A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LANGUAGE CHOICE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS IN SELECTED MULTILINGUAL SPEECH COMMUNITIES IN NIGERIA

BY

YAHAYA ADINOYI ZUBAIR
Ph.D/ARTS/13798/2011-12

MAY, 2018

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LANGUAGE CHOICE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS IN SELECTED MULTILINGUAL SPEECH COMMUNITIES IN NIGERIA

BY

YAHAYA ADINOYI ZUBAIR
Ph.D/ARTS/13798/2011-12

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA, NIGERIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D) DEGREE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

MAY, 2018

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis entitled "A Comparative Study of Language Choice and its Implications in Selected Multilingual Speech Communities in Nigeria" is a product of my research in the Department of English and Literary Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria. All sources of information in the research are duly acknowledged and a list of references provided.

I declare that this dissertation has not been presented or submitted in any previous application for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in English Language or another Degree in any university or institution.

_____ _____

Yahaya Adinoyi Zubair **Date**

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this thesis entitled "A Comparative Study of Language Choice and its Implications in Selected Multilingual Speech Communities in Nigeria" written by Yahaya Adinoyi Zubair (Ph.D/ARTS/13798/2011-12) meets the regulation governing the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English Language of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and scholarly presentation.

Dr. S.A. Abaya Chairman, Supervisory Committee	Date
Professor A. A. Joshua Member, Supervisory Committee	Date
Dr. Isyaku Saminu Member, Supervisory Committee	Date
Professor T.Y. Surakat Head of Department	Date
Professor S.Z. Abubakar Dean, School of Post Graduate Studies	Date

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to Allah (SWT) for His mercies and protection throughout the course of this study. To Him be the Glory and Honour forever (amen).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I give gratitude to Allah (SWT) for His mercies and for seeing me through this programme. It is clear that an individual cannot single handedly claim success in a task of this nature, therefore certain people deserve some special mention. My profound gratitude and appreciation go to my team of supervisors. First, the Chairman of the supervisory team, Dr. S.A. Abaya, whose thorough and careful supervision has made this work come this far. This gratitude is also extended to my second supervisor, Professor A.A. Joshua who has made very useful contributions to this work. This acknowledge would be incomplete without the recognition of the valuable role played by my third supervisor, Dr. Isyaku Saminu in ensuring that this work see the light of the day. The three supervisors made themselves available to me at every stage of this research in spite of their tight schedules. God bless you and your families abundantly.

I will also like to recognize the efforts of other lecturers in the department who have made significant contributions in the course of this work. These include: the Head of Department, Professor T.Y. Surakat for his useful advice, Professor Dili Ofuokwu for his forthright criticisms, Dr. Amodu Jonah, the former Departmental Post Graduate Coordinator whose criticisms have gone a long way in enriching the work. Other lecturers include: Dr. Hauwa Mohammed Sani, the Departmental Post Graduate Seminar Coordinator for her crucial role in facilitating this work, Dr. Isah Ibrahim, the immediate past Departmental Post Graduate Seminar Coordinator, Dr. (Mrs.) Joyce Agofure, the current Post Graduate Coordinator and Dr. Auwal Ibrahim for their useful criticisms and contribution.

I will equally like to appreciate my colleagues in the Department of Languages, Kaduna Polytechnic for their wonderful support and useful suggestions. They are: Dr. Babayo

Mohammed Aliyu, the immediate past Head of Department, Mrs. F.A. Ojo, the current Head of Department, Mr. E.A. Adaji, Mr. Kenneth Anumudu, Mrs. Saratu Isah, Mal. Hassan Suleiman, Mrs. Patricia Sarah Achi and other colleagues in the department, too numerous to mention.

Special thanks and appreciation go to my dear wife, Mrs. Rabi Zubair and my lovely son Mukhtar Zubair for their sacrifice and understanding in the course of the programme. Finally, I like to appreciate my other relations like my elder sisters, Dr. (Mrs.) Halima Suleiman and Mrs. Seffi Adeyemi, my younger brothers, Barr. Rufai Suleiman and Hassan Zubair. My younger sister Hanatu Suleiman cannot be forgotten. Other family members include my cousins, Dr. I.O. Audu, Mrs. Halima Audu, Suleiman Audu, Hajara Audu and others that space will not allow me to mention here. I can also not forget the valuable roles played by my friends like Barr. Sani Katu, Barr. Suleiman Shuaibu, Dr. Anafi Oba, Dr. Abubakar Chatta and finally my friend, uncle and confidant Mr. Kayode Adejumo. God bless you all abundantly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title		Page
Title Page	- - - - - - - - - -	i
Declaration	- - - - - - - - - -	ii
Certification	- - - - - - - - - -	iii
Dedication	- - - - - - - - - -	iv
Acknowledgements	- - - - - - - - - -	v
Table of Contents	- - - - - - - - - -	vii
Abstract	- - - - - - - - - -	x

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0	Background of the Study - - - - - - - -	1
1.1	A Brief Historical Background of the Selected Speech Communities -	3
1.2	Statement of the Problem - - - - - - - -	7
1.3	Research Questions - - - - - - - - -	8
1.4	Aim and Objectives - - - - - - - - -	9
1.5	Scope of the Study - - - - - - - - -	10
1.6	Justification of the Study - - - - - - - -	10

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0	Preamble - - - - - - - - -	12
2.1	Topical Review - - - - - - - - -	12
2.1.1	Sociolinguistics - - - - - - - - -	12
2.1.2	Multilingualism - - - - - - - - -	17
2.1.3	Factors Responsible for Societal Multilingualism - - - -	20

2.1.4 Types of Societal Multilingualism - - - - - - 22

2.1.5 Effects of Multilingualism on a Society - - - - - 24

2.1.6 Diglossia and Multilingualism - - - - - - 25

2.1.7 Bilingualism Vs. Biculturalism - - - - - - 27

2.1.8 Multilingualism Vs. Multiculturalism - - - - - 29

2.1.9 Language Choice - - - - - - - - 30

2.1.10 Language and Attitudes - - - - - - - 36

2.1.11 Language Shift - - - - - - - - 39

2.1.12 Language and Identity - - - - - - - 40

2.1.13 Language and Power - - - - - - - - 44

2.1.14 Mobility, Contact and Accommodation - - - - - 46

2.1.15 Speech Communities and their Characteristics - - - - 47

2.2 Code Switching and Code Mixing - - - - - - 49

2.3 Review of Previous Studies - - - - - - - 52

2.4 Theories of Language Choice - - - - - - 58

2.5 Theoretical Framework - - - - - - - 64

2.6 Conclusion to the Chapter - - - - - - - 66

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Preamble - - - - - - - - - 67

3.1 Sources of Data - - - - - - - - 67

3.2 Methods of Data Collection - - - - - - - 68

3.3 Sampling and Sampling Procedure - - - - - - 68

3.4 Population - - - - - - - - - 69

3.5 Sample Size - - - - - - - - - 69

3.6 Analytical Procedure - - - - - - - - 70

3.7 Linguistic Survey of the Selected Communities - - - - 71

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Preamble - - - - - - - - - 73

4.1 Multilingualism in the Selected Speech Communities - - - 73

4.2 Qualitative Data Analysis - - - - - - - 74

4.3 Quantitative Data Analysis - - - - - - - 81

4.4 Comparison of the Three Communities - - - - - 116

4.5 Discussion of Findings - - - - - - - 118

4.6 Conclusion to the Chapter - - - - - - - 123

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

5.0 Preamble - - - - - - - - - 124

5.1 Summary - - - - - - - - - 124

5.2 Conclusion - - - - - - - - - 125

5.3 Limitations of the Study - - - - - - - 125

5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies - - - - - - 126

5.5 Contributions to Knowledge - - - - - - 126

References - - - - - - - - - - 128

Appendices - - - - - - - - - - 134

ABSTRACT

Multilingual speech communities may appear similar on the surface yet they are different in several respects. These differences are not visibly manifest until they are investigated. In this regard therefore, the study has selected three (3) multilingual speech communities across three geo-political zones of Nigeria for comparison which are Billiri in North-East, Sabongida-Ora in South-South and Zuru in North-West. The aim is to ascertain whether the selected speech communities share common characteristics or are divergent in their use of language and also to determine whether or not multilingualism produces similar implications in all the settings. In this regard, Howard Giles' Communication Accommodation Theory has been adopted as the framework for this study. The survey method was used to obtain data from the respondents while questionnaire and interview were employed as instruments of data collection in addition to non-participant observation. The findings reveal that the selected speech communities share certain characteristics while they equally differ in varying degrees in respect of factors constraining language choice and motivation for acquisition of additional languages. The study has established that minority speech communities in North-West and North-East are more vulnerable and more likely to lose their languages faster than their counterparts in South South parts of Nigeria. The study therefore recommends that more attention should be devoted by linguists to studying such communities with a view to adopting measures to prevent extinction of minority languages in the affected geo-political zones.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study

This research work is a sociolinguistic study of language choice in selected multilingual speech communities in Nigeria with a view to ascertain whether the multilingual societies in question share common characteristics or are divergent in their use of language. Much as sociolinguists are agreed that sociolinguistics is the study of relationship between language and society, they are interested in explaining why people speak differently in different social contexts. They are also concerned with identifying the social functions of language and the way it is used to convey social meaning, (Hudson, 1998; Romaine, 2000; Yul-Ifode, 2001; Wardhaugh, 2006; Holmes, 2008). The interface between language and society therefore lies in the extent to which one influences the other. Multilingualism, a sub-field of sociolinguistics is defined as the act of using or promoting the use of multiple languages, either by an individual speaker or by a community of speakers, (Fishman 1972; Spolsky, 1998; Wardhaugh, 2006). Multilingualism is becoming a social phenomenon governed by the needs of globalization and cultural openness, hence it requires close scrutiny. Moreover, most areas in several parts of the world today are inhabited by diverse linguistic families and groups. This diversity of language within a given area or locality also means that a people's social and economic structures may vary. This diversity of language according to Dorian (1981) leads to unavoidable concept of multilingualism among the local speakers. Hence, this research attempts to compare factors that constrain language choice in three multilingual speech communities in Nigeria and its implications for the speakers.

It has been established by scholars in this field, (Fishman, 1972; Spolsky, 1998; Holmes, 2008; Bamgbose, 1991, and a host of others) that language choice in a multilingual speech community is not a random matter of momentary inclination but constrained by certain extra-linguistic factors. That, Nigeria is a multilingual nation is not contestable. However, within this multilingual, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural nation, inhabits a number of speech communities where more than one language is used in communication simultaneously. Such speech communities and the choice they make of the various languages they speak and the implications of such choice(s) is the concern of this study. One may be tempted to argue that a number of studies have already been conducted on one speech community or the other in Nigeria, particularly the choice that speakers make in those communities. The question therefore is, can the understanding of factors that influence code choice in one speech community be sufficient to generalize that all multilingual speech communities in Nigeria will behave the same way in their code choice? If the answer to this question cannot be given in the affirmative, then there is need to compare multilingual speech communities in Nigeria to determine their similarities or otherwise hence the focus of this study.

In this regard, three (3) multilingual speech communities spread across Nigeria have been selected for comparison. They are: Billiri in Gombe, Sabongida Ora, in Edo and Zuru in Kebbi states. These three communities have been chosen to represent the diverse nature of the Nigerian society, so that the outcome can reflect the diversity. Therefore, Billiri represents North-East, Sabongida Ora, South-South and Zuru, North West.

1.1 A Brief Historical Background of the Selected Speech Communities

1.1.1 Billiri

Billiri town is located in southern part of Gombe State of Nigeria and it is the headquarters of Billiri Local Government. It has a population of 202,144 as at 2006 population census. The original inhabitants of the town are referred to as Tangale. According to Ankruma (2005:134), the Tangale people who also speak the language called Tangale believe themselves to have come from a place called Yemen (in the Middle East) and from there they came through Egypt to Ngazargamu in the present day-Borno State. Tangale is grouped among the languages belonging to West Chadic sub-group of languages of Afro-Asiatic language family. This source also claims that the people later migrated to a place called Kufto in the present Dukku Local Government in Gombe State from where the Tangale people and their kins; the Tera, Bolewa, Waja and Longuda went different ways each to its present settlement.

The Tangale people share borders with Chongom now Kaltungo, Kamo, Awak, Waja and Tula-Wange in the east, while in the north they are bordered by Akko, Tera, Bolewa and Jukuns. It is believed that the Tangale people have been in their present settlement for over three hundred (300) years, (Ankruma, 2005). The ethnic group comprises of seven clans namely: Tangaltong, Tal, Kalmai, Banganje, Tanglang, Todi and Nate. Ankruma further asserts that people of various background continued to trickle into and to conglomerate around present day Tangale hills and plains most of whom traced their origin to the middle east through Egypt and Chad basin. They spoke dialect of a Proto-language that some historical sources call Rogdo, which eventually metamorphosed into Tangale language, (Ankruma, 2005).

Other authors like Attah (2004) and Gwani (1999) corroborated Ankruma's claim. In a detailed account of the origin of Tangale people, Gwani argues that people of Kaltungo also speak a similar Tangale dialect with that of the seven clans of Tangale which suggests that they might have originated as one and the same people.

In view of the long history of migration coupled with the present location of Billiri as a local government headquarters and a sub-urban settlement, people of diverse background have settled in the town thereby making it a multilingual setting. Therefore, in addition to the mother tongue of the people, Hausa is widely spoken by majority of the inhabitants. Similarly, other languages like Fulfulde, Tula, Lunguda, Waja are also sometimes spoken in Billiri town.

1.1.2 **Sabongida-Ora**

Sabongida-Ora Community of Edo state of Nigeria inhabits a local government called Owan and the language spoken by the group is equally called Owan. However, by virtue of linguistic classification in which they have been grouped as a member of proto-North Central Edoid language (Elugbe, 1973), Edo is generally spoken. In addition to this, many of the inhabitants also speak Yoruba, while Etsako the language of their immediate Northern neighbours is also commonly spoken in addition to Nigerian pidgin and English language for the educated speakers.

