Exploring Identity through Code-switching: A Poststructuralist Approach

Malini Ramsay-Brijball

Introduction

The use of a particular language variety in the creation, negotiation and reflection of one's identity has been topical in Sociolinguistics for some time. In this article, I focus on code-switching (CS) and its impact on the construction of identity. CS can be traced as far back as the nineteenth century in the Cape Peninsula (McCormick 1989) and is a commonly observed language contact phenomenon in post-apartheid South Africa. Simply stated, this linguistic phenomenon refers to the use of two or more languages by bilingual speakers in the same conversation or conversational turn.

As an academic on the Westville campus of the University of KwaZulu-Natal for more than a decade, I have witnessed the ease with which isiZulu first language (L1) speakers resort to CS as a regular linguistic option. CS and other language-related studies (e.g. Kieswetter 1995 and Moyo 1996, among others) confirm that CS is a common feature of the speech of isiZulu L1 speakers. Yet, a pilot study conducted a few years ago (Ramsay-Brijball 1999:165) and a doctoral study (Ramsay-Brijball 2003) indicates that many of these speakers deny engaging in CS. They believe it is bad, is destroying isiZulu and must therefore be avoided and discouraged. The question that then arises is: why do isiZulu L1 speakers use this mixed, stigmatized variety so frequently and what impact does it have on the ways in which they construct their identity?

According to Edwards (1985:3) any sociolinguistic investigation is inevitably about identity, its formation, presentation and maintenance. He

regards language as the central linchpin of identity. More recently, Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004:2) have attempted to identify new theoretical approaches to understanding how people negotiate identities in multilingual contexts in view of recent socio-political and socio-economic trends such as globalization, the post-colonial search for new national identities and increased transnational migration. Primarily drawing on Pavlenko and Blackledge's (2004) poststructuralist approach, the article reveals how isiZulu L1 students on the multilingual Westville campus employ isiZulu-English code-switching (Z-E CS) as a vehicle through which they can define themselves. My findings indicate that the greater incidence of a mixed variety in comparison to the use of either a monolingual English or isiZulu variety bears testimony to a 'negotiable identity' these speakers seek for themselves.

Methodological Framework

Drawing on the poststructuralist approach, I undertook to investigate isiZulu L1 students' motivations for and attitudes towards isiZulu-English code-switching (Z-E CS). Data was collected using the triangulation method i.e. the use of multiple data sources arising from multiple data collection procedures. I used a questionnaire survey among, and conducted interviews with, final level isiZulu L1 students on the Westville campus. Apart from my observations and field notes of the speech patterns of isiZulu L1 students, I also used audio-recorded naturally occurring conversations among them in order to investigate the incidence, form and directionality of Z-E CS, and to test the validity of some of the responses emanating from the other data collection techniques.

The recordings of the conversations were conducted by two postgraduate, isiZulu L1 research assistants. The aim was to minimize contamination of the data, a phenomenon that Labov (1966, 1975) described as 'the observer's paradox'. As in-group members (shared age group, home language, tertiary education status, etc) the research assistants could easily gain permission from the subjects and access to authentic isiZulu L1 speech. Milroy (1987:63) states that one way of obtaining spontaneous data is to define the speech event as something other than an interview. In so doing, it is very likely that the interactants will talk to each other/one another rather

than adopting the question-answer format of an interview. The research assistants approached isiZulu L1 students randomly, of whom many were known to them as peers either through a common programme of study or friends. The topics of the conversations were not interfered with in any way. Interactants proceeded with their conversations as naturally as possible as their focus was the content of the conversations rather than the form. Prospective CS researchers should note that when collecting code-switching data, the aim is to collect naturally occurring speech and to then identify the code-switched extracts.

The subjects were divided into two groups, namely, the Experimental Group (EG) and the Control Group (CG). The EG comprised those students who were studying isiZulu as a subject of study. These students were registered for the isiZulu Programme which is taught through the medium of isiZulu and which covers linguistic, literary and cultural aspects of isiZulu and its speakers. The remaining students in the sample population were registered for other programmes across the faculties on the Westville campus and which are conducted in English, the designated medium of instruction of this institution. The students in this latter group formed the CG.

The purpose of delineating the sample population in the manner described above was to investigate the impact of four factors in particular on the subjects' linguistic behaviour and their concomitant effect on the construction of their identity. These factors were: educational orientation (i.e., the academic programme a student registers for), medium of instruction, language attitudes and the diglossic relationship between English and isiZulu. Other sociolinguistic variables were considered in the stratification of the sample, namely, age, gender, student's residence during the academic year and student's location of home. These, however, are not the focus of this article.

