with the out-group. This relationship does not necessarily imply total assimilation as in the original formulation of ELIT but recognises intermediate states of acculturation where both dominant and minority identities are retained (Oakes 2001).

Language information

The indigenous languages identified among the sampled Sierra Leonean refugees were mainly Mende, Temne, Limba, Krio. The respondents claimed an indigenous language as their first language and English as their second language. This is expected because English is the official language in Sierra Leone (Ngovo, 1988). Additionally, all the respondents claimed Krio (Sierra Leonean pidgin) as one of the languages in their repertoire; this claim is understandable as pidgin runs through the length and breadth of Anglo-phone West Africa, hence West Africa Pidgin English (WAPE). Krio is native to the Sierra Leonean Krio people

or Krios who number about 100,000 presently but is probably the most widely spoken of all Sierra Leonean languages (Sengova 1987). Fyle (1994: 47) states that Krio has assumed recognition as 'the main vehicle of communication' in Sierra Leone, and used in the market place and in political speeches in making policy statements by heads of states. In the education sector, Krio is used to introduce pupils to English; thus, Krio is the window through which students gain entrance into modern education. It is also used in entertainment and enlightenment programmes.

In addition to these, the language of the host community is Yoruba. Adegbija (2004) identifies Yoruba as one of the three major languages in Nigeria, (the other two are Hausa and Igbo) owing to the population of their speakers. These languages enjoy co-official status with English, and they are used in the national, state, and local government levels as *lingua francae* and as languages of informal interaction. It is therefore obvious that the refugees were domiciled within one of the three dominant ethno linguistic groups in Nigeria-Yoruba.

Methodology

The approach used in this study is the qualitative method. The sample for this study is the Oru refugee camp in Ogun State Nigeria. The population of the sample was about 2000 going by the opinion of the leaders of the Liberian group in the camp. However, 30 respondents were purposively sampled for this study. The reason for the limited number is that this is a qualitative investigation. Two research instruments were employed to collect information in compliance with the qualitative methodology adopted. These techniques are interviews and participant observation. The type of interview used is face-to-face, unstructured interviews, somewhat akin to Korth's (2005) language biographies which is a narrative interview form used to give a cohesive account of a person's life in relation to language. We chose the unstructured interview because its loose and open-ended nature gives respondents freedom to express their personal opinion. According to Krulfeld (1998) participant observation proves to be highly essential for refugee research due to the fact that refugees often do not trust researchers who usually come from stable dominant groups. However, the fact that refugees are reachable, due to their peculiar circumstances, offer researchers the opportunity to relate with them in everyday life and by so doing build up trust which is necessary to obtain reliable data. In the course of this research, the researcher became very familiar and involved with some of the residents in Oru camp, with respect to their socio-economic condition.

Results, analysis and discussion

The result of this investigation sourced through interviews and participant observation, is presented below.

Greetings-based switch

The manifestation of different identities is often triggered by factors such as greetings, in the course of a conversation. This kind of code switching occurs where there is an obvious change in the situation like ‘the arrival of a new person’ (Holmes 2008:35). This is an instance of participant related code switching. Some of their occurrences are in situations where a participant needs to greet a new entrant. An instance of such incidence is presented below.

Sample 1 An introduction of the researcher (RES) to a Temne Woman (TW) in the camp by Mr. Lebbie (LB), the chairman of the Sierra Leone group.

1. LB: Madam dis man na researcher and he need your assistance.
(*madam, this man is a researcher and he needs your assistance*)
2. TW: Which kin assistance?
(*what kind of assistance?*)
3. LB: He wan know the language you speak.
(*He wants to know the languages you speak*)
4. RES: Yes, I actually want to know the various languages you speak in different situations.
5. TW: Okay, no problem
(another Temne woman (TW1) stops by)
6. TW: Topia?
(*How are you*)
7. TW1: Mpiare seke.
(*Good afternoon*)