Even though, they are presently referred to as Owan, historically they are called Luleha and they occupy the present day Owan West Local Government of Edo State. Sabongida Ora, the biggest town in the Luleha speaking area is the headquarters of the local government, and by 2006 Nigerian census they are said to have numbered 97,388.

Obuhoro (2001) puts forward that historically, the origin of the Luleha people is traceable to one Irimo who is believed to have had a Yoruba ancestry. According to this source, Irimo (Aremu in Yoruba language) is believed to have migrated from Ile-Ife before settling down in Luleha land around 1200 AD. Obuhuro submits that Aremu is the son of Izoduwa or Oduduwa of Ile-Ife, the present day Osun State. Aremu migrated first to Ibini or Benin in the company of Oranmiyan, where they met Oba Awaika (pronounced Eweka) who was the then Oba of Benin. He further claims that Aremu moved from Benin with his wife Ooto to his distant cousin in Uokhai. As a result of disagreement, Aremu separated from his cousin and moved further to Kukuruku land that had a mixture of Hausa, Ebira, Yoruba and other migrants. They were called Kukuruku because during the Nupe war, when the Nupes came to capture them, they shouted as cockcrows to deceive their captors. The popular market where the Yorubas and the Kukuruku people traded in Etu (meaning antelope in Yoruba) was called Oja Etu. Oja Etu or market for antelopes blossomed and was synchronized as "Jattu" located in Auchi land or Etsako. However, other Ora historians according to Obuhoro disagree with the Yoruba origin of Luleha. They are of the opinion that their origin is traceable to Benin. They claim that when Obazua and Okpame met at Uokha, a bond was formed. When the father of Okpame (the Oba of Benin) died, he was called back to inherit the throne of the Oba of Benin.

In view of the above historical accounts, it is therefore not surprising that Luleha or Owan or Ora people became multilingual where languages like Yoruba, Ebira and even Hausa are used simultaneously in conversation, in addition to the indigenous language of the people.

1.1.3 **Zuru**

Zuru is the headquarters of Zuru Local Government of Kebbi State. The inhabitants of this town and the surrounding villages are usually referred to as Dakarkari. However, historical sources argue that several groups like Kalawa, Lilawa and Bangawa and even Hausa came together to form this town, hence the multilingual nature of the settlement. According to Regnier, (2003:3) Zuru Local Government is sub-divided into three districts: Zuru, Dabai and Fakai. According to this source, often in the past anthropologists described the indigenous people of this area as Dakarkari. However, around this dominant group are the Fakai people considered as sub-group of Dakarkari and the Bangawa. This source argues that the Fakai, the Dakarkari (Lela), and the Bangawa (Lyase) are three distinct language groups. Their languages, along with the Duka languages belong to the Northern group of the Kainji branch of the Benue-Congo sub-family.

Similarly, Dettweiler and Dettweiler (2005:3) assert that the indigenous people of Zuru and its environs; these include Danko-wasagu L.G.A, Sakaba L.G.A. and the Northern part of Rijau L.G.A. in Niger state are Lela speaking. However, while the Hausas refer to them as Dakarkari, they refer to themselves and their language as Lela. Grimes (1992:320) describes the language under the heading Lela and gives Lalawa, Clela, Kolela, Cala-cala, Chilela and Chilala as alternate names to this. Regarding the origin of the Lela people before their present location in Zuru, (Harris, 1938:116) suggests that they along with the Bangawa, the Kelawa and the Dukawa were a subject people in the Kingdom of Kebbi, which reached the height of its power in the 16th century. The "Dakarkari" (i.e. Bangawa, Kelawa and Lela) are said to have been the "foot soldiers" of

the king of Kebbi, from which occupation they obtained their Hausa name (Gunn and Conart 1960:32). Around 1700, the Hausa peoples of Zamfara and Gobir rebelled against their Kebbi overlords and separated from the Kingdom of Kebbi. Harris argues that it is likely that the subject peoples, still loyal to Kebbi but wanting to farm undisturbed by the continual internecine warfare of the Hausas, migrated southwards to set up a small buffer state. He identifies the Bangawa and the Kelawa as originating from an area near the Kebbi River and the Lela, coming from further east, as "The Zamfara Element" of the buffer state (Harris, 1938:114). In view of this historical antecedent, it is clear that the Zuru people had always been multilingual having migrated with Hausas over a long period and yet still retain their indigenous languages. Therefore, their warlike disposition, the several encounters they had with other groups, particularly the Hausas and their constant migration have seemingly contributed to their multilingual nature.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to find out the motivation for and patterns of language choice in the selected communities and the consequences of such choice(s) on the indigenous languages of these areas. Furthermore, the study compares the selected intra-group multilingual speech communities in Nigeria to determine the impact of multilingualism on the societies and the various implications of the choice that they make of the various languages they speak; whether multilingualism and language choice hold similar implication for all the speech communities selected for this study. The study enables us to ascertain the similarities and differences among multilingual speech communities and their behaviour towards the various languages they speak. It can also assist in

determining whether all the domains of language behaviour elicit similar responses from speakers or not in the different multilingual speech communities.

It is true that a lot of scholarly researches have been conducted on multilingualism in Nigeria like Bashir (1996), who studied language choice and use in Maiduguri Metropolis to determine languages most frequently used and the reasons for their usages, Ayemoni (2006), who examined the role of code-switching and mixing in childhood in a Yoruba speech community and Ugot (2010), that studied language choice in Biase, Cross Rivers State, Nigeria where she ascertained the role of code-switching and mixing in a multilingual speech community, but no attempt has been made to the knowledge of the researcher to compare multilingual speech communities in Nigeria, particularly in relation to the various factors that constrain or influence choice of codes in the various speech communities.

In view of the above background, and with due regard to the above previous studies on language choice in multilingual settings, it is necessary to compare multilingual speech communities from different parts of Nigeria in order to ascertain whether multilingualism produces similar consequences in all multilingual settings in Nigeria.

1.3 **Research Questions**

The study therefore attempts to provide answers to the following questions.

1. What factors influence code choice in Billiri, Sabongida-Ora and Zuru?
2. To what extent are factors that influence code choice in these communities?
3. What similarities exist among Billiri, Sabongida-Ora and Zuru?

4. What domains of language behaviour elicit responses from the speakers in Billiri, Sabongida-Ora and Zuru?
5. To what extent do speakers maintain, converge or diverge from their addresses in Billiri, Sabongida-Ora and Zuru?
6. What are the implications of language choice on the speech communities?

1.4 Aim and Objectives

The aim of this study is to determine whether all multilingual speech communities share common characteristics or they are divergent in their use of the various languages.

The objectives of the study are to:

1. establish whether similar or different factors influence choice of codes in all multilingual speech communities.
2. identify the patterns of choice in the selected communities so as to understand their similarities and differences.
3. determine the various constraints faced by the speakers in the communities regarding language choice.
4. gauge the long-term effects of these choices – language shift or language death.
5. establish how speakers maintain, converge or diverge from their addresses in the selected multilingual speech communities.
6. ascertain the implications of the choices that speakers make of their various languages in the selected multilingual speech communities.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The scope of this research is to identify the factors that determine code choice in the selected multilingual speech communities and compare these factors to determine their similarities and differences, the significance and implications of the differences. In this regard, three multilingual speech communities have been selected across three geo-political zones of Nigeria for comparison, namely: Billiri, North-East; Sabongida-Ora, South-South; Zuru, North-West. The South East and the South West have been excluded because they are largely monolingual in composition.

It is instructive to state that the study is not a contrastive analysis of the systems of the languages involved in the selected speech communities neither is it aimed at analyzing the linguistic features of any of the languages involved, rather it is limited to the choice the speakers make of the various languages in the process of interaction, the motivation for the choice as well as the implications of those choices. These tasks will be undertaken using Communication Accommodation Theory of Howard Giles. The study is both qualitative and quantitative where accommodation theory is used as tool of analysis.

1.6 Justification of the Study

It is a fact that language is an important factor in human communication. Therefore the ability of a group to use two or more languages simultaneously in any communicative event makes it even more intricate. In this regard, a comparative study of language choice in different multilingual speech communities is useful in the following ways:

1. The study can help researchers to understand the various social factors which constrain the use of the various languages in these communities.

2. A study of this nature can aid in predicting which code or codes would be appropriate for use in different situations in the various speech communities so as to avoid wrong choice in the wrong domain.
3. The study can reveal the status of the various languages by the selected communities, thereby determining whether the indigenous languages of the speakers are being threatened.
4. The study can also benefit language planners and policy makers.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Preamble

This chapter deals with the review of existing literature on societal multilingualism, particularly the circumstances or factors that regulate choice in multilingual speech communities as presented by various scholars. Attempt is made to relate the literature to this study and identify the gaps that this study proposes to fill. Furthermore, the chapter is discussed under three sub-headings; namely: topical review, review of previous studies and the theoretical framework adopted for the study.

2.1 Topical Review

2.1.1 Sociolinguistics

It is imperative to spare a little space for the wider discipline of sociolinguistics while trying to grapple with the concept of societal multilingualism. Sociolinguistics is generally described as the study of language in relation to society, it is a branch of linguistics which deals with the social aspects of language in context. Therefore, sociolinguists are interested in identifying the social function of language and the way it is used to convey social meaning (Hudson, 1998; Romaine, 2000; Yul-Ifode, 2001; Wardhaugh, 2006 and Holmes, 2008). According to Le Page, (1997) cited in Mesthrie, Swann, Deumert & Leap (2009) the term sociolinguistics appears to have been first used in 1939 by T.C. Hudson in relation to language study in India. It was later used independently in 1952 by Haver Currie, a poet and philosopher who noted the general absence of any consideration of the social from the linguistic research of his day. Significant studies on the discipline appearing after this date include Weinreich's

influential languages in contact (a structural and social account of bilingualism) of 1953, Ernar Haugen's two-volume study of the social history of the Norwegian language in America (1953) and Joos (1962) on the dimensions of style, (Mesthrie et al, 2009).

However, Chomsky's emphasis in the 1960s on abstracting language away from everyday contexts ironically led to the extraction of a core area of sociolinguistics, opposed to his conception of language. Chomsky characterized the focus of linguistics attention on an idealized competence of an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogenous speech community. While such approach brought significant gains to the theory of syntax and phonology, many scholars felt that abstracting language away from the contexts in which it was spoken served limited ends which could not include an encompassing theory of human language. This according to Mesthrie et al, (2009) marked a break between sociolinguistics with an interest in language use within human societies and followers of Chomsky with interest in an idealized competence. Whereas the Chomskyan framework focuses on structures that could be generated in language and by what means, the social approach, tries to account for what can be said in a language, by whom, to whom, in whose presence, where and when in what manner and under what social circumstance.

Therefore, sociolinguistics concern for the human communication aspect within the definition of language implies attention to the way language is played out in societies in its full range of functions. It is to be recognized that language is not just denotational, a term which refers to the process of conveying meaning, referring to ideas, events or entities that exist outside language. While the primary function of language may be

denotational, a speaker will inevitably give signals concerning his or her social and personal background. In this regard, language is accordingly said to be indexical of one's social class, status, region of origin, gender, age group and so on.

In view of the above assertion, it is evident that sociolinguistics is a very broad field, and it can be used to describe many different ways of studying language, for instance, how individual speakers use language, how people use languages differently in different regions and how a nation decides what languages will be recognized in courts or education. Everyone can modify the way they speak depending on who they are with or what the situation is. When they do this, they are drawing on their sociolinguistic knowledge and every time they change the way they speak, depending on their interlocutor or situation, they provide more sociolinguistic knowledge in the community. Hence in investigating language, sociolinguists use a range of methods to analyze patterns of language in use and attitude towards language in use. Some sociolinguistic patterns can only be observed systematically through close examination of lots of recorded speech and a good understanding about the speaker's background or place in community.

On the other hand, sociolinguists who are interested in investigating national language policies might never need to use any audio or radio recording at all. In all, sociolinguists are interested in how people use language and what they use if for. In pursuit of this, (Meyerhof, 2006) asserts that sociolinguists are not only interested in documenting the different forms of language, what it looks like and how it is structured, but also want to answer questions like:

- Who uses those different forms of language varieties?

- Who do they use them with?
- Are they aware of their choice?
- Why do some forms of languages win out over others? (And is it always the same ones?)
- Is there any relationship between the forms in flux in a community of speakers?
- What kind of social information do we ascribe to different forms in a language or different language varieties?
- How much can we change or control the language we use?

The attempt to answer the above questions illustrate the claim that sociolinguistics is interested in both 'social' questions and 'linguistics' questions. Inevitably therefore some sociolinguistic researches have more to say about social issues, and some have more to say about linguistic matters, but what makes someone's work distinctively sociolinguistic according to Meyerhof (2006), is that regardless of its emphasis, it has something to say about both linguistic structure and social structure. In essence therefore, sociolinguistics also includes how speakers use language to present themselves to others and to identify or differentiate themselves from others. This includes variation in the form of an individual's choice of language as well as their use of different styles or repertoires in a language.

According to Milroy and Gordon (2003:50), one of the defining characteristics of sociolinguistic research is its commitment to the examination of language that is actually produced by speakers (as opposed to the potential language of their competence). Hence, an acknowledgement of the inherent variability of language follows directly from this

commitment since any investigator who examines actual language usage is quickly faced with enormous variation. In view of this, sociolinguists strive to understand why individuals vary in the extent to which they use particular features, and speak noticeably differently according to situational context.