Of the four factors being considered, 'diglossia' is worth further explanation for those unfamiliar with this linguistic jargon. Numerous definitions of diglossia are offered in the literature. Ferguson (1959) first introduced this term into the literature on Sociolinguistics in order to describe the language situation in places like Greece, Haiti and the Arab- as well as the German-speaking worlds in general. Ferguson's definition is as follows:

> Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation (Ferguson 1972:232).

In his definition, Ferguson refers to different varieties of the same language. In this regard, he distinguishes between a High variety and a Low variety. The former represents a standard variety and the latter, a non-standard, colloquial variety. Fishman (1971) however, used the term differently. Fishman extended the definitions provided above to include the use of two genetically unrelated languages for different purposes in a given community. For purposes of this study, I adopt Fishman's (1971) definition of diglossia in this study as I focus on the use of two genetically unrelated languages viz. English and isZulu in the CS patterns of isiZulu L1 speakers.

    According to Kamwangamalu (2000:199), much has been written about diglossia and the critical role that the status of languages plays in shaping one's speech patterns. However, only a few studies relate diglossia to CS (Mkilifi 1978; Scotton 1986; Wald 1986). With respect to CS in the African context, Kamwangamalu (2000:202) suggests that diglossia is a 'useful macrolinguistic construct for the study of CS structure'. According to him, CS in the African context is characterized by unidirectional switching from the African languages (Low varieties) to the ex-colonial languages (High varieties). Taking this into account, exploring the diglossic relationship between isiZulu and English is important to understand the form and function of Z-E CS. It also enables one to gain insight into how power relationships between the languages create as well as reflect particular identities.

Theoretical Framework

Various theoretical frameworks are considered in this article. These range from general sociolinguistic approaches such as Edwards (1985) to more

specific functional models in CS research (e.g. Myers-Scotton's 1993a markedness model and Heller's 1992, 1995 ideological-political model). Pavlenko and Blackledge's (2004) poststructuralist approach to understanding how identities are negotiated in multilingual contexts, however, forms the over-arching theoretical framework that guides the discussion.

According to Pavlenko and Blackledge (hereafter P&B) the sociopsychological and interactional sociolinguistic approaches have dominated macro-sociolinguistic research for many decades. These approaches are relevant for exploring identities in multilingual contexts but some also present shortcomings. For instance, the sociopsychological approaches (e.g. Tajfel's (1974, 1981) social identity theory and Berry's (1980) theory of acculturation) assume a one-to-one correlation between language and ethnic identity. This assumption is based on the misconceived notion that members belong to a 'homogeneous ethnolinguistic community which has a monolingual, monocultural, linear and unidirectional bias' (P&B 2004:4-7). Such a view obscures the existence of hybrid identities and also hides the complex linguistic repertoires of bi/multilingual speakers in this global world.

With respect to the interactional sociolinguistic approaches (e.g. Gumperz's (1982) interactional model, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (1985) work on focusing and diffusion as well as Myers-Scotton's (1993a) markedness model), P&B highlight various shortcomings. One shortcoming has been around the use of 'identity' as the explanatory concept 'when the concept itself needs to be explained' and furthermore, it is not the only factor influencing code-switching and language choice generally (P&B 2004:8-9). According to Auer (1995, 1998) another shortcoming of interactional sociolinguistic approaches is that they tend to relegate the prediction and determinants of code-switching patterns and language choice to macro-sociolinguistic issues at times. Auer suggests that these can only be explained by investigating the specific interactional aspects of a conversation.

P&B (2004:8) consider Myers-Scotton's (1993a) markedness model as the best-known sociolinguistic model of negotiation of identities through code-switching [CS]. In summary, Myers-Scotton draws attention to the socio-pragmatic nature of CS. She focuses on CS as a negotiation of the balance of rights and obligations (RO) between speakers and argues that speakers choose a code 'that would symbolize the rights and obligations they

wish to enforce in the exchange in question and index the appropriate identities' (P&B 2004:8). The central organising device of this model is the notion of 'markedness', a concept that Myers-Scotton (1993a:79) has argued to be 'a part of the innate cognitive faculty of all humans', but one that has not yet been proven beyond doubt either by Myers-Scotton or by anybody else. By 'markedness', Myers-Scotton means that speakers make either marked or unmarked choices for any given situation. Basically, 'unmarked' refers to the normal or expected choice in a conversational context. 'Marked', on the other hand, indicates a negotiation of a different balance of rights and obligations by using an unexpected or less common form (cf. Myers-Scotton 1993a). Speakers use marked choices to either increase or decrease social distance, to establish deference or superiority, among other reasons.