In sample 1, the switch is from Krio to an, indigenous language, Temne. This shift represents a transition from a metropolitan identity to an ethnic identity. The switch from Krio to Temne is an instance of divergence, for the purpose of greeting or phatic communion, but its remote cause is to express ethnic identity and solidarity. However, the switch to an indigenous language is not mandatory for this kind of phatic-based switch; it is a matter of choice among the participants. Guerini (2005:171) proposes that ‘though in many cases phatic expressions are actually uttered in the language of interaction, bilingual speakers may choose to give up the code employed up to that point of the conversation and mark them through the introduction of a different language, thus giving rise to a code switching occurrence’. It should be noted that TW suspended her interaction with the researcher due to the entrance of her ethnic relation. This suspension underscores the strength of ethnic bonding and solidarity. However, the suspension is a subtle exercise of power by TW in that she initiated the suspension, without the consent of the other participant, and especially the fact that she suspended the talk without the courtesy of an excuse. Although, the divergence to the ethnic language in the greetings by the women is unmarked it had the effect of distancing RES. The implication of this distancing is the drawing of a line between ‘we’ and ‘they’, and to some degree the ‘distancer’ openly highlighted her psychological distinctiveness. In this instance, TW diverged from a metropolitan face (Krio) to an ethno linguistic face (indigenous language).

Emphasis-based switch

The manifestation of different identities is sometimes triggered by the need to emphasize a point in the course of a conversation. This case of code-switching is the switch to an indigenous language in order to strengthen one's position. This is employed when a conversation in one code failed to achieve the desired result, so the speaker switches to another code to emphasise his /her position. This variety of codeswitching is represented below

Sample 2: (Interaction between Mr. Charles (CH) a Mende man and a Mende woman (MW) who sells bean cakes (akara).

1. MW: Chairman, me wan gi yu akara
(Chairman, I want to give you akara)
2. CH: No worry, mi no fit kari
(Don't worry, I can't carry it)
3. MW: Udat yu de shakara for?
(Who are you showing off for?)
4. CH: No be shakara
(I am not showing off)
5. MW: (aloud) Boi hoi mbe!
(Hold this thing!)
MW pushes the nylon bag containing akara into CH's hands and he takes it reluctantly.

Sample 2 above involves a switch from Krio to Mende which represents a shift from national to ethnic identity. MW expressed an intention to offer *akara* to CH but he turned down the offer. MW felt he was feeling shy due probably to the presence of the researcher, and then switched to Mende to force CH to accept her offer. MW used the switch to intensify her intension and to break down the defence of CH by arousing ethnic feelings and consciousness. This is also an instance of divergence for cultural needs. By switching to Mende MW excluded or distanced the researcher by marking their psychological distinctiveness and strengthened the ethnic bond shared with CH. Thus, in this context MW showed the power of the indigenous language (Mende) over their national language (Krio). What this suggests is that the first language of interaction (Krio) seemed too weak to achieve the result, hence a switch to a stronger code (Mende). However, it should be noted that the emphasis in this example did not represent the exact repetition of an earlier comment. Rather we are dealing with a subtle or partial repetition in an indigenous language of that which had been said earlier in another language. In other words we are dealing with 'semantic equivalence' (Guerini 2005:167) between the two codes. It should also be noted that the switch to Mende involved a change in sonority. There was an observable rise in the speaker's voice. This is in keeping with Guerini's (2005:169) supposition that 'as a rule, repetitions tend to be marked by a rising, exclamative intonation,

especially if they are meant to influence the addressee's behaviour by reiterating an order or a request that he hesitates to fulfil'. In this instance, there is a shift from a metropolitan face to an ethnolinguistic face.

Proverb-based switch

The manifestation of other identities is sometimes effected by the need to support or strengthen a position in the course of a conversation. Like quotations above, proverbs are reasons for a switch from one code to another, and also serve a referential function. However, proverbs are culture specific. In a conversation, a participant may switch to a proverb in his native language for one reason or the other as the following example, taken in the camp show.

Sample 3: Interaction between the researcher (RES) and Mariama (MA) a Limba woman

1. RES: what are your plans, are you going
2. back to Sierra Leone?
3. MA: I don't know, we are tired of moving here and there ... and this integration
4. is not working; my people say 'woko bocha kan see a ma gra'
5. RES: Is that a Limba proverb?
6. MA: No, it is krio
7. RES: Oh!
8. MA: It means, one who walk up and
9. down may not see his mother's grave.
10. RES: Alright

In sample 3 above, there is a switch from English to Krio in the course of using a proverb. The purpose of switching to Krio to say the proverb is evidently to make the truth more explicit and undisputable. If the respondent had translated the proverb in the language of interaction (English) probably English would have tempered the strength of expression and it would not be as effective as she wanted. Saying the proverb in the indigenous tongue (Krio) MA made the expression effective. This is a case of divergence motivated by communicative and cultural expediencies. Apart from the referential function which this switch served in the interaction, the switch also signalled ethnic identity; MA used the proverb to signal identity with Kpelle. Additionally, the language of interaction up to the point of the quote was English which MA used to signal and project a modern image and also marked the formality of the situation. In this instance, the identity shift is from a cosmopolitan face to an ethno linguistic face.