In their contribution to the field of sociolinguistics, Llamas, Mullany and Stockwell (2007) argue that anyone who has ever noticed an accent, or puzzled over a dialect, phrase, or wondered why road signs are in different languages; anyone who adjusts his or her speech or writing in different situations, or cannot imitate the way the older people or younger people talk, or feels excluded by the way another group speaks; anyone who has ever tried to create an impression of themselves in an interview or e-mail, anyone who has ever made a snap decision on the basis of someone's voice, anyone who has ever been in an argument – in all these situations, you have been involved in the field of sociolinguistics. In this assertion, at the core of the discipline is a concern for the observable facts of language variation and principled thinking about the reasons and consequences of this variation and change. Therefore, politics, ideology and education policy have become key areas for sociolinguists. The principles of language variation and change determine the pattern of multilingualism and the shape of new language varieties, helping to define ethnicity and identity in general. This is so because language is the means by which groups articulate themselves and delineate themselves from others. In addition to this core area of sociolinguistics, the field has also been enriched by developments in discourse analysis, pragmatics and ethnography. The negotiation and manipulation of power and powerlessness, status and stigma, consensus and conflict are all matters for analysis within sociolinguistics, (Llamas et al, 2007).

Another area of sociolinguistics which was begun when Langacker (1999) emphasized the necessity to extend cognitive linguistics to the areas of discourse and social interaction is cognitive sociolinguistics, (Kristiansen and Driven, 2008). In other words, steps should be taken in the direction of an empirically validated investigation into the social dimensions of linguistic variation. In their argument, cognitive sociolinguistics is a usage based linguistics which takes language as it is actually used by real speakers in real situations in a specific historical moment as the basis for its enquiry. To them therefore, research that endeavours to unravel, examine and compare social and cognitive dimensions of language can be regarded as cognitive sociolinguistics. Kristiansen and Driven (2008:95) further argued that cognitive sociolinguistics research can be loosely characterized as that which;

(a) explores language – internal or cross-linguistic variation of a social origin in its own right or incorporate it into an investigation with other aims,

(b) draws on the theoretical framework developed in cognitive linguistics and

(c) arrives at its findings by implementing solid empirical methods.

Subsequently, since the hallmark of sociolinguistic investigation is language variation, the study of language choice and its impact on the users of multiple languages fall within the scope of sociolinguistics, hence the relevance of this study.

2.1.2 **Multilingualism**

Multilingualism, a sub-field of sociolinguistics has generally been defined as the act of using or promoting the use of multiple languages, either by an individual speaker or a community of speakers. However, definition and qualification of multilingualism varies according to authors. For instance, Bloomfield (1933) takes an extremist position by

arguing that one needs to have a native -like ability in the second language to be considered multilingual. Heugen in Fishman (1972) adopts a minimalist approach by asserting that a working knowledge of the second language is sufficient for one to be considered multilingual. The third position which is maintained by Hornby in Fishman 1972 and shared by others like Spolsky, 1998; Sirdhar in Wardhaugh, 2006; asserts that multilingualism should be viewed as a process and on an individual's basis which may vary in degree from minimal competence to complete mastery.

Multilingualism therefore is the use of more than one language by a single individual or community, (Gal, 2007). In popular imagination and in linguistic theory, multilingualism is often assumed to be an anomalous, exceptional practice. The knowledge and use of single language – monolingualism – has been taken as the natural human condition. Yet, both historically and currently, most of the world's communities and a majority of speakers are multilingual to a greater or lesser extent. According to Gal (2007:200), the privileging of monolingualism as against multilingualism is due to the dominance of the European nation states, which has been legitimated by a monolingualist language ideology. This ideology now taken for granted throughout the world – presumes that each ethnic group has a language of its own and by virtue of this difference deserves political autonomy. Linguistic knowledge in this view, is an emblem of political belonging and thus multilingualism implies political unreliability or mixed loyalty. Gal (2007) further argues that the biblical story of Babel suggests a much older distrust of multilingualism in the western tradition. Thus, a single, universal language was seen as a gift of paradise, while linguistic diversity and multilingualism were presented as divine punishment for human arrogance.

However, in the contemporary world, there has been increasing flow of migrants, tighter economic ties across the globe and other factors as a result of which and despite the legacy of the Babel story, there is increasing recognition of the high incidence and practical advantages of multilingualism. This recognition extends to the significance of multilingualism historically, before the rise of nation states and in the centuries since.

Having established the widespread and stable nature of multilingualism in contemporary world, it is pertinent to point out that some multilingual researchers are interested in the ethno-linguistic vitality of languages in multilingual settings. According to Meyerhof (2006) this concept comes from work on social psychology of language. Researchers were initially interested in the relationships between groups of speakers and the language in use in their community. They asked questions such as why do some languages remain strong in face of social change, while others are abandoned within a few generations? And what roles does language play in defining a group or ethnic identity? Hence, a linguistic variety has relatively high vitality if it is spoken and used widely. This kind of vitality is a good indicator of whether or not that particular language will continue to be spoken in successive generations, or whether speakers are likely to shift to another language. Therefore, the demographic composition of the (ethnic) group speaking a language, the status afforded to a language and the institutional support provided for a language are all important considerations for evaluating the relative strength or vitality of languages.

Therefore, in multilingual communities where more than one language is spoken by a majority of people, sufficient consensus about appropriate rules of speaking and

interpreting linguistic behavior may arise for it to be considered one sociolinguistic unit (or speech community), (Mesthrie et al, 2009). In this regard, cultural conceptions and institutional arrangements define how speakers allocate languages to social circumstances – which language(s) for politics, for intimacy, scholarship or prayer, how much switching is appropriate and what social meaning it conveys. The languages of a multilingual speech community commonly stand in the same relation of functional contrast to each other as do registers in monolingual speech communities. When this happens, switch in language and switch in register signal the same kinds of social differences. They both signal changing alignment between speakers in the event of speaking and changes in stance towards the objects of discussion.

2.1.3 **Factors Responsible for Societal Multilingualism**

In Fishman's (1972:14) view to determine the factors responsible for societal multilingualism, certain questions need to be answered, such as (a) under what circumstances do multilinguals function without benefit of a well-developed and widely accepted social consensus as to which language to use between which interlocutors for communication, concerning what topics or for what purpose? (b) Under what circumstances do the speech varieties or languages involved lack clearly defined or protected functions? It is an attempt to provide answers to the above questions that a satisfying discussion on the scenarios that give birth to multilingualism can be held.

In view of the above, the first of such factors is rapid social change and sometimes great social unrest. In this situation, there is a widespread abandonment of earlier norms before the consolidation of new ones. In this circumstance, children typically become

multilingual at very early stage while still largely confined to home and neighbourhood since their elders (children of school age and adults alike) carry into the domains of intimacy a language learned outside its confines.

Another factor is industrialization. Industrialization and urbanization compel members of a speech community providing manpower to abandon in haste their traditional socio-cultural patterns and to learn or be taught the language associated with the means of production in order to be absorbed into the socio-cultural patterns and privileges to which that language and its speakers belong (Fishman, 1972:14). In response to this, one group's reaction further stresses the advantages of the newly gained language of education, industry and power.

The other historical factor is immigration. This is so because overtime, dislocated immigrants and their children are inclined to use their mother tongue and other tongues for intra-group communication in seemingly random fashion since the formerly separate roles of the home domain, the school and the work domains are all disrupted by the massive dislocations of values and norms resulting from migration, industrialization and urbanization, the language of the work and of the school, come to be used at home. Consequently, languages formerly kept apart come to influence each other phonetically, lexically, semantically and even grammatically much more than before. Even in modern world with what is referred to as “linguistic globalization” most speech communities have become multilingual, Musau (2003) cited in Jegede, (2012).Contact between languages has become an important factor in modern day living.

Sridhar (1996:100) lists migration as one of the most potent factors responsible for multilingualism, because as people move from one country or region to another, there is contact with various speech communities in a natural setting. Even as individuals maintain their home languages, an area were several languages are spoken becomes overtime, a place of multilingualism.

2.1.4 **Types of Societal Multilingualism**

Having established that societal intra-group multilingualism is possible and in fact stable and widespread as opposed to the previous thesis which viewed it as an inter-group phenomenon resulting from contact between essentially separate monolingual groups, it is important to turn to the issue of the types or patterns of acquisition and usage. As a phenomenon, multilingualism raises issues such as how one acquires two or more languages, how the languages are cross accessed for communication, and how the use of many languages embodies and shapes one's mental state. The question is, when a person is fluent in two or more languages, how is his/her thought integrated with each of this languages? (Sam and Joseph, 1975:186).

Another question is, are there also intellectual consequences of multilingualism for the individual? Multilingualism therefore offers a unique opportunity for examining the relationship between language and thought. Within a single mind, two or more languages co-exist, so if language determines or influences thought, then there should also be two or more conceptual systems, one corresponding to each language. If however, language primarily expresses the result of thought processes, then we should find only one conceptual system underlying the languages.

With these intricacies, scholars have made distinction between two types of multilingualism (Ervin and Osgood in Sam and Joseph, 1975:158; Yul-Ifode, 2001:170). Hence, if two or more languages have been acquired in separate and quite distinct contexts, separate and parallel languages and conceptual systems might result. This would exemplify co-ordinate multilingualism. It is argued that the co-ordinate multilingual is able to keep the languages apart in separate contexts, the grammar of the two or more languages completely independent of one another (Yul-Ifode, 2001:17).

If on the other hand, a child learns two or more languages in one place, as when his/her parents speak both languages at home, and then compound multilingualism will result. in this case, the two or more languages would represent different ways of expressing the same meanings. Some scholars argue that compound multilinguals do not have an independent grammar for their second language, and therefore are not able to keep their two or more languages apart. The learning of the second languages is dependent on and compounded to the first. Compound multilinguals will therefore always be translating from their first to their second languages each time they want to speak the latter, (Yul-Ifode, 2001:17).

Other scholars argue that multilingual speakers typically do not differ from one another in their language usage but with one minor exception, (Macanmara in Sam and Joseph, 1975:188). Coordinate multilingual speakers seem to have slight different affective meaning for the words in each language, while compound multilingual speakers tend to rate the words of their second languages in the same way; their connotative meanings are the same for the languages. This difference between the two types of multilingual

probably reflects the differences in their experiences with the objects that the words refer to. In any case, any fluent multilingual should have the same kind of conceptual system whether compound or coordinate, that is why it is possible to switch freely from one language to another without disrupting the communication flow.

2.1.5 **Effects of Multilingualism on a Society**

That multilingualism produces certain effects on speech communities where more than one language is used for communication is incontestable. In his demographic analysis of bilingualism in Montreal, Liesberson in (Fishman 1922:200) asserts that multilingualism can produce some of the following effects.

First, it can provide the mechanism leading to the development of a monolingual population. According to him, this is what happened among non-English speaking groups in the United States after the establishment of Anglo-Saxon dominance. After these groups learned the language of the nation and became bilingual, somewhere along the line of linguistic transfer between generations, only English was passed on.

Secondly, multilingualism may be an end product in itself. In this case, there is sufficient multilingualism to enable a population with various languages to maintain the social systems, hence, the multilingualism of parents does not lead to the loss of the mother-tongue among the next generation as was the case in first instance above.

Thirdly, it can lead to a situation where speakers of many languages may begin to use a simplified form of other tongues (pidginization) which in turn is passed on to children as their first language or mother tongue (creolization). Furthermore, a multilingual speaker

can achieve communicative effectiveness or competence by means of code-switching or code-mixing. These are phenomena in which a multilingual combines aspects of the many languages he speaks in one communicative event. If it is intra-sentential, it is called code-mixing but when it is inter-sentential, it is code-switching. This will form the basis of another subheading in this chapter.

Finally, multilingualism can lead to diffusion, that is, the spread of certain features from the language to the others as a result of contact, like Hausa is doing to other minority languages in Northern Nigeria.

2.1.6 **Diglossia and Multilingualism**

Diglossia is a sociolinguistic term first advanced by Ferguson in 1959 to describe society that recognizes two or more languages and two varieties of a language for intra-societal communication (Fishman, 1972). In this situation, each code serves distinct functions. These two codes are maintained without one displacing the other. Certain behaviours, attitudes and values are supported and expressed in the two varieties respectively. Both sets are fully accepted as culturally legitimate and complementary within the society, hence the varieties are non- conflicting, (Fishman, 1972:137, Yul-Ifode, 2001:171). In this circumstance, one variety is accorded prestige and is used in formal situations and for serious businesses which is designated the 'H' variety, while the other variety is the colloquial one reserved for informal situations like jokes, social interaction and is designated 'L' variety, for example, Arabic; the classical and the colloquial varieties, Swiss: the standard German and Swiss German.

However, there are communities in which both diglossia and multilingualism are widespread. For instance, in Paraguay, more than half of the population speaks both Spanish and Guarani (Fishman, 1922:157; Holmes, 2008:27; Spolsky, 1998:51; Romaine, 2000:35); a substantial portion of formerly monolingual rural population has added Spanish to its linguistic repertories in matters of education, religion, government and high culture. Therefore, the existence of a single official language in a multilingual setting should not divert attention from recognizing the fact of widespread and stable multilingualism at the levels of societal and interpersonal functioning, as is the case in Nigeria. Diglossia and multilingualism may be said to exist wherever speech communities exist in which speakers:

a. Engage in a considerable range of roles.
b. Wherever several roles are encouraged or facilitated by powerful social institutions and
c. Wherever the roles are clearly differentiated as to when, where and with whom they are felt to be appropriate (Fishman, 1972:140).

There are situations in which multilingualism obtains but diglossia is generally absent, like in many communities in Nigeria. In this case, multilingualism is a characterization of individual's versatility while diglossia is a characterization of societal allocation of functions to different languages or varieties. In treating multilingualism, it has to be understood that it is a character of use and usage of language rather than the features of code which is the domain of diglossia. In describing a community as multilingual, one has to identify the many languages they use, what they use them for, the role of these languages in their total pattern of behaviours, the manner and extent to which they

alternate their many languages. It is also important to know how well the community is able to keep the various languages apart or the influence one has on the others. Multilingualism therefore, is a behavioural pattern which involves the modification of individual's or community's linguistic practices, varying in degrees, functions and interference (Yul-Ifode, 2001:170). Therefore, multilingualism entails the psychological state of an individual who has access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social interaction as well as the state of a community where two or more languages are in contact with the result of using several codes in the same interaction (Ogunsiji, 2007:1).