Myers-Scotton's work is not without its detractors. Concerns have been raised with regard to various aspects of this model (cf. Meeuwis and Blommaert 1994). Alvarez-Caccamo (1998) has drawn attention to the misconception that might arise with Myers-Scotton's notion of indexicality viz. that the indexical value of CS is the compound of the values associated with each language. Li Wei (1998) and Auer (1998) have also questioned Myers-Scotton's static notion of indexicality by arguing that it incorrectly 'draws on speakers' perceptions rather than local meanings' and therefore may not be able to capture the diversity of interactions in multilingual settings (P&B 2004:9). It is worth noting however, that speakers' perceptions and local meanings are not necessarily incompatible.

As a way forward, P&B suggest a poststructuralist approach to understanding the negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts by focusing on 'how languages are appropriated in this complex, multi-faceted process'. Their approach is informed by the works of various scholars such as Bourdieu (1977, 1991), Woolard (1985, 1998), Gal (1989) and Heller (1982, 1992, 1995). In using the concept of 'capital' (borrowed from economics), Bourdieu (1977, 1991) refers to one's access to the various types of resources that are available. Bourdieu argues that language is a form of capital that can be exchanged for other forms of capital, i.e. social, economic or cultural capital. This basically means that language choice can determine the extent of one's social, economic and cultural success. His model rests on the notion that 'the value of a particular language variety in a

symbolic market place derives from its legitimation by the dominant group and the dominant institutions' and that 'a symbolically dominated group is complicit in the misrecognition *(meconnaissance)*, or valorization, of that language and variety as an inherently better form' (Bourdieu 1991:163). By 'dominant', Bourdieu refers to numerical supremacy.

Fundamentally, Bourdieu's notion of symbolic domination forms the basis of the work of the other three researchers, viz. Woolard, Gal and Heller. While all of them recognise the relevance of Bourdieu's model, each has critiqued this core notion on different grounds, thereby resulting in approaches that may be similar but which, in fact, are conceptually different. In spite of adopting the basic premise of Bourdieu's model of symbolic domination in her studies, Woolard (1985) offers a counter-argument to Bourdieu's distinction of majority/minority in terms of numeracy only. Woolard suggests that the status a language enjoys in a particular society can also distinguish one as superior and the other as inferior. Hence, it is possible that a language with fewer speakers than another language may enjoy majority status if its symbolic and instrumental value is greater than the other language. Woolard also recognises the limitation of Bourdieu's 'marketplace metaphor' and has suggested that languages can have different values in different marketplaces. By this, she means that a single language/language variety can have high value (e.g. to show solidarity) in one context but low value (e.g. to reflect social distance) in another context.

Similarly, Gal's (1989) critique of Bourdieu's model is based on the premise that people of different classes and ethnic groups use languages differently and that they transform their linguistic norms and associated identities 'through microstructures of interaction' (P&B 2004:11). In other words, Gal also argues that people can use a single language/language variety in different ways. While some can use a particular variety as an out-group variety to reflect resistance, others may use the same variety as an in-group variety to reflect solidarity.

According to Bourdieu (1991), varieties that are considered official and standard are often regarded as superior to those that are unofficial and non-standard. While this statement may hold theoretical validity in some contexts, it may present shortcomings in contexts that are highly diglossic. For example, both English and isiZulu enjoy official language status in South Africa. However, in considering the standard varieties of each,

English enjoys superior status rather than isiZulu, not only among English L1 speakers but also among speakers of other home languages. It may also be said that given the hegemonic role of English in the South African context, even the non-standard varieties of English are misrecognised as more superior to the standard variety of isiZulu by many speakers.

In view of the inherent unequal distribution of capital, Heller (1995:161), in her ideological-political model, suggests that an unequal distribution of linguistic and cultural capital in a society can influence language practices in that society. In this regard, Heller (1992:123) states:

> language practices are inherently political insofar as they are among the ways individuals have at their disposal of gaining access to the production, distribution and consumption of symbolic and material resources.

This means that language forms part of the negotiation of power. Heller (1992, 1995) therefore argues that code-switching (CS) may be viewed as a strategy for attaining a sense of shared power and solidarity among bilingual speakers. Furthermore, CS can function as a salient means of achieving social, economic and political goals.

Analysis and Discussion

Drawing on the approaches outlined above, my study shows that Zulu L1 speakers use Zulu-English code-switching (Z-E CS) i.e. a mixed, stigmatised variety as a tool to define themselves and to express their aspirations. On the basis of my findings, it may be summarised that the use of Z-E CS exposes the hybrid nature of the subjects' identity e.g. linguistic, cultural and social identity.