Formality-based switch

The manifestation of other identities is sometimes provoked by the need to use a formal code in the course of a conversation in an informal code. A speaker may switch from an informal to a formal code to reflect a transition from an

informal to a formal situation or relationship. This is represented in the data below which is an extract of interview with a respondent.

Sample 4: Interaction preceding an interview with Victoria (VA) a Mende school girl. Charles (CH) introduced VA to the researcher (RES) before the interaction.

1. CH: Mariama come talk with wi padi
(*Mariama come and talk with our friend*)
2. VA: aba wo?
(*about what*)
3. CH: The dialect you speak.
4. VA: Ha! ustem?
(*when?*)
5. CH: naw naw (immediately)
6. VA: Me jus coma na skul me hungry
(*I am just coming back from school, and I am hungry*)
7. CH: No worry, e no take time and e na buy you something
(*Don't worry, it will not take time and he will buy you something*)
8. VA: (to researcher): okay let us start sir,
9. RES: Thank you Mariama, could you tell us about yourself and the languages you
10. speak.
11. CH: My name is Victoria from Sierra Leone. We are eight in the family and
12. speak English with my family,... my native language is Mende, I speak it just a little because my parents are not from the same place...

The sample above represents a switch from Krio to English. In example 8, CH tried to woo VA to grant an interview to the researcher and this conversation between CH and VA was carried on in Krio. But when VA agreed, she spoke to the researcher in English. VA spoke with her national relation (CH) in Krio which is unmarked but diverged to English to interact with a non-ethnic relation, the researcher. This switch was especially done because interviews are formal engagements which require a formal code. Holmes (2008:36) states that 'a switch may also reflect a change in status relation between people or the formality of their interaction'. The demands of such switches are that more formal interactions which also involve status differences are sometimes expressed in a higher code or variety. This is what Myers-Scotton (1993:147) termed 'code switching as a deferential strategy'. Myers-Scotton posits that such a strategy is employed to index deference to a superior person by accommodating oneself to an addressee's code. The respondent VA switched or diverged to a code which marked the status of the researcher and in so doing signalled respect, and a cosmopolitan face. Evidently VA switched to English to show RES that she was educated, and in so doing projected a modern image.

Apart from indexing the formality of the situation, this switch is also status marked. This is especially so since the switches took place in the midst of other people. Evidently VA switched to English to show RES that she was

educated, and in so doing projected a modern image. In so doing she impressed the researcher that she belonged to the educated class who speak English, despite their position as refugees. In other words, the switch to English is also for the purpose of signalling higher status in order to attract respect and avoid being looked at with contempt. This example is an instance of upward convergence for reasons of social approval.

Emotion-based switch

The manifestation of other identities is sometimes caused by a change in the mood of a speaker in the course of a conversation. Emotions such as anger can trigger a switch from one code to another and the purpose is to widen distance between the speaker and his addressee. An example was found in the camp and is represented below:

Sample 5: Mr. Lebbie's (LB) introduction of the researcher to Mr. John (Jo) who was playing a draft game with a friend

1. JO: Kushe
(*Greeting*)
2. LB: Kushe, wi padi wan tok wit yu smol
(*greeting, our friend wants to talk with you briefly*).
3. JO: Ok, a de com
(*ok I am coming*)
John continues playing with his friend
4. LB: Wetin mek yu de do lak dis?
(*why are you behaving like this?*)
5. JO: Me say a de com
(*I say I am coming*)
John continues playing with his friend, ostensibly ignoring LB and RES.
6. LB: If you don't want to talk, tell us and let us go! (to RES) let us go!

In the sample above, the code switching is from Krio to English. The language of interaction, in this example, is Krio which LB and JO used to signal their national identity. However, JO was reluctant to grant an interview to the researcher despite the appeal by LB who is the chairman of the Sierra Leone group. LB took JO's reluctance as a snub and slight to his person and authority and therefore switched to English to address JO. This switch is an instance of divergence for reasons of showing authority and power. By switching to English LB expressed both anger and authority at JO. This is a marked code switching example, and is in tandem with Myers-Scotton's (1993:132) position that 'one of the most common uses of marked CS is to express authority; along with anger or annoyance, it can be argued of course, that those who have the luxury of expressing anger are often those who have authority'. The effect of such a switch is either to increase distance, or to decrease it. In the example above, LB's switch to English was done to register his annoyance and in so doing he increased the distance between him and JO. The divergence helped to cancel and neutralise

whatever national identity LB had established at the onset and to tell JO that he has failed to act in a way that showed they shared the same national belongingness. Therefore, the switch to English is an instance of divergence used to signal strangeness and difference.