2.1.7 **Bilingualism Versus Biculturalism**

Bilingualism according to McCarty (2009) is the ability to communicate in two languages. This to him generally implies writing, reading and speaking fluently, although, the term is also sometimes applied to individuals who are only bilingual speakers and not literate in a second language. On the other hand, biculturalism is an immersion in two district cultures, implying participation in traditional heritage practices like food, dress, family traditions, folklore, etc. From the above definitions, it is clear that the two concepts are related, but they are not the same thing. The assumption that if an individual is bilingual that person will automatically have access to two cultures may be misleading in the sense that an individual can be bilingual without being bicultural.

However, bilingualism is more of a door into biculturalism. If by bicultural we mean that two cultures are operative in one person, or at least that one person can operate in two cultures, then biculturalism can refer to either the academic study of cultures in contact or the conviction that recognizing two or more cultures in individuals and society is

beneficial (Shapson and D'Oyley, 1984), while culture deals more with appearance and behavioral tendencies language is most revealing of differentiating factors, whether it is fluency in it or lack of it. This can mark one as a group member or an outsider. Although, appearances trigger automatic assumptions about others, which can make communication difficult for someone with a native appearance who is not fluent in the native language, or for someone who does not appear native but is fluent in the local language. Therefore, Yoneyama (2008) argued that regardless of appearances and or fluency in any language, if an individual cannot act on behavioural cues as expected by group members, such a person would be vulnerable hence dependent on the goodwill of others.

Another similarity between bilingualism and biculturalism lies in the fact that just like similarities in the structures of two languages can aid acquisition or learning of either of the languages, so also is the degree or kind of biculturalism possible is also affected by characteristics of the two cultures and the relationship between them. In the final analysis, McCarty (1999) argues that more than becoming bilingual, becoming bicultural seems to be an advanced attainment. Therefore, given positive social attitudes toward linguistic and cultural diversity, the second language and culture do not take anything away from one's native heritage but are additive and enriching. Furthermore, for a bilingual who is also bicultural, it equips him/her with the ability to view the same situation though both eyes and having the choice to determine which way to respond. This becomes a resource for the society and gives the individual more choices in behaviour and thought, therefore more freedom.

2.1.8 **Multilingualism Versus Multiculturalism**

Multilingualism as earlier defined in this chapter is the act of using, or promoting the use of multiple languages, either by an individual or by a community of speaker whereas multiculturalism "refers to the doctrine that several cultures (rather than one national culture) can coexist (within an individual) or peacefully and equitably in a single country" (Azu, 2013). Multilingualism and multiculturalism are an integral part of a multi-ethnic state or country. One of the greatest factors that had aided those phenomena is migration which has been taking place through the ages owing to various historical factors. In the 21st century however, globalization has hastened the process even faster, while these phenomena are generally perceived as beneficial to individuals and a very useful resource to the society, there are concerns about the usefulness in education. Similar to the phenomena of bilingualism and biculturalism, an assumption that a multilingual speaker may have corresponding knowledge of all the cultures of the languages he/she speaks may be erroneous. This according to Azu (2013) is the reason why effort to relate second language teaching and learning to culture, particularly students and teachers unexposed to the foreign tongue and its accompanying intrinsic culture, can really prove to be a daunting exercise. Therefore, it is possible to possess structural linguistic competence of multiple languages with little or no exposure to the cultures of the native speakers of such languages.

This can result in a situation in multilingual setting where an individual can transfer his/her own personal cultural experiences and linguistic prejudices of one language to another. However, in spite of the linguistic complexities arising out of inherent diversities in terms of multiple languages and cultures, there exist unique and rich heritage in

multilingual settings which still remains unexplored. As part of solution, efforts may be initiated while planning language policy and curriculum to bridge the gap and minimize the degree of difference.

2.1.9 **Language Choice**

In this study, we are looking at how choosing between languages can be invested with the same kinds of social and affective meaning as choosing styles in one language. Decisions made about the use and recognition of languages can have a powerful impact on the long term strength of a language. In multilingual settings, the choice between languages carries interactional force or implies something about the situation or the interlocutors. One language may be used for some social functions or in a specific social context, while another language is reserved for other functions and contexts. The study of choice can also focus on the relationship between groups of speakers and the languages in use in their community. This can lead to the understanding of why some languages remain strong in the face of social change, while others are abandoned within a few generations. It can equally help us to understand the role language plays in defining a group or ethnic identity. Domain of use can also determine the language a speaker chooses in a multilingual setting. In making a choice therefore, speakers may conceptualize the relationship between location, addressee and in group identity in different ways.

According to Sankoff (1972) the behavior of multilinguals in communities where multiligualism is the norm and communication takes place in two or more codes has received considerable amount of attention. He argues that rather than concentrating on the historical linguistic consequences of such heterogeneous situations, scholars have

dealt instead with the network of communication itself, trying to elucidate, on the synchronic level, the systematic aspects of people's use of the various codes available to them. Hymes (1967) and Gumperz (1968) cited in Samkoff (1972) have both argued that in every speech community, there exist a variety of repertoires of alternate means of expression. They go on to note that this fact has social implications, i.e. that in choosing among the various codes available to them, speakers indicate what might be called social meaning. To further buttress the assertion, speakers in any community share rules regarding language usage, which allow them to interpret the social meaning of alternate linguistic choices. Multilingual speech communities are however unique in one way. The fact that the alternates in question are (theoretically) discrete and easily identified i.e. (as separate languages) makes them particularly prone to certain types of sociolinguistic investigation.

Language use in multilingual setting is, therefore, examined in specific contexts, looking at how, during the course of an interaction, speakers may adopt different language varieties or create switch between varieties as a communicative strategy.

Many studies of language use in multilingual communities have been concerned with habitual language choices made by speakers, (Mesthrie et al, 2009). However, in many cases, speakers could, in principle use any of their languages in interaction with others, but in practice certain languages tend to be associated with certain contexts (with certain settings, topics, groups of interlocutors and so on). For instance, Myers-Scotton in (Mesthrie et al 2009) noted that in Africa the most common pattern of multilingualism is to use the speaker's own mother tongue plus an indigenous lingua franca or an alien

official language (such as English or French). She also argues that evidence from urban communities in Africa suggests that patterns of language choice vary according to speakers' social backgrounds and the types of interaction in which they engage. In multilingual communities, then it is possible to identify certain broad regularities or patterns of language use.

This does not mean, however, that individual speakers simply reflect these patterns. In so far as a language becomes associated with certain groups of speakers and contexts of use, it will require important social meanings. Speakers may use the language to convey information about their own identity and about the relationship that obtains between themselves and others (or that they would like to obtain between themselves and others). It has also been noted that language choice can be an uncertain matter. For instance the tension surrounding the position of English in Kenya (Scotton, 2009), i.e. whether English language will continue to serve as the only official language or it should be used alongside Swahili. Relationship between languages in multilingual settings may be relatively stable, but they may also change. A variety of social factors (migration, invasion and conquest, industrialization) have been associated with a process termed language shift, in which the functions carried out by one language are taken over by another.

It is pertinent to note that language use is critical to a good understanding of the linguistic situation in a multilingual setting. When people have command of two or more languages, they make choices as to when and where to use a certain language. The choices speakers make of the languages rests on their attitude concerning the language of choice.

Adams, Matu & Ongarora (2012:100) argue that as group patterns begin to emerge, implications about the roles of languages in a multilingual community can be translated into explanations about how that community operates in general.

Muaka (2011:221) argues that language is inevitably at the centre of identity construction in multilingual contexts where language choices have to be made. This is so where individuals have to negotiate their identity through their language choice. According to Muaka, Gumperz's (1982) study helped to contextualize how speakers construct identity in bi/multilingual situations. In this work, he shows how the we-code and they-code represent an individual's group identity in relation to others. He further stresses that the we-code represents the speaker's variety as being informal, familiar and proximal in terms of social distance. In multilingual setting, this code would be the local language. The other people's code which is the they-code denotes unfamiliarity, formal and social distance. In essence therefore, each language uniquely fulfils certain roles and represents certain identities, and all of them complement one another to serve the complex communicative demands of a pluralistic society (Vershik, 2004). On the other hand, Nkwain (2012) and Hymes (1968) submit that language choice in complex multilingual speech communities for each speech event can be difficult given the complexity in the acquisition patterns, the domains of use and other deciding factors. Therefore, extra-linguistic correlates such as participants, the locale, the topic, the setting, role relations, the tone, the intention and pressure from parents can be held accountable for the choice of a code in such a multilingual setting.

Furthermore, Scotton (1995:50) using her "markedness" model of language choice to explain choice of code in multilingual Kenya advances that members of a multilingual speech community are aware of the range of codes that would be appropriate for a particular type of conventionalized exchanges and they assign meanings to choices based on such expectations. Thus, while the unmarked choice in any context is the normatively expected one, speakers who make marked (i.e. unexpected or unusual) choices in specific contexts are responsible for the implications triggered by these choices. Hence, any deviation from the neutral or unmarked choice conveys symbolic social messages entailing the speaker's marked communicative intention. For instance, as Grosjean (1982) notes, choosing a particular language or opting to mix languages in a particular social context can signal group solidarity, or ethnic identity marker. Therefore, Myers-Scotton and Grosjean's interpretations of code choices indicate that choosing one variety over another has relevance to the intentional nature of a message. In this regard, code choices are not just choices of context, but are "discourse strategies" by which the speaker becomes creative actor, hence linguistic code choices are used for accomplishing the speaker's communicative intention more than for simply conveying referential meaning.

In another dimension, it has been observed by Gal (1979:201) that multilingualism can facilitate language shift, although its existence in a community do not necessarily lead to it. Language shift according to Gal is a complex process, the causes of which are constellation of factors. Societal language shift according to Fishman (1964:205) is a case where a community collectively adopts another language at the expense of the mother tongue. Clyne (2003:20) on the other hand submits that language shift can designate a

gradual or completion of a process; a change in the main on dominant language of an individual or group; a change in one or more domains; or even the exclusive language for one or more of the four language skills. The unstable nature of multilingualism can lead to language shift, the progression of which is inter-generational.

It is believed that multilingual competences are linguistic resources available to members of a community for socially significant interactions. However, Ludi (2004:15) is of the view that multilingualism does not concern linguistic competence alone but entails life in two or more cultures. This according to Ludi does not mean an ideal, coordinated, unrestricted membership of several cultural communities but that such an individual is able to adapt his or her language choice to the situation and to switch from one language to another, if necessary, independently from the balance between his or her competencies. Thus, multilingualism entails breaking up the prison of a single culture, putting the concepts and values of each cultural system in relative terms, bridging cultures and integrating them into a proper meta system. The resulting social identity can be harmonious or characterized by breaks and contradictions, but is in any case plural. Therefore, becoming multilingual, entails in most cases, the development of an intercultural communicative competence. Ludi further observes that traces of multilingualism at the surface of discourse are referred to as "translinguistic markers" (2004). These are forms at the surface of discourse like loans, interferences, code-switching etc which seem to result from an influence exerted by language/variety A on a language/variety B or which seem to represent the mixture of both.

In summary, (Mesthrie et al 2009) submit that studies of language choice in multilingual communities have demonstrated some regularities in the language used by different groups of speakers and in different contexts. They have also been able to document general trends in language use e.g. processes of language shift. Therefore, a speaker's choice of language has to do with maintaining or negotiating a certain type of social identity in relation to others; code switching between languages allows speakers (simultaneous) access to different social identities.

2.1.10 **Language and Attitudes**

Attitude as a psychological constructs is not easily defined, however, according to Garret (2007) there is broad acceptance of Sarnoff's definition: 'a disposition to react favourably or unfavourably to a class of objects'. In this regard, attitudes are generally seen as learned through human socialization, with those acquired early in life like many language attitudes-less amenable to change in later life. Attitudes are further classified by Garret into these components: cognitive (beliefs and stereotypes), affective (evaluations) and behavioural. Attitudes according to him are also attributed various functions: for instance, (negative and positive) stereotypes are employed to provide order to our social world and in particular, to explain intergroup relations.

In view of the fact that attitudes are a mental construct, there can be problem in determining whether any research data on attitudes truly represent the respondents' attitudes. As a result therefore, there are essentially three research approaches usually termed *the societal treatment approach, the direct approach* and *the indirect approach*. The first is a broad category that typically includes observational (e.g. ethnographic)

studies, or analysis of various sources within the public domain. The second one, which is the direct approach, involves simply asking people to report self-analytically what their attitudes are, and is much used in larger-scale surveys, for example, attitudes to the promotion of minority languages or in second language learning. However, this approach is prone to biases. The third approach, the indirect method developed by Lambert (1960) cited in Garret (2007) is known as the Matched-Guise Technique (MGT). This method relies upon vocal 'guises', where researchers record a single speaker who commands or can imitate the required speech styles, and deceive listeners into thinking they are listening to different speakers saying similar things, or reading the same text aloud in different accents. The MGT approach according to Garret (2007) has allowed the manipulation of a range of variables, including language, dialect and accent variables in various speech communities, levels of accentedness, speech rate, lexical intensity, lexical formality,age and speech accommodation. The use of attitude-rating scales in this indirect approach has revealed that respondents generally judge and differentiate language along three primary dimensions: superiority (characteristics such as prestige, intelligence and competence), social attractiveness (e.g. friendliness, trustworthiness) and dynamism (e.g. enthusiasm, liveliness).

Language shift tends to be slower among communities where the minority language is highly valued. When a language is seen as a symbol of ethnic identity, it is generally maintained longer. Positive attitudes support efforts to use the minority language in a variety of domains, and this helps people resist the pressure from the majority group to switch to their language. Pride in ethnic identity and language can be important factors which contribute to language maintenance, provided there is a strong community to

support and encourage these attitudes. Attitudes to language reflect attitudes to the users and the uses of language.