With respect to linguistic identity, the use of this mixed variety reveals one's linguistic repertoire and one's cline of bilinguality (Kachru 1986). Simply stated, the former refers to the number of languages known by an individual and the latter refers to the varying degrees of proficiency that an individual may develop with respect to the different languages he/she may acquire/learn. As mentioned in the methodological framework, all the subjects in my study were bilingual in English and isiZulu. They studied

either through the medium of isiZulu (the Experimental group i.e. the EG) or English (the Control group i.e. the CG). Apart from being accepted as the language of wider communication on the campus setting, English is the L1 of 39% of the student population. isiZulu, on the other hand, is the language of the majority of the student population (43%).

With regard to the subjects' clines of bilinguality, a comprehensive analysis of the form of the subjects' code-switches (the focus of a forthcoming article) reveals that the form of code-switching by the subjects of the EG is different from that of the subjects in the CG. The key distinguishing features are larger embedded language (EL) islands, matrix language (ML) islands, single lexeme switches and intra- vs. inter-sentential code-switching (CS). For instance, the subjects in the EG use larger embedded language islands to a larger extent than those in the CG i.e. the use of more than two word phrases and clauses in their CS patterns. In this regard, Finlayson, Calteaux and Myers-Scotton (1998:415) have argued that the more proficient bilinguals tend to produce larger embedded language constituents. The implication of this, therefore, is that the EG shows greater proficiency of English than the CG.

With respect to single lexeme switches, nouns are code-switched more than any other part of speech. However, a closer analysis of the form of the switched nouns indicates that the subjects in the CG use more multiple-layered, inflected noun forms than their counterparts (59:29%). According to Poplack (1980) and more recently, Muysken, Kook and Vedder (1996), there is a close relationship between levels of bilinguality and types of code-switched constituents. They state that the higher the level of bilinguality, the more complex the form of code-switching. Bearing this in mind, one may deduce that there is a high level of bilinguality among the subjects in the CG. The contrastive findings reflect the subjects' differing levels of usage and proficiency of English and isiZulu.

Regarding cultural identity, the study shows that the subjects use Z-E CS to sanction their cultural backgrounds while trying to adapt simultaneously to global demands. In this regard, the use of ML islands is particularly interesting. The findings clearly reveal that isiZulu is the ML in the Z-E CS patterns of both groups. A closer inspection of the data further indicates that the subjects in the CG use ML islands to a greater extent than their counterparts in the EG. Of the ten conversations by the subjects in the

CG, there are three conversations that have instances where several turns would take place entirely in the ML. This finding may be attributed to two extra-linguistic features in particular, viz. language attitudes and educational orientation. As these students pursue their studies through the medium of English, the pressure to deliver academic material in the L2 weighs heavily upon them. Arguably, it may be said, that the subjects in the CG use isiZulu extensively in informal situations while engaging in Z-E CS in order to seek relief from the exclusive use of English in their formal interactions and assessments. Furthermore, these students acknowledge the importance of English in their education but at the same time, they also want to display their ethnic identity.

Z-E CS also mirrors the subjects' social identity. The use of this variety reflects one's educational status and 'elite closure', a term that Myers-Scotton (1993b:149) uses in her markedness model. She defines this term as a 'type of social mobilization strategy by which those persons in power establish or maintain their powers and privileges via linguistic choices'. The subjects in this study may be described as the education-based elite, when compared to isiZulu L1 speakers that cannot afford the privilege of higher education.

Details of each of the above-mentioned identities are further explored in the next section with specific focus on the impact of 'educational orientation' (i.e. the programmes that students register for), medium of instruction, the diglossic relationship between English and isiZulu and the language attitudes of the subjects.

Impact of Educational Orientation and Medium of Instruction

The study reveals that while subjects in the EG mainly use isiZulu in formal communication and subjects in the CG use English, subjects in both groups resort to Z-E CS in informal situations. This linguistic practice is consonant with Edward's (1985:96) premise that an alteration in speech patterns in a particular society is a reflection of changing social and linguistic needs. In his view, this is the rule, not the exception. Therefore, an alteration in speech patterns in a particular society is a reflection of the evolution of social and linguistic needs as well as of identity. While this cannot be denied, many sociolinguists would disagree with this restricted view. Gal (1989:374), for

example, argues that 'language not only reflects societal patterns and divisions but also sustains and reproduces them'.