Manifestation of Identities through Code mixing

Code mixing is a similar form of code alternation through which identities were manifested in the camp. The data represented below were sourced from recorded conversations involving people from the same ethnic group.

Sample 6: Extract from a conversation between Juma (JM) and Lebbie (LB) (both Mende).

1. LB: Na everyday dis grumble, you just de grumble, e no easy for we.
(why are you always grumbling, it is not easy for anybody)
2. JM: Chairman, how we no go grumble... Den don abandon we ti bia muma we get
3. plenty pickin dem de ngaa lo nyama gbo gbe gbi moyaa meva na only small
4. eba and garri wo mia mo ya mu me maha
(chairman why should we not grumble, they abandoned us, they abandoned us, we have plenty children with us; we don't have anything to eat except a little eba and garri for just one day)
5. LB: wetin una cook today?
(What did you cook today?)
6. JM: Mister chairman we no cook natin, na le muongo mume njo la mi nya gi he
7. gbe nya gue gbe, nya hi gbe gwe
(Mister chairman we did not cook anything, the only thing we have to eat is potato leaf, look at me sitting here, look at my feet, I am sick)
8. LB: Bi koo lo, everywhere na de worl e no de easy. The fact here is that if you see
9. garri you manage it.
(You know things are not easy all over the world. The fact here is that if you see garri you manage it).
10. JM: Bi koo lo ge federal government dia ye tia take care mo but right now nungaa
11. gbe abandonga because nya me I de hear news say dis camp den don hand am
12. over to the Moslem people dem.
(You know that the federal government has promised to take care of us but right now everybody has abandoned us because I heard that this camp has been handed over to the Moslem people).
13. LB: In the first place, person no go live here forever, and irrespective of the fact
14. that we de here, ma ya agira kemu ya mama mu ye tahu back to our home,
15. that is the important thing...

(In the first place, nobody will live here forever, and irrespective of the fact that we are here, we have to be thinking and making plans to go back home. That is the important thing).

16. JM: Ngowoo, gba yo jaun
(By the grace of God).

Sample 7: Extract of interaction between Mohammed (MO) and Saffiatu (SF) about the war in Sierra Leone. (Both Temne)

1. MO: Dis war make me tiede go backward
(the (Liberian) war made me go backward till today)
2. SF: Me sef, a suffer na de war, gbin ka kuru; o ma easy.
(Even me, I suffered in the war in a very terrible way; it's not easy).
3. MO: De time wey de Ecomog dem take over, a be de cam na Freeton for buy
4. market... Den a been dey buy fuel for sale; me neng titi la a market do
5. Guinea. From Guinea, nti kone do kiamp. Dat time de (rebel) don de
6. cam na
village, na de we meet de rebel dem wey den take all de markit na we
hand.
(when Ecomog took over I used to go to Freetown on business. Then I used to do fuel business; I used to go to markets in Guinea to sell. From Guinea I traveled back to my village. That time the rebels were in our village, and it was there we met them and they took all our products)
7. SF: Mi na gbe tonuton, na dat day den (rebels) kill me broda wey de burn am
8. inside hose dat January 6.
(Even me that particular day. It was that day the rebels killed my brother by setting him ablaze inside the house on January 6).

The examples above involve a mixing of different languages in the interaction. In sample 6, three codes are involved: Mende, Krio and English. Mende is the language of the Mende which mark their ethnolinguistic identity as a distinct cultural group. By using Mende, the participants expressed high ethnic solidarity and shared identity; in so doing other people who are not members of the Mende community, like the researcher, were excluded and distanced in the talk. By using Krio in the discourse, the participants signalled their national and metropolitan identities as gregarious city people. The use of English in this interaction symbolized social distance and status. English, here is a symbol of education and so in this context it is marked. This is in agreement with Scotton's (1993:132) markedness principle.