In Holmes (2008:406) it is suggested that intelligibility is also affected by attitudes. People generally find it easier to understand languages and dialects spoken by people they like or admire. A closely related point, at least for majority group members, is that people are more highly motivated and consequently often more successful, in acquiring a second language when they feel positive towards those who use it. Clearly attitudes to language have interesting implications both for politicians and language teachers. People generally do not hold opinions about language in a vacuum. They develop attitudes towards languages which reflect their views about those who speak the languages, and the contexts and functions with which they are associated. When people listen to accents or languages they have never heard before, their assessments are totally random, there is no pattern to them. In other words, there is no universal consensus about which languages sound most beautiful and which most ugly.

Attitudes to language are strongly influenced by social and political factors, e.g. attitudes to pidgin and creoles, for instance, present major impediments to their promotion and acceptance as official languages. On the other hand, attitudes of minority groups in Northern Nigerian to Hausa language seems to be one strong reason why the language is dominating the other languages in the region, with influences in areas like commerce, politics, economy and even leisure. Attitudes to language can lead to what Holmes (2008) regards as overt or covert prestige. According to her overt prestige is a situation where a variety of language is rated highly on the scales of educational or occupational status, and

these rating reflect the associations of the speech variety, which is generally held up as the “best” way of speaking in the community. Covert prestige on the other hand refers to positive attitudes towards vernacular or non-standard speech varieties which people rarely admit valuing particularly to strangers.

2.1.11 **Language Shift**

There are many different social reasons for a speaker to choose a particular code or variety in a multilingual community, however, Holmes (2008) argues that there is very little chance for those who speak lesser-used languages in a community where the people in power use the language of the majority or a world language such as English. Language shift therefore occurs when a group for different social factors change from using a particular language to using another one in different domains. Language shift though common among migrant groups is not always the result of migration. Political, economical and social changes can occur within a community and this may result in linguistic changes too.

When languages shift occurs, it is almost always towards the languages of the dominant powerful group. A dominant group has little incentive to adopt the language of a minority. The dominant language is associated with status, prestige and social success. It is therefore not surprising to see many young minority group speakers opting for the majority language owing to its advantages and abandoning their own language.

Some of the factors responsible for language shift are economic, social and political. For instance, the need to get good job to be accepted socially or gain political relevance. Other factors are demographic, for instance the rate of language shift might be faster in

urban areas than rural settings. This is because the rural groups tend to be isolated from the centres of political power for longer and they can meet most of their social need in the ethnic or minority language. Therefore, to resist language shift and maintain a language you must have people who can use it on regular basis. Attitudes and values are other factors that can facilitate or prevent language shift as earlier mentioned under language and attitudes.

For language shift to be prevented, the language should be considered as an important symbol of ethnic identity. Another factor is the degree and frequency of contact with homeland. Above all, the strongest factor in preventing language shift and ultimately language loss or death is institutional support, e.g. education, law, administration, religion and the media. So the minority group that can mobilize these institutions to support language maintenance has some chance of succeeding.

2.1.12 **Language and Identity**

The concepts of language and identity relate to the extent to which we use language to construct different identities in different social interactions. Using an ethnographic approach a researcher focuses on the ways in which individuals perform particular aspects of their social identity in specific situations. Linguistic Identity is not only the use of a particular language, but also how it is used with others. Fadong (2017) submits that language is so important in the construction of individual identities to the extent it is often used as a powerful means of exercising social control. Thornborrow (2004) further remarks that identity is something which we are constantly building and negotiating all our lives through our interaction with others. Different aspects of an individual's social

identity will be more or less relevant in specific social contexts, and even at different points within the same interaction. Holmes (2008) argues that sociolinguists use the term 'community of practice' to capture the complexities of what it means to belong to a social group. This concept has been adopted by some sociolinguists to permit a focus on social categories which make more sense to participants than abstract categories such as class and gender. Communities of practice develop around the activities which group members engage in together, and their shared objectives and attitudes. We all belong to many communities of practice which share particular goals and ways of interacting-family, sports team, work group and so on. Some may be relatively long-term; others, such as a group organizing an event, a dance, a school fair, or a conference, will be more temporary.

Therefore, in constructing identity, social meaning is a dynamic mutual linguistic construction between different participants in an interaction, while sociolinguists need to describe the linguistic patterns that correlate with the macro-level abstract categories of class, age, ethnicity and gender, for describing the detail and complexity of what goes on in day-to-day interactions between individuals, the concepts of social network and community of practice are particularly useful. They allow us to examine the ways in which individuals use linguistic resources in dynamic and constructive ways to express various social identities – identities which draw on macro-level categories such as new gang member, or feisty friend, or youngest child in a family. Indeed, it is this moment-to-moment linguistic choices which ultimately create the larger scale patterns, a point which becomes evident in given speech communities.

The role of language in identity formation and presentation has been a prime interest of sociolinguistics right from the onset (Bell, 2008 in Liamas et al). Labov 1963 study of the local identity value of a single vowel sound in the English of Martha's Vineyard. In this regard, language is seen as having an active, constitutive role in interaction, as being very much a matter of initiative rather than response. The emphasis therefore is on how individual speakers use style (in the case of monolingual speaker) or and other aspects of their language repertoire to represent their identity or lay claim to other identities. In any contact of people with different background, language can be used to take initiative in framing the encounter, the speakers' relationship and their positioning towards what they discuss. In this regard therefore, their linguistic usage reflect both the responsive dimension of language, it can be ethnic identities which they want to project, and their ability to use language creatively for their own identity purpose.

According to Norton cited in Llamas et al (2008) identity is "how people understand their relationship to the world, and how that relationship is constructed across time and space and how people understand their possibilities for the future. Sociolinguists have long acknowledged that variation in speech can be used to express social meaning and to signal important information about aspects of speakers' social identity. Therefore, sociolinguistic perspectives on identity are unsurprisingly deeply intertwined with investigations into language variation. Eckert (2002) proposes useful sociolinguistic perspectives on identity. This is categorized into three waves; the first being Labov (1966) study where he employed surveys and quantitative methods to investigate the correlations between linguistic variability and social categories like social class, age, ethnicity and sex. The second wave employed more ethnographic methods with

categories suggested by the participants themselves, in an attempt to understand most locally grounded linguistic variation. According to Eckert, studies in the first two waves are concerned with language as situating the individual in a community or social group. The third wave focuses on the social meaning of variables, with variation not simply reflecting but actually constructing social categories and meaning. This wave also focuses on variation within one speaker and with the various and overlapping constructions of identities within the individual.

Another crucial concept in the understanding of relationship between language and identity is what Milroy (2000) refers to as indexiciality. This is a process by which language comes to be associated with the specific locally or contextually significant social characteristics. In this regard, he argues a whole language or just one linguistic form can become an index, or a pointer to a speaker's social identity, as well as of typical activities of that speaker. Thus, indexicality entails an association of a language or a linguistic form with some sort of socially meaningful characteristic. This is demonstrated most clearly in code-switching or mixing situations, where speakers shift between different languages that have different social meaning in their community.

Other ways of viewing identity and language can be as a form of social category (Labov, 1966), as a contact phenomenon (Milroy, 2000), in this regard, social and geographical mobility in terms of who a speaker mixed and identified with, as well as macro social factors were shown to be important in understanding identity. Giles's (1977) Speech Accommodation Theory in social psychology on acts of identity was highly influential in shaping views of identity within sociolinguistics. This approach acknowledges that a

speaker is not merely a passive voice-piece of his or her social position in society, but rather sometimes makes conscious choices as to how to speak. Along this dimension, speakers are viewed as actively exploiting linguistic resources available to them in order to project differing identities that different contexts. Finally, identity can also be seen as practice which is concerned with how groups of speakers come together and develop distinct ways of speaking around their joint enterprises, hence communities of practice. On the whole, Bucholtz and Hall (2004:376) sum up the current sociolinguistic perspectives on identity as follows:

> Any given construction of identity may be in part deliberate and intentional, in part habitual and hence often less than fully conscious in part an outcome of others' perceptions and representations, and in part an effect of larger ideological processes and material structures that may become relevant to interaction.

2.1.13 **Language and Power**

There is growing attention on the relationship between language and power which Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is quite interested in. This is explicitly concerned with investigating how language is used to construct and maintain power relationships in society; the aim is to reveal the connections between language and power and between language and ideology. The critical discourse analyst deliberately dons a pair of critical spectacles and looks for evidence of the overt exercise of power in supposedly "equal" interactions, or for identification of hidden ideological assumptions about 'normal' way of doing things that disadvantage minority groups. Language choice in a multilingual setting can be used as an illustration of relationship between language and power where minority groups assume or believe that one way of gaining access to political power is to use the language of the majority group since power is exercised through the language of

the majority. Sociolinguists therefore attempt to highlight the relevance of the social context in which people are operating and the underlying connections between language, power and ideology. Hence, this perspective of viewing language tends to highlight the ways in which discourse enacts and reinforces power relationships and making explicit the ideological beliefs or covert assumptions which underlie some instances of discourse in society.

In line with the above assertion, CDA researchers aim to expose the hidden messages and specially the taken-for-granted assumptions that underline much of our everyday discourse e.g. adverts. Adverts appeal to audience's emotions, their desires and fears and to their often unexamined attitudes and beliefs. Another focus of CDA has been discourse which is apparently neutral and informative, but which on closer examination turns out to be manipulative and even distorting. Even more interesting and less obvious are the subtle ways in which our responses are manipulated in contexts which are supposedly sources of information; such as newspaper reports, or even textbooks – contexts where we are perhaps less aware of the underlying orientations and goals of the writers or speakers. But closer critical look will often identify the subtle sources of bias in the way language is used in these contexts. A CDA approach therefore seeks to identify ways in which readers or listeners are manipulated through choices of particular words and construction to take a particular position in relation to the topic of discussion. Pronoun choices, for example, can quickly and effectively position a researcher as one of 'us', observing the behaviour of 'them', thus including the reader or listener in one group which objectifying another group and distancing the reader or listener from them.

2.1.14 **Mobility, Contact and Accommodation**

The term accommodation according to Auer (2007) is used in two different ways in socio-linguistics. On the one hand, it refers to interpersonal accommodation, which is the convergence of two or more interactants' way of speaking within an interaction episode.Models for the analysis of interpersonal convergence (or divergence) have their sources in social psychology, particularly in the work of Howard Giles (1977). The second way in which the term is used refers to what is sometimes called long-term dialect accommodation, the convergence which may occur in groups of speakers who change their place of living more or less permanently within the same language area. This type of internal migration and the subsequent dialect contact between the brought-along variety and the one spoken in the receiving area can lead to a durable change in speech habits of the immigrant group. In language contact situation, convergence between structurally distant language systems can lead to code-switching, code-mixing, lexical borrowing, or even language loss, whereas dialect contact is rather associated with more gradual, often quantitative changes in the realization of certain variables in morphology and phonology. However, language contact may lead to processes of gradual structural convergence, for instance in syntax.

Also, in viewing accommodation as a consequence of migration, the focus changes in the language behaviour of the migrants. It is not impossible however, that the receiving group may accommodate to the immigrants and change their speaking habits, or that the immigration has a more indirect but still permanent impact on the local varieties. Depending on the situation, different processes of accommodation may set in. In the first scenario, the brought along features may be lost which implies the acquisition of those of

the receiving areas. Secondly, the immigrants face the task of acquiring the standard variety, which may or may not lead to the loss of the brought-along dialect. Thirdly, they may additionally acquire the local vernacular and finally the features of the brought-along variety may be given up in favour of the standard or a more standardized way of speaking and or the features of the local vernacular of the receiving area may be acquired.

On the whole, there are external factors such as loyalty to the dialect or language of origin, the prestige of the varieties concerned, as well as general satisfaction with post-migration life which play some significant roles in influencing accommodation. On the other hand, internal linguistic factor such as notion of 'salience' can be invoked as having influence on accommodation. For instance, features with a high degree of linguistic awareness, which can be controlled consciously, are better candidates for negative and/or positive accommodation than those which are used unconsciously and are hard to control.

2.1.15 **Speech Communities and their Characteristics**

The term speech community according to Hudson (1996) is widely used to refer to a community based on language; however the term linguistic community is also used with the same meaning. Lyons (1970:326) simply defined it as "all the people who use a given language". By this definition, the people need not necessarily reside in one place. Hockett (1958) on the other hand defines speech community as "the whole set of people who communicate with each other, either directly or indirectly, via the common language". In this definition, the criterion of communication within the community is added. This study therefore adopts this definition as a working one. This therefore means that a speech community may use more than one language so long as they communicate in those

languages all the time. In essence a speech community refers to a group of people who feel themselves to be a community in some sense irrespective of the number of languages they use in communication. Such community comes to share a specific set of norms for language use through living and interacting together. Such groups can be villages, countries, political or professional communities, communities with shared interests, hobbies, or lifestyles. Therefore, speech communities may share both particular sets of vocabulary and grammatical conventions, as well as speech styles and genres, and also norms for how and when to speak in particular ways and for multilingual speech communities which language can be used with whom, when and why.

According to Patrick cited in (Trudgill, 2011), the study of the concept of speech community lies in the general sources of sociolinguistics, historical linguistics, philosophy of language, dialectology, anthropology and early structuralism. Therefore, every branch of linguistics that is concerned with representative samples of a population; that takes individual speakers or experimental subjects as typical members of a group; that studies language attributable to a socially coherent body; or that takes as primitive such notions as ‘native speaker’, ‘competence/performance’, ‘acceptability’, etc which manifestly refer to collective behaviour, rests partially on a concept equivalent to the speech community. Linguistic systems are exercised by speakers, in social space. There they are acquired, changed, manipulated for expressive or communicative purposes and so on. So, whether linguists prefer to focus on speakers, varieties or grammars, the problem of relating a linguistic system to its speakers is paramount.