The respondents/interviewees offer various reasons for Z-E CS. One of the more commonly cited reasons is that it allows them to express a 'dual identity'. They justify this description by stating that English has wider cachet in the global world and it can reflect their superior educational and social status on the one hand, while isiZulu, on the other hand, can reflect their ethnic identity and solidarity with their community. By using Z-E CS, the interviewees claim they can achieve all their goals simultaneously. This finding presents an interesting contrast to the negative attitudes recorded by the respondents in the questionnaire survey. The contradiction raises critical methodological questions in CS research.

P&B (2004:21) state that there are essentially three types of identities, namely, imposed, assumed or negotiable identities. Imposed identities are not negotiable at a particular time and place. Speakers are unable to resist or contest such identities. Assumed identities refer to identities that speakers are comfortable with and which are 'valued and legitimized by the dominant discourses of identity' (P&B 2004:21). Lastly, negotiable identities refer to 'all identity options which can be - and are - contested and resisted by particular individuals and groups' (P&B 2004:21). In saying that they seek a 'dual identity', isiZulu L1 speakers can be said to be seeking a 'negotiable identity' when using Z-E CS. A negotiable identity enables isiZulu L1 speakers to narrow the divide between their academic and social lives in an informal campus setting and to also project other identities consciously or subconsciously when they revert to the use of either monolingual English or isiZulu as a medium of learning in the formal context.

As mentioned earlier, in terms of P&B's approach, one needs to consider how individuals appropriate the languages they use in multilingual contexts. These writers suggest that identities are multi-dimensional and are constructed at the intersection of the use of the different languages. Factors such as linguistic repertoire, cline of bilinguality, cultural link, educational and social status, educational orientation and medium of instruction, language attitudes and the impact of a diglossic situation all have a bearing on how English and isiZulu are distributed and assigned to use by different speakers in different contexts.

Of note, the subjects in the CG claimed (through interviews mainly) that although they were obliged to use English in formal communication in and out of the lecture hall where the pressure was on them to express high levels of English proficiency, resorting to Z-E CS in informal situations enabled them to seek relief from the obligatory use of academic English, to integrate the use of a casual, informal variety of English with the formal variety in an institutional setting and to enjoy the comfort of the familiar i.e. their home language, isiZulu. The subjects in the EG, on the other hand, claimed that while their goal was to increase their knowledge about isiZulu, culture and society, they also needed to position themselves in a wider, multilingual, multicultural society. They therefore claimed that the use of Z-E CS in informal situations enabled them to express their adaptability to and prevent alienation from the wider community.

Kamwangamalu (2000:62) argues that language choices are not as clear-cut as Myers-Scotton (1993a) suggests. He states that there are instances where the boundaries overlap and where a particular variety can function as a marked choice in one context and, as an unmarked choice in another. While it is noted that Z-E CS is subconscious to a large extent, the proposition that 'sub-conscious implies unmarked' has yet to be proven beyond doubt. Finlayson and Slabbert (1997: 415) also question the simplicity of categorizing patterns of CS as marked or unmarked. They state that unmarked CS 'does not only signal multiple identities but also signals an identity as such'. These researchers suggest bilingual, urban/township speakers seek an identity which 'simultaneously embraces those features that are marked as "modern" and "Western" and those that are marked as "traditional" and "African"' (Slabbert and Finlayson 2000:122).

Taking into consideration the intentional use of Z-E CS as presented above, it may be argued that its use may also be marked as it serves to meet specific goals of the subjects in each group, subjects who may be distinguished primarily by their educational orientation and the medium through which they receive instruction. In terms of P&B's categorization of identity types, marked CS may be understood as an intentional quest to negotiate identity at a given time and place.

Impact of Language Attitudes

Language Choice	Campus	Public Places	Church	Home
isiZulu only	30.6	46.4	73.7	84.7
English only	31.7	24.5	12.9	4.6
Z-E CS	35.7	26	9.8	6

Table 1: Summary of language choices as per settings in percentages

Language attitudes also impact on the way one constructs identity. An investigation of the subjects' attitudes towards English, isiZulu and Z-E CS sheds light on the way the subjects construct identity. As explained elsewhere (cf. Ramsay-Brijball 1999:164), attitudes may be intrinsic or extrinsic. Drawing on Hoffman's (1977) ideas, 'intrinsic attitude' refers to a person's perceived sentimental value of a language and the manner in which one uses it to become a representative member of the community in which it is used. 'Extrinsic attitude', on the other hand, refers to the instrumental or usefulness value that a language or language variety holds for a person. In this instance, a particular language or language variety is learnt as a means to an end.