...speakers engage in what is here called marked CS to indicate...superior educational status to assertions of ethnic identity. All these, however, can be subsumed under one general effect: to negotiate a change in the expected social distance holding between participants, either increasing or decreasing it'.

It is important to note that LB is educated while JM is not educated. By switching mainly to English, LB diverged from JM and demonstrated a marked superior educational status, which increased the social distance between him and JM. By momentarily switching to the indigenous and national languages, LB converged downward towards JM and narrowed the social distance between him and JM. Through this accommodation LB projected a polite face, which is used as an inclusive device in conversation, and an ethnolinguistic face which is employed to signal identity with an ethnic kin. The effect of this accommodation is a flow in the conversation between the two unequal participants. If LB spoke only English he might be regarded as being disloyal and disrespectful to the other Mende participant. If he spoke only Mende or Krio, he might be afraid of losing face before his uneducated participant. So he involved the three identities for the benefit of his addressee and his own status and self esteem. In sample 7, two codes are used: Krio and Temne. MO and SF vacillated between Krio and Temne to signal two contrastive identities, national (Krio) and ethnic (Temne) and in so doing they facilitated their interaction and projected both a metropolitan and ethnolinguistic face.

On the whole, the effect of this rapid switchings, from one language to another is that it helped the speakers to 'signal different identities at once' (Trudgill, 1974:123) and in the process lubricated their talk. Such dual or multiple identities (Collier and Thomas, 1988; Cupach and Imahori, 1993) are negotiated for the purpose of signalling different faces to different individuals (Carson, 2005) which implies that the respondents belonged to multiple spheres and groups. The analyses of code switching and code mixing above show that the two language devices fulfilled pragmatic functions in multilingual interactions; more importantly, the two devices helped to assign hyphenated and multiple identities to the refugees.

It is important to note that the trajectory of code switching has implications for identity. The pattern of code switches were mainly, Krio-Ethnic, English-Ethnic, and Krio-English. It is obvious that Krio and English were the bases of the switches encountered in the samples, that is, the respondents switched from Krio/English to their indigenous languages, and switched from Krio to English. The base of the switch, to an extent, represents the language mainly used by the respondent. Myers-Scotton (1993) posits that the matrix or base language (that is, the language from which a person switches to another) is the primary language while the embedded language (that is, the language switched to) is the secondary one. The matrix/embedded distinction indicate power differentials between the two languages, whereby the matrix is assumed to be more valuable in the particular conversation, than the embedded. However, the distribution of power is not frozen as a change of topic may require a reversal of power, and consequently, the embedded will become the base, and the matrix will play the lesser role. The obvious implication is that the matrix language is more preferred than the embedded language, in a conversation. But in a consistent situation, that is, where a particular language is dominant, across topics, then it is easy to delineate the language actually preferred by the participants. In terms of identity

projection, it is deemed fit that the preferred language represents the identity preferred by the participants.

On the strength of this, it is suggested that the pattern of switching in the present study shows that the respondents preferred a metropolitan identity represented by Krio followed by a modern identity, represented by English, and an ethno linguistic identity represented by their indigenous tongues, in that order. The reason for the overwhelming preference for Krio is not far-fetched. Krio is a language of wider communication, used mainly in the cities and thus has a high status, in terms of the image of the user. Most Sierra Leoneans speak Krio with pride due to the fact that it gives them a city image and is also an index of their national identity. The use of English is tied to its prestige and limitless instrumental capabilities. In most instances, their indigenous languages served as the embedded language which means that the respondents occasionally shifted to their roots. This is a suggestion that they did not really appreciate projecting themselves as ethnic people for doing so implies being seen by others as uncultured. The absence of the host community language in the samples above seems to indicate that the least preferred identity is Yoruba ethno-culture. However, the non use of Yoruba in the interactions above could be related to the fact that the conversations wholly involved the Sierra Leonean group.

Conclusion

The analysis of code switching above shows that the language device fulfilled pragmatic functions in multilingual interactions; more importantly, it helped to assign hyphenated and multiple identities to the respondents. The merit of these switches, from one language to another is the speakers' capacity to signal different identities simultaneously and in the process lubricated discourse. Such dual or multiple identities are negotiated for the purpose of signalling different faces to different individuals which implies that the respondents belonged to multiple spheres and groups. It has been shown that code switchings, in this case, were triggered by varying factors: greetings, proverbs, formal situations, emphatic expressions and emotional outbursts. This is an indication that code switching is not an arbitrary linguistic practice but a systematic strategy used by speakers to achieve socio-cultural objectives, in the course of a conversation. Moreover, the pattern of switches provides ample reason to suggest that the sampled respondents in this study preferred the projection of a modern identity, instead of an ethnic identity.