The term speech community has been applied by different scholars from different perspectives. For instance, Labov (1989) has used the term for geographically bound communities as large as Philadelphia while Feagin (1996) used it for a small community like Anniston in Alabama or for the national unity of a people. So, cutting across geographic and class lines, it has been used of very general assemblages such as children (Romaine, 1982) and women (Coates, 1993), as well as specific and temporary ones such as members of a jury (Durant, 1999). To this end, Wardhaugh (1986:116) describes speech community as "some kind of social group whose speech characteristics are of interest and can be described in a coherent manner". Gumperz on the other hand defines it as "any human aggregate characterized by regular and frequent interaction by means of shared body of verbal signs and set off from similar aggregates by significant differences in language usage" (1968:38). This definition not only limits the concept of speech community to linguistic similarities among the various codes in use but also to agreement on the social meaning of various linguistic parameters, including sociolinguistic variables, code-switching, and contextualization cues which can only be understood by members of the same speech community. However, a speech community may be united by a common set of evaluative norms, but divergent in the application of these norms.

2.2 Code-Switching and Code-Mixing

Code-switching and mixing are sociolinguistic phenomena in which speakers of many languages combine aspects of the languages they speak in one communicative event. Essien (1995) cited in Ugot (2010) defines code-switching as "the process by which the speaker or the initiator of speech changes or switches from one language or code to another, depending on the situation, audience, subject matter, etc". Similar changes may

also take place within a sentence, such a switch is known as code-mixing which Essien (1995) defines as “a phenomenon in which two codes or languages are used for the same message or communication”.

Adekunle (1990:240) describes the phenomena as being determined by “bounds of limitless avenues and patterns of social interaction and the unfathomable depth of human creative reservoir”. Code-mixing is usually the infusion of single word or item from the donor language into the L1 construction. Code-switching on the other hand is the lifting of phrasal, clausal or sentential structures. In syntactic terms, code-switching occurs in a discourse which is made up of sentences in languages A and B.

Bentahila and Davies (1983) stress that code-switching is sometimes used to register the multilingual’s ability to choose one or the other of the languages in a particular situation. According to Banjo (1983) and Pfaff (1983) the phenomenon is conditioned by social as well as linguistic constraints. The linguistic constraints are those of proficiency and mastery of the systems of the various languages. Social constraints are primarily those of topic, situation, participants, education, sex, etc. The basic difference between code-switching and code-mixing is the composition of the elements intermingled and the arrangement of such intermingling, (Ugot, 2010).

Thus, Wardhaugh (1986:200) argues that in code-switching/mixing situation, the interlocutors are required to demonstrate good knowledge of the grammar of the languages involved as well as the societal norms that constrain the use of these languages. Lipski (1982:192) submits that the phenomenon arises from an inner-drive that cannot find a ready expression by remaining within a single language.

However, a good number of other sociolinguistic scholars have investigated the phenomenon of code-switching/mixing with emphasis on the causes, functions, characteristics and effects. The causes have been identified as mainly sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic. One is bilingualism itself or language contact that results in lexical borrowing and mixture of languages (Ansre, 1971; Bamgbose, 1971; Cheng and Butler, 1989). Some are status, integrity, self-pride, comfortability and prestige (Akere, 1977; Bokamba, 1989; Hymes, 1962; Kachru, 1989, Kamwangamalu, 1989). Other causes include modernization, westernization, efficiency, professionalism and social advancement (Kachru, 1989; Kamwangamalu, 1989). Some of the identified functions are intra-group identity (Gumperz, 1982), poetic creativity (Kachru, 1989) and expression of modernization (Kamwangamalu, 1989). One of the major characteristics of the phenomenon according to Kamwangamalu (1989) is its imposition as the norm of language use in most multilingual communities.

Among the effects are the undermining of certain tradition and values (Kachru, 1989), innovations in the structure of one of the languages involved (Kamwangamalu, 1989) and making one language to be more dominant than the other, thereby causing individual to switch always to the dominant language (Cheng and Butler, 1989). In their contribution (Ferguson, 1972; Bloom and Gumperz, 1972) submit that whether switching is vertical or horizontal, situational or metaphorical, it is established that it is determined by several factors such as solidarity, respect, distance and seclusion, topic, linguistic security, pride, stylistic variation, humour and connotation. At another level, (Tay,1989; Myers-Scotton, 1995; and Adendorff, 1996) examined the various strategies used by switchers and how the impact of speech is increased by the switching behaviour. According to Tay, despite

differences in the formal characteristics of the languages involved in CS, common communicative strategies have evolved in multilingual communities. She indicates the unconscious nature of CS behaviour, which means that typical code-switchers are usually not aware of why they switch codes at certain points in discourse.

2.3 Review of Previous Studies

In an attempt to present a comprehensive review, it is pertinent to delve into some previous works done by other authors that are in one way or the other related to this study. Bashir (1996) undertakes the study of language choice and use in Maiduguri metropolis where she examined languages most frequently used and the reasons for their usages in the area. However, the difference between Bashir's work and the current one being undertaken by the researcher is that while Maiduguri is a metropolitan setting with people from diverse socio-political and cultural backgrounds, the selected speech communities in this research are largely rural and homogenous and yet multilingual in nature. Furthermore, this research seeks to compare three different multilingual speech communities in three different regions of Nigeria to ascertain the implications of multilingualism in those communities and establish whether similar conclusions can be drawn on all of them or not. This study is equally beneficial to the present study in the sense that it affords the researcher the opportunity to compare the linguistic situation in Maiduguri with the selected communities for this study.

Kudo (2005) on the other hand studied the management of language choice of multilinguals in Japan. In this study, attempt was made to determine whether a multilingual interlocutor responds in a language similar to that another multilingual

initiates discourses in and also whether linguistic recency and linguistic distance will affect the choice of language. By recency the author means the frequency of use while distance indicates less usage. According to the author the result does not indicate that a multilingual necessarily responds in the language that co-interlocutor initiates discourses in rather that a multilingual sometimes responds in different languages and sometimes in non-verbal language. So, what determines the choice according to Kudo is sometimes the level of competence of the multilingual in any of the languages, particularly the language in which he/she can handle the topic of the discourse effectively provided the co-interlocutor can understand him/her. In essence, multilinguals in Japan pay more attention to meaning than language choice. He also asserts that linguistic recency may affect language choice but not distance. He concludes that multilinguals in Japan pay more attention to the function provided they can be understood, hence language choice is adequate for mutual understanding much more than simply languages themselves. He therefore suggests that cognitive functional approach will be adequate for the studies of multilingual management and predicts that "empathy" toward the other participant in discourses may affect language choice.

Ayemoni (2006), in a study of style of language use in childhood in a Yoruba speech community where the phenomena of code-switching and mixing were examined submits that the phenomena have both merits and demerits in the speech repertoire of users. He however suggests that the English Language teachers should devise means of preventing the demerits from adversely affecting the language learning process of the child. Jegede (2012) equally studied the role of code-switching in multilingual public primary schools in Ife-Ife, Nigeria and observes that the language in which education is conducted is very

important as the selected language may enhance or impede the quality of education. Therefore, adopting the matrix language model by Myers-Scotton as framework, Jegede argues that where the language of instruction has become a problem especially in handling difficult subjects like mathematics, code-switching can rescue the teacher from the quagmire, hence leading to better understanding of the contents being taught. He concludes by arguing that code-switching in classroom situation is necessary because it helps pupils to understand the subject matter, it helps teachers to motivate, discipline and praise pupils, it facilitates interpersonal relation between the teacher and the pupils.

In the study of language choice, code-switching and code-mixing in Biase, Cross River State, Nigeria, Ugot (2010) dwelt extensively on the role of code-switching and mixing in multilingual speech communities. According to her, language choice in Biase is motivated by extra-linguistic factors such as education, religion, politics and domestic matters. She identifies other languages spoken in Biase alongside the languages of the people as English Language, Efik, Igbo and the Nigerian pidgin. Ugot therefore argues that code-switching and mixing in Biase is used to accommodate speakers who do not share common L1. According to her, speakers in Biase may often switch for emphasis, appropriateness of a particular language, perception of speech situation, changes in content, linguistic skills of co-interlocutors, degree of formality or as solidarity marker. Thus Ugot (2010) concludes that in spite of the multilingual nature of Biase, the ethnolinguistic vitality of the local languages is high and that none of the languages is endangered. This, according to her may have been enhanced by the phenomenon of code-switching and mixing which makes it possible for speakers to use any of the languages involved in daily conversation if not fully at least partially.

However, researches have indicated that multilingualism is not devoid of pains and obstacles. In a study of linguistic choices in post-colonial Cameroon, Ngefac (2010) asserts that in post-colonial African settings certain attitudinal tendencies, linguistic/cultural conflicts and unhealthy identity competitions tend to be the hallmark of the day, especially when people resort to defining their identity with one of the colonial languages. For him, instead of individuals exploring the potentials of multilingualism for the well-being of the members of the community, speakers of different languages in post-colonial multilingual settings often embark on tendencies that disharmonize the unity of the community. In Cameroon for instance, Anchimbe (2007) identifies some of these attitudinal tendencies to include imposing one's language on others irrespective of their knowledge of that language, refusing to speak the language of given groups of speakers, threatening and even penalizing speakers for using certain language, identifying speakers with certain stereotypes and prototypes and in rare cases banning or threatening to ban certain languages. So, against this unhealthy rivalry and disharmonious relationship among speakers of the two official languages (French and English) in Cameroon, Ngefac (2010) attempts to investigate choices speakers make as far as other indigenous languages spoken in Cameroon like Kamtok, Camfranglais and Mbokotok, etc are concerned. He concludes by arguing that as a result of the prevailing riotous linguistic situation in Africa before colonialism and the hostile post-colonial competitions between colonial languages and their speakers, indigenous languages have suffered serious setback. This is so according to him, to the extent that some indigenous speakers perceive their own culture and languages as inferior. They think that the colonial languages are the only media through which effective communication can take place and are even ready to negotiate

their own identities to embrace one that strongly links them to the western world. This position is corroborated by Nkwain (2012) where he argues that the multilingual situation in Cameroon has been acrimonious leading to conflicts at various levels. This he argues is orchestrated by inherent pride, supremacy and a superiority complex expressed by users of a language mindless of the linguistic legacy, aspiration and hegemony of the users of another language. This raises problems ranging from intelligibility failure, apprehension, distrust, hatred to outright confrontation.

In the study of language choice in multilingual Mauritius, Sauzier-Uchida (2010) investigated the use of and attitudes towards colonial languages, indigenous languages and ancestral languages. In this study, questions such as how Mauritians differentiate the use of languages in various social circumstances, the images they have of each language, how they feel about the introduction of their mother tongue, creole, as a medium of instruction in the school system and in religious practices and the languages they want to promote for the future of Mauritius were raised. In summary, the study reveals that the Mauritians perceive the various languages as follows: English and French are regarded as international languages used in the media, education, legal matters and other formal discourses. Creole is restricted to home, family intimacy, identity marker associated with the masses and less privileged. However, ancestral languages are used in traditional setting, cultural activities, keeping in touch with roots. She further asserts that language use in Mauritius is multi-faceted. It symbolizes ethnicity and cultural roots, creates a sense of solidarity; serves as a communication tool to achieve socio-economic success and career advancement. Sauzier-Uchida stresses that the last aspect has the strongest impact on people's language choice. This, according to her tallies with recent researches

which stress the importance of establishing a solid link between language use and the economy in efforts to promote indigenous African languages. She concludes that unless indigenous languages can offer access to socio-economic well-being of an individual, efforts to promote them will be futile.

Muaka (2011) in a study of language perceptions and identity among Kenyan speakers asserts that Kenyan youths negotiate their identity through their language choice. According to Muaka, Gumperz's (1982) study helped to contextualize how speakers construct identity in multilingual situations. In this study, he shows how the we-code and they-code represent an individual's group identity in relation to others. He further stresses that speakers regard their own language as we-code which denotes informality, familiarity and proximity. The other codes, which are they-codes indicate unfamiliarity, formality and social distance. He argues further that the situation given above essentially reveals the status of English and French in post-colonial multilingual contexts in Africa where official languages and local languages compete for communicative space in public domain. The core of this argument is that in a multilingual setting, the choice of language a speaker makes at any given time could be used to mark identity or even negotiate status. In this study (Muaka, 2011) concentrates essentially on youths and their use of language to negotiate identity whereas the present study is interested in intra-group societal multilingual speech communities who have been able to institutionalize the various languages they speak and separate the various codes without one threatening the existence of others.

In a related study, Adam, Y; Matu, P.M; Ongarora, D.O. (2012) using the questionnaire and interview methods studied the Kinubi speakers in Kibera, Kenya to ascertain the extent to which Kinubi is retained and maintained within the home domain in Kibera and the factors that may explain it. The study also attempts to confirm whether multilingualism has negative or positive effect on Kinubi. The authors conclude by arguing that the home domain of language use and choice enhances the maintenance of Kinubi. They further argue that the Nubian community in Kibera has managed to accord each domain the language choice it deserves. Hence, Kinubi has been accorded the position of home language and its communicative role clearly spelt out and its vitality assured. However, the difference between the above study and the current one is that the attempt is not to determine the ethnolinguistic vitality of a particular language in a particular setting but to compare three different multilingual speech communities in Nigeria in one study in order to ascertain whether they are constrained by similar factors or not.

Having reviewed other studies similar to this, it is clear that none of them has endeavoured to compare different multilingual speech communities and the various implications that multilingualism may hold for them, hence the need for this study.