On the one hand, isiZulu L1 students generally have a positive, intrinsic attitude towards isiZulu. They feel a deep sense of loyalty and pride towards their home language. As indicated in Table1, isiZulu as a monolingual variety is the preferred choice in the home setting (84.7%), the church (73.7%) and in public places (46.4%). It is noted that as the most commonly used language in the home setting, the subjects in both groups place strong sentimental value on their home language and regard isiZulu as their badge of ethnic identity. The qualitative data corroborates these findings.

While one may say that such an identity is largely assumed by these subjects rather than imposed, one must be cautious in generalizing this deduction to the larger population. It is possible that investigating the attitudes of isiZulu L1 speakers in the province that is the language's stronghold may present a bias. Investigations of the attitudes of isiZulu L1

speakers in contexts out of this region (cf. Finchilescu and Nyawose 1998) indicate that these speakers reject the idea of a one-to-one correlation between their language and their ethnicity. Finchilescu and Nyawose (1998:59) cite the following quotation from one of their participants:

> I have also experienced something like that when people say to you 'Oh! You are Gatsha's child.' And now you get scared to tell people that you are Zulu speaking because they will think that you are also IFP.

This and other quotations from Finchilescu and Nyawose's study indicate that the subjects refute the assumption made by other African language speakers that as isiZulu L1 speakers, they are unequivocally members of the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP), a party that was established as the party for the AmaZulu in its genesis. In other words, these subjects perceive ethnicity to be bigger than political party affiliation and reject the 'insularity' and 'tribalism' (cf. Finchilescu & Nyawose 1998:57) that is implied by such an assumption. They state that they prefer to embrace a 'more global black African or even South African identity' (Finchilescu & Nyawose 1998:57).

Finchilescu and Nyawose's study was conducted among isiZulu L1 speakers on the University of Cape Town campus (UCT), confirming the use of isiZulu in this setting but with reservations. On the Westville campus, my findings are similar in that the isiZulu only option is not the preferred choice in this educational setting (30.6%), a low statistic when compared to the use of the monolingual isiZulu variety in other domains as mentioned previously. While the subjects of my study did not highlight political reasons, other reasons became apparent.

Questions asked in the questionnaire survey as well as in the interviews that relate to language attitudes are: How important and necessary are English and isiZulu in your life? Asking how 'important' a language is, was intended to test one's intrinsic attitude towards it and how 'necessary' it is, one's extrinsic attitude. Cross-tabulating the results reveal that subjects rate the importance and necessity of English higher (87.6%) than the importance and necessity of isiZulu (72%). It could be said that the high score for English on the one hand reflects its 'assumed' role as the High

Variety and the vehicle to upward social mobility. On the other hand, the high score for isiZulu highlights the covert prestige that a Low Variety may enjoy in a diglossic situation, a situation that Bourdieu's model fails to explain.

Other than the 87.6% of the respondents who consider English as very important and necessary, 11.3% think English is important but unnecessary. Only a minimal 1% considers English to be unimportant and unnecessary, and 6% of the respondents failed to give a response. One may question why 6% of the respondents did not give a response. Can it be said that by not answering, they were reflecting their psychological discomfort at having to choose one language at the expense of another? Could it be that they preferred not to make such a choice but preferred an alternative, that is, a mixed variety that enables them to enjoy the advantages of both languages?

Drawing on P&B's approach, it may be said that isiZulu L1 speakers do not want an imposed identity, one that may arise from the use of either monolingual variety. Neither do they want an assumed identity that may result from the tacit acceptance of one or other option. As developing intellectuals, isiZulu L1 students prefer to exercise their right to challenge and negotiate their linguistic options in considering which would be most optimal in a given situation. The 6% who did not respond could possibly be categorized as 'psychologically uncomfortable' as suggested above. Alternatively, that they are 'intellectually astute' and would prefer options other than those that were presented to them in the questionnaire, in my opinion, is a more plausible explanation, affording these respondents the benefit of the doubt.

Both explanations may be understood in view of Davies and Harre's (1990) positioning theory, a theory that forms a key component of P&B's approach. Simply stated, this theory postulates that identities are shaped, produced and negotiated as a result of the way in which one positions oneself in discourses. These researchers distinguish between 'interactive positioning' and 'reflective positioning', stating that the former refers to the way one positions oneself in relation to others and that the latter refers to the way one positions oneself without the other as reference. P&B (2004:20) draw on this distinction and extend it further by stating:

While agency and choice are critical in positioning, it is important to

underscore that instances of reflective positioning are often contested by others and many individuals find themselves in a perpetual tension between self-chosen identities [i.e. preferring choices others than those offered in the questionnaire] and others' attempts to position them differently [i.e. contesting the limited choices I presented to them in the questionnaire].