It is recommended that refugees should pragmatically utilize their indigenous languages as a means of ensuring their maintenance and vitality, and boosting their ethnic image and bonding. In the same vein, refugees should identify more with the language of the host community. They stand to benefit immensely from an identification of this nature. Being a window to a culture, the acquisition of another language makes one a part of the other culture and people, makes one more acceptable to the other culture, promotes inter-ethnic bonding and peaceful co-existence, and creates socio-economic opportunities for the recipient. These are some of the benefits of inclusion and diversity.

References

- Adegbija, E. (2004). "Language Policy and Planning in Nigeria", *Current Issues in Language Planning*, Vol. 5, No. 3 pp. 58-61.
- Albrecht, S. (2001). 'Preventing the Flight of Refugees' *Peace Review* 13, No. 1, pp.109-120.
- Berry, J.W. (2008). "Globalisation and Acculturation", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* Vol. 32 pp. 328 – 336.
- Carson, L (ed.) (2005). *Multilingualism in Europe Settings*. Berlin: Peter Langue.
- Cupach, W.R. & Imahori, T.T. (1993). 'Identity Management Theory: Communication Competent in Intercultural Episodes and Relationships', in R.L Wiseman and J Kocster (eds.) *Intercultural Communication Competence*, 112-131. Newbury Pack C.A: Sage.
- Ed. Zar-zar, B. (2002). Conspiracy to Eliminate the Krahn Group, *The Perspectives*, www.theperspective.org/campjohnsonroad.html/
- Fishman J.A. (1968). "Sociolinguistic Perspective in the Study of Bilingualism", *Linguistics*, 39: 21-49.
- Fyle, M.C (1994). 'Official and Unofficial Attitudes and Policy Towards Krio as the Main Lingua Franca in Sierra Leone', in *African Languages, Development and the State*, Fardon, R and Furniss, G(eds.), London: Routledge.
- Gibson, K. (2004). 'English Only Court cases Involving the U.S. Courtplace – The Myths of Language Use and the Homogenisation of Bilingual Workers' Identities'. www.pdf.con/k.39531html/www.hawaii.edu/sis/uhalpest/22121/gibson.
- Giles, H. And Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Buckingham: Oxford University Press.
- Giles, H. And Johnson, P (1987). "Ethnolinguistic Identity Theory: a Social Psychological Approach to Language Maintenance". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 63, PP. 69 – 99.
- Grosjean, F (1982). "Individual Bilingualism", *The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Guerini F. (2005). *Language Alternation Strategies in Multilingual Settings*, Bern: Peter Langue.

- Holmes J. (2008). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, UK: Longman.
- Hudson, R.A. (2001). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Y.Y. (2001) *Becoming Intercultural: An Integrative Theory of Communication and Cross –Cultural Adaptation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Korth, B. (2005). *Language Attitudes Toward Kyrgyz and Russian*, Bern: Peter Langue.
- Kruffeld, R.M. (1998) “Exploring New Methods for Collaboration in Ethnographic Research: An Attempt at Overcoming exploitation and Violation of Human Rights”, in R.M. Krulfeld & J.C. MacDonald (eds.) *Power, Ethics and Human Rights: Anthropological Studies of Refugees Research and Action*. New York.
- Myers–Scotton, C. (1993). *Social Motivations For Code Switching*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Ngovo, B L. (1998). ‘English in Liberia’ in *English Today* 54 vol. 14, No. 2, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Oakes, L. (2001). *Language and National Identity: Comparing France and Sweden*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Olaoye, A. (1998) *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Abuja: Ogunleye Publishing and Printing Press
- Phinney, J. (2001). “Ethnic Identity and Acculturation”, in K. Chum, P.B. Organists and G. Marin (eds.) *Acculturation Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied Research* pp. 63 – 81 Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Romaine, S. (2003). “Multilingualism” in *The Handbook of Linguistics*, Mark Arnoff & Janie Rees – Miller (eds.), U.K: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sengova, J. (1987). ‘The National Languages of Sierra Leone: A Decade of Policy Experimentation’ in *Africa, Journal of the International African Institutes*. Vol. 57 No. 4, pp. 7-12 U.K: Edinburgh University Press.
- UNHCR (2008) <http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home>.