2.4 Theories of Language Choice

Having reviewed some authors that have contributed to the concept of language choice in multilingual setting through empirical studies, it is pertinent to examine some theories that can be used to account for this sociolinguistic behaviour. Some of these theories will be examined as follows:

a) **Domain Theory:**

One of the significant perspectives by which language use in multilingual setting is examined is through the domain analysis of Fishman (1968). Fishman (1972:231) claims that habitual language choice in multilingual speech community is far from being a random matter of momentary inclination rather proper usage dictates that only one of the theoretically co-available languages will be chosen by particular classes of interlocutors on particular kinds of occasions to discuss particular kinds of topics. Domain therefore is described as a situation which involves typical interactions between typical participants in typical settings (Holmes, 2008:12). According to her, it is a very general concept which draws on three important social factors in code-choice such as participants, settings and topic. It is also defined as an abstraction which refers to a sphere of activity representing a combination of specific times, settings and role relationships, (Romaine, 2000:44). Under domain analysis, domains are regarded as institutional contexts in which one language is more likely to be appropriate than another and are to be seen as constellations of other factors such as topic, location and participants. In other words what language an individual chooses to use may depend on whom he/she is speaking with, the topic of discussion and the location of conversation. Other scholars like Baker and PrysJones (1998) extend the concept of domain to include the notions of formality and informality. They also hold that minority languages are linked with informal situations while majority languages are connected with formal situations. Although, different scholars employ different domains, common domains include home and family, neighbourhood, school, mass media, business and commerce, religion, etc.

However, one of the noticeable drawbacks of this theory is the assumption that language choice in multilingual setting is essentially functional, in other words, it is aimed at ensuring harmonious relationship or understanding among interlocutors. It has failed to account for the role of language choice in demonstrating discord, resentment or non-cooperation.

b) **Ethnography of Speaking**

Another important theory that can be applied in the explanation of language choice is the ethnographic theory. Hymes (1974) proposes an ethnographic framework which takes into account the various factors that are involved in speaking. An ethnography of communicative events is a description of all the relevant factors that aid the understanding of how that particular communicative event achieves its objectives. He uses the word SPEAKING as an acronym for the various factors he deems to be relevant. They are: the setting and scene(s): This refers to the time and place, that is, the concrete physical circumstances in which speech takes place. Scene on the other hand is about the abstract psychological setting or the cultural definition of the occasion. The participant (P): include various combination of speaker-listeners, addressor-addressee, or sender-receiver. They generally fill certain socially specified roles. Ends (E): refers to the conventionally recognized and expected outcomes of an exchange as well as to the personal goals that participants seek to accomplish on particular occasions. Act sequence (A): refers to the actual form and content of what is said, the precise words used, how they are used, and the relationship of what is said to the actual topic at hand. Key (K): refers to the tone, manner or spirit in which a particular message is conveyed, light-hearted, serious, precise, pedantic, mocking, sarcastically, pompous and so on.

Instrumentalities (I): refers to the choice of channel, for example, oral, written or telegraphic and to the actual forms of speech employed, such as the language, dialect, code, or register that is chosen. Norms of interrelation and interpretation (N): refers to the specific behaviours and properties that are attached to speaking and also how these may be viewed by someone who does not share them e.g. loudness, silence, gaze, return and so on. Genre (G): the final term refers to clearly demarcated types of utterances; such things as poems, proverbs, riddles, seminars, prayers, lectures and editorial. These are all marked in specific ways in contrast to casual speech. So, in view of the above theory, Wardhaugh (2006:249) submits that what Hymes (1974) offers in his SPEAKING formula is a very necessary reminder that talk is actually a piece of skill work, more so in a complex multilingual setting where many languages compete for space. However, in the revised version of the theory, variables like topic, purpose of function, message form and content have been included (Homes, 2008).

In this theory Hymes offers a formula of speaking which he expects all conversation to follow, however, in real speech situation some of the elements of the formular can be flouted hence the need to adopt a more dynamic theory like communication accommodation that accounts for unexpected or unanticipated behaviour like divergence among interlocutors.

c) **Accommodation Theory:**

Communication accommodation theory was developed by Howard Giles. Giles (1977) has taken a socio-psychological dimension in his critical evaluation as to why in language contact situations, some communities maintain their languages while others do not. This theory argues that when people interact, they adjust their speech, vocal patterns and

gestures to accommodate others. The theory is concerned with the links between language, context and identity and explores the various reasons why individuals emphasize or minimize the social differences between themselves and their interlocutors through verbal and non-verbal communication. This theory according to Holmes (2008) contains two opposing concepts, speech convergence and speech divergence. In convergence, people who converse regularly come to find out though unconsciously that their speeches have become similar. In other words, each person's speech converges towards the speech of the person they are talking to. This tends to happen when the speakers like one another, or where one speaker has a vested interest in pleasing the other or putting them at ease. So, converging towards the speech of another person according to Holmes (2008) is usually considered a polite speech strategy which implies that the addressee's speech is acceptable and worth imitating. In multilingual speech communities therefore, speakers may accommodate to others by selecting the code or variety that is most comfortable for their addresses.

On the other hand, deliberately choosing a language not used by one addressee is an example of speech divergence. For example, in multilingual setting, minority ethnic groups who want to maintain and display their cultural distinctiveness will often use their own linguistic variety, even and sometimes especially, in interaction with majority group members. However, divergence does not always indicate a speaker's negative attitudes towards the addressee because where the divergent form is admired, it can be used to benefit the diverger.

However, accommodation theory encounters a number of problems in relation to real speech situation. One of such problems is the tendency for speakers to overdo convergence and offend listeners. This is so because over-convergent behaviour may be perceived as patronizing and ingratiating, as sycophantic, or even as evidence that the speaker is making fun of others. In other words, if it is discovered that the reasons for convergence is manipulative, listeners are less likely to feel positive about convergence. In general, therefore, reactions to speech convergence and divergence depend on the reasons people attribute for the convergence or divergence. If divergence is perceived as unavoidable, then the reaction will be more tolerant that when it is considered deliberate. In the same vein, deliberate divergence will be heard as uncooperative and antagonistic, (Holmes, 2008:245).

d) **Social Network Theory**

This theory was developed by Bloom and Gumperz (1972) to account for language choice in multilingual setting. This theory has gained interest partly because it appeals to the notions of social identity and solidarity as well as the interactional aspects of individuals' language choice. The central thesis is the claim that speaker's identity and the identities of their regular interlocutors are measured to account for speaker's variation in language choice patterns (Gal, 1979; Li Wei, 1994; Roscana, 2002: Saravanan, 2002).

This theory focuses on the network of relationship that interlocutors enter into which is measured to account for variation in language choice. However, the theory fails to recognize that interlocutors may also refuse to use a particular language in a particular setting with a particular set of interlocutors in an attempt to disconnect them from his or her network.

e) **Ecology of Language Theory**

This framework was proposed by Mackey (1980) and expanded by Heugen (1972/2011). This theory seeks to examine the interaction between a language and its "environment", i.e. the social, cultural, political and economic as well as the larger linguistic contexts in which the community is positioned. It examines a language in relation to other languages in the following aspects: its internal varieties, linguistic demography, the state of multilingualism, institutional support for the language, domains of use, the nature of its written traditions and standardization, and language attitudes of the speakers. However, Mackey (1980) defines ecology of language shift as "inter-related sequences of causes and effects producing changes in the traditional language behaviour of one group under the influence of another, resulting in the switch in the language of one of the groups". So, speakers may share the same language repertoire but vary in patterns of language choice, depending on various speaker variables.

This theory is quite useful when considering ethno-linguistic vitality of a language. It can help us to understand the patterns of language choice and the reasons for such choices. However, when speakers deviate or deliberately refuse to interact in a particular language to evade a particular group, this theory has no explanation for this behaviour.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

A number of theories relevant to the explanation of language choice have been highlighted in this study. This includes domain theory, ethnography of speaking, communication accommodation, social network and ecology of language theories.

However, this research has adopted Giles' (1977) accommodation theory because it is socially diagnostic and lays emphasis on effective communication in complex multiethnic and multilingual communities. Furthermore, it is concerned with the way language users perceive and respond to language in such communities.

Accommodation theory is a powerful attempt to explain the courses of choice and it is paralleled by an approach within sociolinguistics. The theory is interested in the specific motivations that may encourage individual speakers to adopt certain language varieties. Accommodation is regarded as a general phenomenon, applying in both monolingual and multilingual communities.

The theory is a bundle of principles that are intended to characterize the strategies speakers use to establish, context or maintain relationships through talk. Regardless of its scope accommodation theory rests on one pivotal process: attunement. The idea is that we all tailor, or attune our behaviors according to the interaction and this process of attunement involves a range of communicative behaviours like language choice. Attunement renders the addressee(s) as equally important as the speaker and it also presents communicative behaviours as elements in a dynamic system. Speakers may consciously undertake convergence or divergence, but it is important to note that accommodation may occur well beyond the speaker's level of conscious awareness.

It tends to suggest that one's language behavior shows that one associates other social and interactional benefits with speaking more like the different groups of people one moves in and out of. The theory allows for the possibility of an interaction in which one person converges and the other person diverges, which shows how complicated and important people's attitudes towards others are and how these attitudes can be played out

in language choice. The theory may also reveal aspects of the structure of a speech community that a linguist may have taken for granted. The theory equally stresses the importance of speaker's attitudes to their addressee, and the resulting dynamism in interactions. The theory provides us with a context for comparing what speakers think they are doing with what they actually are doing.

2.6 Conclusion to the Chapter

In conclusion, this chapter has attempted to analyze the broad concept of multilingualism, its causes, effects and forms. Other concepts closely linked with multilingualism like diglossia and code-switching and mixing have also been given adequate space. Theories that are relevant to language choice in multilingual setting are discussed. In the end, it can be safely argued that language choice in multilingual setting, casual and common place as it appears, is not accidental neither can the speakers themselves control it but is constrained by factors beyond the speakers.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Preamble

This chapter discusses the methodology which is the instrument by which data is collected in any research. However, the method adopted by researcher is dependent on the nature of the research topic. Therefore, a sociolinguistic research of this nature which requires some form of interactions between the researcher and the subjects of the research will have to adopt a combination of methods.

Traditionally, the data of primary interest to sociolinguists is the one representing the spontaneous, everyday usage of the speakers. However, the status of the researcher as an outsider to the community challenges one's ability to gain access to such data. Therefore, one has to rely on the services of informants.

In this regard, attempt will be made in this chapter to explain the method used for this research, the study areas, the questionnaires and interview and the data processing and analysis procedure.

3.1 Sources of Data

The data for this research comes from the primary source obtained from the settings of this research; that is Billiri in Gombe State, Sabongida-Ora in Edo State and Zuru in Kebbi State. The people of these communities are predominantly farmers, although due to urbanization, a good number of them have acquired some skills which make them artisans, educational attainment has also enhanced the status of some members of these communities.

3.2 Methods of Data Collection

The study took the researcher to these towns i.e. Billiri, Sabongida-Ora and Zuru to physically observe the language situation and collect data. Collecting data through written questionnaires is an established method in other social scientific fields and has a long history in dialect geography (Milroy and Gordon, 2003). Interviews have also been regarded as one of the most common approach to data collection among sociolinguists.

The research methodology adopted for this study is the survey method. This sample survey method is adopted through the use of structural questionnaire. The questionnaire was directed at respondents who are literate while structured and unstructured interview were directed at the illiterate members of the population of the study. Each questionnaire solicits information on age, sex, level of education and occupation. Other questions include languages spoken apart from the mother tongue, how those languages are were acquired, where and when they are used and what factors influence the choice of any of the languages. Furthermore, conversations are recorded as samples of actual speech events in the three settings.

3.3 Sampling and Sampling Procedure

Sankoff, cited in Milroy (1987:2), notes that large samples tend not be to as necessary for linguistic surveys as for other surveys. This, according to him, is because linguistic behavior is apparently more homogenous than many other types of behaviour studied by surveys - such as for example dietary or television programme preferences. He further stresses that experiences suggest that even for quite complex communities samples of more than about 150 individuals tend to be redundant bringing increasing data-handling problems with diminishing analytical returns. To achieve the research objective without

getting entangled in the statistical quagmire emanating from random sampling, Milroy (1987) proposes what is referred to as judgment sampling. According to Milroy the principle underlying judgment sampling is that the researcher identifies in advance the types of speakers to be studied and then seeks out a quota of speakers who fit the specified categories. Although, he argues that a good judgement sample needs to be based on some kind of defensible theoretical framework; in other words, the researcher needs to be able to demonstrate that his or her judgment is rational and well-motivated. Milroy therefore concluded that in view of the problems associated with strict representative sampling it may be more realistic for researchers conducting linguistic survey to use judgment sample than to aim for true representativeness.

3.4 Population

Billiri is estimated to be about 202,144 by 2006 Nigerian population census, Sabongida-Ora about 65,000 and Zuru equally about 60,000. In view of the above population sizes, a sufficient sample size is necessary.

3.5 Sample Size

The survey is conducted in the three selected multilingual speech communities namely Billiri, Sabongida-Ora and Zuru. The choice of these communities is informed by their representative nature, that is: Billiri represents North-East; Sabongida-Ora, South-South; and Zuru, North-West. Therefore, using judgment sampling method, 200 respondents are selected from each of the communities. A total of 600 respondents formed the sample size of this study.

About 200 respondents are randomly selected across social strata like age, sex, occupation and educational level in each of the settings. The researcher has settled for 200 respondents in anticipation of those who might not cooperate. This sample size is arrived at in view of the fact that the respondents have similar environment, their characteristics are largely the same in each environment and their exposure are likely to be similar.

In each of these communities, the researcher is accompanied by informants who are indigenous to these communities to the field of interview. The interview is helpful in the sense that areas that cannot be adequately covered by questionnaire are complemented by the interview.

3.6 Analytical Procedure

Six hundred questionnaires are processed in three stages, namely coding, data presentation and data analysis. The coding is carried out by giving numerical value to respondents' answers. The analysis is based largely on frequency and percentage distribution.

Tables are used to elucidate the data. There are three columns in each table. The first column deals with the number of respondents. The second column deals with the frequency of occurrence while the third column is concerned with the value as expressed in percentage. For example, where the total number of respondents is 191 and 17 of the respondents agree that they can combine Yoruba and Bini, it is therefore calculated as follows:

$$\frac{17}{191} \times \frac{100}{1} = 8.9$$

This shows that the 17 respondents represent 8.9% of the population of the study that can combine Yoruba and Bini.

In essence, the analysis is both quantitative and qualitative as detailed explanation is required to illustrate the tables.