Taking this into account, one may therefore say that both explanations presented above may be understood as the dynamic interplay between the two types of positioning through which these 6% of the respondents attempt to negotiate their identities. Furthermore, as P&B (2004:21) suggest, taking into account a Bakhtinian view, that such negotiation takes place, not necessarily between two or more different physical parties, but 'within' the individual and thereby 'resulting in changes in self-representation'.

Impact of the Diglossic Situation

Given the diglossic situation in which isiZulu and English co-exist on the Westville campus elsewhere, isiZulu L1 speakers state that they resort to Z-E CS in search of an identity that allows them to express their cultural solidarity with other isiZulu L1 speakers while simultaneously expressing their educational and social status. A parallel may be drawn between Z-E CS by isiZulu L1 speakers in this study on the one hand, and French-English CS by Francophone speakers in Quebec (Heller 1995) on the other. In her investigation, Heller also discovered that by engaging in French-English CS, her subjects were gaining power and solidarity simultaneously.

> The goal is to gain access to global networks and globally valued economic resources, but without having to become Anglophones to do so. In these cases, code-switching may be a means of re-defining conventions of language choice as part of the process of re-defining relations of power (Heller 1995:167).

By using Z-E CS, isiZulu L1 speakers maximize their access to the social, academic and economic benefits of using English while simultaneously maximizing their access to the cultural benefits of using Zulu. In view of

this, Heller's (1995:161) idea that CS is a strategy to 'attain a sense of shared power and solidarity' as well as P&B's notion that such goals may be achieved through negotiation is therefore relevant to understanding why Z-E CS is the preferred choice among isiZulu L1 speakers in informal settings on the campus. Taking these scholars' views into account, it may be said that using isiZulu as a monolingual variety in a multilingual, urban setting such as that on the Westville campus may not reflect the social nor academic identity to which many Zulu L1 students aspire. It is worth noting that subjects from the EG and CG cite the use of Z-E CS for the sake of affirming a dual identity to similar extents (49%:51%).

Conclusion

As mentioned elsewhere (cf. Ramsay-Brijball 2002:220), the use of Z-E CS is legitimized as the incidence of this variety increases daily. One can say that using Z-E CS enables isiZulu L1 speakers to fulfill their intrinsic and extrinsic needs simultaneously and in so doing, to construct their negotiable identity. Lamy (1979) concluded decades ago that bilingualism facilitates the process of new identity formation. This assertion is still valid today as we see the close relationship between language and identity through the use of a stigmatized, mixed variety among bilingual Zulu L1 speakers who may be distinguished primarily by their 'educational orientation' and medium of instruction. Of particular importance, is the relevance of the P&B's poststructuralist approach in explaining how isiZulu L1 speakers use Z-E CS to negotiate the construction of their identity. This approach encourages researchers to consider new ways of theorizing old issues.

Department of Linguistics
School of Language, Literature and Linguistics
University of KwaZulu-Natal
ramsaym@ukzn.ac.za

References

Alvarez-Caccamo, C. 1998. From 'switching code' to 'code-switching': Towards a Reconceptualization of Communicative Codes. In Auer, P. (ed.): *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity.* London: Routledge.

Auer, P. 1995. The Pragmatics of Code-switching: A Sequential Approach. In Milroy, L. & P. Muysken (eds.): *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. 1998. Introduction: Bilingual Conversation Revisited. In Auer, P. (ed.): *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity.* London: Routledge.

Berry, J. 1980. Acculturation as Varieties of Adaptation. In Padilla, A. (ed.): *Acculturation: Theory, Models and Some New Findings.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. The Economy of Linguistic Exchanges. *Social Science Information* 6: 645-668.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Davies, B. & R. Harré 1990. Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20,1: 43-63.

Edwards, J. 1985. *Language, Society and Identity.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Ferguson, C.A. & J.J. Gumperz 1959. Linguistic Diversity in South Asia: Studies in Regional and Functional Variation. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 26,3: 111.

Ferguson, C.A. 1972. Diglossia. In Gigliolo, P. (ed.): *Language and Social Context.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Finchilescu, G. & G. Nyawose 1998. Talking about Language: Zulu Students' Views on Language in the New South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology* 28,2: 53-61.

Finlayson, R. & S. Slabbert 1997. 'I'll meet you halfway with language'-Codeswitching within a South African Urban Context. In Putz, Martin (ed.): *Language Choices: Conditions, Constraints, and Consequences.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Finlayson, R., K. Calteaux & C. Myers-Scotton 1998. Orderly Mixing: Codeswitching and Accommodation in South Africa. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2,3: 395-420.

Fishman, J.A. (ed.). 1971. *Advances in the Sociology of Language.* The Hague: Mouton.

Gal, S. 1989. Language and Political Economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18: 345-367.

Gumperz, J.J. 1982. Conversational Code-switching. *Discourse Strategies.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. 1982. Negotiations of Language Choice in Montreal. In Gumperz, J. (ed.): *Language and Social Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. 1992. The Politics of Codeswitching and Language Choice. *Journal of Multingual and Multicultural Development* 13: 123-142.

Heller, M. 1995. Codeswitching and the Politics of Language. In Milroy, L. & P. Muysken (eds.): *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Codeswitching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffman, J.E. 1977. Language Attitudes in Rhodesia. In Fishman, J.A. *et al* (eds.): *The Spread of English as an Additional Language.* Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Kachru, B.B. 1986. *The Alchemy of English.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kamwangamalu, N.M. 2000. The State of Codeswitching Research at the Dawn of the New Millennium (2): Focus on Africa. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 18: 59-71.

Kieswetter, A. 1995. Code-switching amongst African High School Pupils. *University of Witwatersrand Occasional Papers in African Linguistics* (1). Johannesburg: Witswatersrand University Press.

Labov, W. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, W. 1975. *What is a Linguistic Fact?* Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.

Lamy, P. 1979. Language and Ethnolinguistic Identity: The Bilingualism Question. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 20: 23-36.

Le Page, R. & A. Tabouret-Keller 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li Wei 1998. Banana split? Variations in Language Choice and Code-switching Patterns of Two Groups of British-born Chinese in Tyneside. In Jacobson, R. (ed.): *Codeswitching Worldwide.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McCormick, K. 1989. *English and Afrikaans in District Six: A Sociolinguistic Study.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Cape Town.

Meeuwis, M. & J. Blommaert. 1994. 'The Markedness Model' and the Absence of Society: Remarks on Codeswitching. *Multilingua* 13,4: 387-423.

Milroy, L. 1987. *Observing and Analyzing Natural Language*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.

Mkilifi, A.M. 1978. Triglossia and Swahili-English Bilingualism in Tanzania. In Fishman, J.A. (ed.): *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism*. The Hague: Mouton.

Moyo, T. 1996. Code-switching among Competent Bilinguals: A Case for Linguistic, Cultural and Group Identity. *South African Journal of Applied Studies* 4,1: 20-31.

Muysken, P., H. Kook & P. Vedder 1996. Papiamento/Dutch Code-switching in Bilingual Parent-child Reading. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 17: 485-505.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993a. *Social Motivations for Codeswitching.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993b. Elite Closure as a Powerful Language Strategy: The African Case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 103: 149-163.

Pavlenko, A. & A. Blackledge 2004. Introduction: New Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts. In Pavlenko, A. & A. Blackledge (eds.): *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Espanol: Toward a Typology of Code-switching. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.

Ramsay-Brijball, M. 1999. Understanding Zulu-English Code-switching: A Psycho-social Perspective. *South African Journal of Linguistics* 17,2/3: 161-172.

Ramsay-Brijball, M. 2002. Code-switching and the Lives of Zulu First Language Speakers. In Owino, F. (ed.): *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development.* Cape Town: CASAS.

Ramsay-Brijball, M. 2003. A Sociolinguistic Investigation of Code-switching Patterns among Zulu L1 Speakers at the University of Durban-Westville. Unpublished Doctoral thesis. University of Natal, Durban.

Scotton, C. 1986. Codeswitching and Diglossia. In Fishman, J.A. *et al* (eds.): *The Fergusonian Impact.* ii. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Slabbert, S. & R Finlayson 2000. 'I'm a cleva!': The Linguistic Makeup of Identity in a South African Urban Environment. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 144: 119-135.

Tajfel, H. 1974. Social Identity and Intergroup Behavior. *Social Science Information* 13: 65-93.

Tajfel, H. 1981. *Human Groups and Social Categories.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wald, P. 1986. Diglossia Applied: Vernacular Mixing and Functional Switching with Bangui Yakomas. In Fishman, J.A. *et al* (eds.): *The Fergusonian Impact.* ii. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Woolard, K. 1985. Language Variation and Cultural Hegemony: Towards an Integration of Sociolinguistic and Social Theory. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 66: 85-98.

Woolard, K. 1998. Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In Schieffelin, B., K. Woolard & R. Kroskrity (eds.): *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory.* New York: Oxford University Press.