3.7 The Linguistic Survey of the Selected Communities

This sociolinguistically oriented language survey was conducted in stages. The first stage involves the preparation of the questionnaire, interview schedule and the training of research assistants. The second stage is a trial run. The survey itself went on for a period of four (4) weeks in each community. The purpose of the survey is to collect background information on language choice in the selected communities. In addition to the questions aimed at determining the number of languages spoken in these communities and the number each respondent can speak, questions are included concerning language choices, the functional distribution of the languages. In addition, recorded conversations of specific domains are obtained for qualitative analysis. For instance, in each of the three selected speech communities, conversations where observed and recorded in the markets at different times.

There were also questions asked about language use in specific situations and with which set of interlocutors. The structured interview schedule questions aimed at eliciting responses from respondents who are not literate.

The questions were asked in English language while in the case of interview, the Research Assistants were instructed to ask the illiterate respondents in the language they would normally speak but record the response in English language. In all, two research assistants are employed in each community. All the research assistants understand most of the languages spoken in these communities fairly well in addition to English language.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 Preamble

This chapter deals with the analysis of randomly collected data on the use of the various codes available to speakers in the selected multilingual speech communities. The attempt here is to apply the theoretical framework adopted for this study (Communication Accommodation Theory) in illustrating the data collected on language choice in the selected communities.

The main trends with which this analysis was undertaken were close attention to the functions of speech; specification of the non-linguistic variables which resulted in the choice of particular linguistic options on the part of the individual speakers; and the examination of the implications of such choices. The analysis however is in two parts; the qualitative data which deals with the actual or real speech events as they unfold in a specific domain. This is done by observation and recording of the conversations for analysis. The quantitative data on the other hand was obtained through structured questionnaire administered on the randomly selected speakers in the three communities regarding language choice and its implications.

4.1 Multilingualism in the Selected Speech Communities

To illustrate the analytical points being proposed in this chapter, a brief description of the language situation in the selected speech communities is necessary.

Billiri Town which is the headquarters of Billiri Local Government in Gombe State is inhabited by Tangale people. They also speak the language called Tangale. In addition to

this, a very significant proportion of the population of Billiri if not all speak Hausa. Other languages like Fulfulde, Tula, Lunguda and Waja are also spoken which makes the setting a multilingual one.

In Sabongida-Ora situated in Owan West Local Government of Edo State, the language situation is a little more complex. In this community, the inhabitants speak a language they now refer to as Ora, even though it was previously referred to as Owan or Luleha. In addition to this, Nigerian Pidgin English is generally spoken alongside Yoruba. However, a number of other languages like Bini, Etsako, Ebira, Igala and Urhobo are spoken by a certain percentage of the population.

Similarly, Zuru, the headquarters of Zuru Local Government of Kebbi State has a language situation that is not too different from Sabongida-Ora . In this setting, the inhabitants speak a language previously referred to as Dakarkari in many literatures but now called C'lela and the ethnic group is referred to as Lelna. In addition to this language, significant number of the inhabitants of this town speak Hausa language, in fact Hausa can easily be regarded as lingua franca here. Added to this are other languages like Dukanci, Fulfulde, Nupe and even Yoruba. In fact, some respondents lay claim to speaking French and Spanish. One plausible reason for this multiplicity of languages is that significant number of Zuru people are either serving or retired military personnel and many of them have travelled far and wide in the course of their military duties. So, children born outside home came back with different languages.

4.2 **Qualitative Data Analysis**

The data below were recorded conversations from the setting of this research between December, 2015 and June, 2016. It is meant to complement the quantitative data to

illustrate the theoretical framework adopted for this study. In each of the settings, two separate conversations were recorded; one from a village nearby and another from the metropolis. The aim is to ascertain whether language choice by the speakers in both rural and urban settings are similar on divergent.

4.3.1 **Billiri**

a) The following conversation took place at a market in a village called Kalmai about ten kilometers outside Billiri.

Buyer: Lele ka pissi

Seller: Lele. Shi lekong nan?

Buyer: Wonthon wobok *somthe* ma ki puwad.

Seller: *Somthe* ma di puwad wayim? Tam katiji kwing am ma won dok.

Buyer: Wonthon ma won dok an tam mo ya lori.

Translation

Buyer: Good afternoon

Seller: Afternoon. What do you want?

Buyer: Give me sorrel for fifty naira.

Seller: There is no sorrel for fifty naira. The least is for one hundred naira.

Buyer: Give me that of one hundred naira, it will be enough.

b) The following conversation took place at a market in Billiri town.

Buyer: *Mangoron* an titiga?

Seller: *Kashi* ko mala an won rab

Buyer: Padan *kowane kashi* won dok ka ki puwad.

Seller: Ku lekong *kashi* tiga?

Translation:

Buyer: How much is a share of mango?

Seller: Each share is two hundred naira.

Buyer: Sell each share for me at one hundred and fifty naira

Seller: How many share do you want?

The above conversations that took place in markets at Kalmai, a Tangale speaking settlement outside Billiri and at Billiri town reveal a number of implications. In the first place, while speakers in rural areas like Kalmai are still largely unaffected by other languages like Hausa in their choice, the Billiri situation is quite different. A comparison shows that speakers in Billiri are greatly influenced by other languages especially Hausa in their choice of words during conversation. For instance, while Kalmai speakers have indigenous name for *Sorrel* which is *Somethe*, Billiri speakers have no indigenous name for mango rather they use the corrupted Hausa version *mangoro*. In the same vein, the Billiri speakers reveal a great deal of Hausa expressions in their conversations like *Kashi* which means share, *kowane* which means each. In essence, code-mixing and switching are prevalent in Billiri as that is the only way speakers can accommodate one another, hence a convergence.

4.2.2 **Sabongida-Ora**

a) The following conversations occurred at a market in Umhomora, an Ora speaking settlement about eight km outside Sabongida-Ora between a young man and an elderly market woman in Ora language.

Buyer: Mama Edio Ma

Seller: Laoba Ovbi me

Buyer: Ekai khi Ema?

Seller: Ekpa Eva

Buyer: Mama Uyawa i Ekpa okpa?

Seller: Eye Ovbime

Buyer: Mama Khakon Sken I Me

Seller: Mui Ekpa Okpa Bi Ushomo Re

Buyer: Ohomon Iyon Ma I Muy Ode Vbai Me

Translation

Buyer: Good morning Ma.

Seller: Good morning my child.

Buyer: How much is yam?

Seller: Four hundred naira

Buyer: Mama will you agree to sell for two hundred naira?

Seller: No my child.

Buyer: Please sell for me.

Seller: Bring three hundred naira.

Buyer: Ok give me two parts.

The above conversation reveals that speakers around Sabongida-Ora are less susceptible to influence of other languages, so there is very little or no code-switching in the conversation.

b) The following conversation took place at a market in Sabongida-Ora between a young buyer and an elderly seller.

Buyer: Who dey sell for here?

Seller: me me o obvime.

Buyer: How much for basin of garri?

Seller: Ekpa Ogban bi Ihen Ushomo.

Buyer: Mama how much you go sell am last?

Seller: Ovbime Ubo we.

Buyer: You no sell for five thousand naira?

Seller: Eye Ekpa Ogban.

Translation

Buyer: Who is selling here?

Seller: It is me my child.

Buyer: How much is a basin of Garri?

Seller: It is seven thousand naira.

Buyer: Mama how much will you sell it last?

Seller: My child that is the last price.

Buyer: Won't you sell for five thousand naira?

This exchange is Sabongida-Ora revealed a number of implications on the importance of greeting in an African setting. For instance, unlike the earlier conversation in Umhom-Ora village where the buyer opened the conversation with greetings in Ora language, the Sabongida-Ora case is quite different. The buyer a younger person, failed to greet the seller as an elderly person. More so, rather than open the conversation in Ora language,

he chose to speak Nigerian Pidgin English, which is a lingua franca among the people of this area. The elderly woman who understood Pidgin English as well, chose to reply in Ora language. Even when the buyer later realized his mistake and decided to be courteous by addressing the woman as mama in the middle of the conversation, the elderly woman continued to respond in Ora language. As far as she was concerned the damage had already been done. In fact, the conversation ended abruptly without any agreement between the buyer and the seller and any form of courtesy from either side. This in accommodation theory is a clear case of divergence. The elderly woman decided not to speak pidgin in response to the young man to show her resentment and anger. It shows therefore that in multilingual setting speakers can chose to converge or diverge in their choice of language depending on the circumstance and the domain of interaction.

4.3.4 **Zuru**

a) The following conversations took place at a market in Bedi village about 5 kilometers outside Zuru town, in C'lela language.

Buyer: M'zana.

Seller: M'zan bade.

Buyer: Iyne Yala?

Seller: Ihonidn s'bais iloh

Buyer: Hebeme.

Seller: M'honomnai v'toni ne?

Buyer: M'tonk m'hon'n nase

Seller: T'mhab kwech'ilon opa

Buyer: To, mbonk whedi

Translation

Buyer: Good morning.

Seller: Good morning you too.

Buyer: How much is beans?

Seller: A measure is four hundred naira.

Buyer: Reduce for me.

Seller: How many measures do you want?

Buyer: I want four measures.

Seller: I will reduce (N50) fifty naira.

Buyer: Ok, thank you very much.

b) The following conversations took place at a march in Zuru town, in C'lela language.

Buyer: Iyne ch'*Lemu*?

Seller: *Kashi* didn kwech tan.

Buyer: Legsem kwech nase *mana*?

Seller: *Kashis* ney' vtoni ne?

Buyer: *Kashis* Tochu.

Seller: *To* nocta kindi.

Translation

Buyer: How much is orange?

Seller: One portion is a hundred naira.

Buyer: Leave it for me at eighty naira now?

Seller: How many portions do you want?

Buyer: Three portions.

Seller: Ok bring money.

In this setting, there is also a marked difference between conversations in Bedivillage and Zuru town. Speakers in Bedi have very little or no influence of any other language intheir choice of words during conversation whereas in Zuru the conversation is characterized by code-mixing. A number of words in the conversation in Zuru are typically Hausa which have been fused into C'lela conversation. For instance, *Lemu* is Hausa word for orange, also *kashi* is Hausa word for portion just like *mana*? Which is Hausa expression that means now? In essence, therefore, language choice in Zuru is heavily influenced by Hausa which is widely spoken in the area. Therefore, where the conversation is done in C'lela, a number of words and expressions are traced to Hausa language. In accommodation theory therefore, code-switching and mixing are devices by which speakers accommodate one another in multilingual setting which is an indication of convergence.

4.3 **Quantitative Data Analysis**

The analysis presented here was done using the frequency and percentage analysis method which is prevalent with researches in social sciences. This was adopted to get the necessary information that would lead to a meaningful conclusion. Although, 200 copies of the questionnaire were administered in each of the settings, 167 copies were successfully completed and returned in Billiri, 191 in Sabongida-Ora and 190 in Zuru respectively.

4.3.1 **Multilingualism and Age**

There appears to be a high degree of correlation between age and multilingualism as the data below revealed. The older the speakers get the higher the incidences of multilingualism.

Table 4.3.1a: Distribution of Respondents by Age in Billiri

Response (Age)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
5 – 10	0	0
11 – 15	12	7.2
16 – 20	16	9.6
21 – 25	23	13.7
26 and above	116	69.5
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

The table shows the age distribution in respect of multilingual speakers in Billiri. For instance, no respondent between age of 5 – 10 agreed they could speak multiple languages, in fact many of them are monolingual at this age. The acquisition of additional language begins to evolve from age 11 and above where 12 respondents representing 7.2% of the respondents were multilingualism. This continued progressively where the majority of the respondents, 116 of them representing 69.5% claimed to be multilingual.

Table 4.3.1b: Distribution of Respondents by Age in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Age)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
5 – 10	4	2.1
11 – 15	9	4.7
16 – 20	45	23.6
21 – 25	69	36.1
26 and above	64	33.5
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

This table gives a picture of the multilingual situation in Sabongida Ora where 4 respondents representing 2.1% of population of study agreed they speak more than one language. Again, a great number of people in this setting begin to acquire additional language(s) from the age of 16. For instance, 45 of the respondents representing 23.6% in the age group of 16 – 20 claimed to speak more than one language, 69 of the respondents representing 36.1% which fall between the ages of 21 – 25 agreed they could speak more than one language. The respondents in the age group of 26 and above who claimed to speak more than one language constituted 33.5% of the respondents.

Table 4.3.1c: Distribution of Respondents by Age in Zuru

Response (Age)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
5 – 10	15	7.9
11 – 15	15	7.9
16 – 20	39	20.5
21 – 25	67	35.3
26 and above	54	28.4
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015.

This table shows the multilingual situation in Zuru. The picture was a bit brighter in this setting in the sense that contrary to the other three settings, the number of respondents between the age bracket of 5 – 10 who claimed to speak more than one language rose to 15 out of 190 of total respondents, this represents 7.9%. The greater number of correspondents who could speak multiple languages fell between age 16 and above. 16 – 20 represent 20.5%, 21 – 25 represent 35.3% while 26 and above represent 28.4%.

The above tables revealed that multilingualism develops slowly as very few children between the ages of 5 – 15 were susceptible to multiple languages. In Billiri, no child in

the age bracket of 5 – 10 among the respondents could speak more than one language, which surprisingly is Hausa, they only begin to understand Tangale at a later age, mainly because their parents either consciously or unconsciously spoke Hausa to them even at home. The same scenario is prevalent is Sabongida Ora where only 4 out of 191 respondents in the age bracket of 5-10 could speak more than one language which is just 2.1% of the sample size. In Zuru, the number of children in the age bracket of 5-10 that possess more than one language appreciates a little as 15 out of 190 respondents representing 7.9% admitted they could speak more than one language. Therefore, in the three settings, the data showed that multilingualism begins to take root from the age of 16 and develop progressively up to adulthood. This is evident as over 80% of respondents in the three settings in the age bracket of 16 and above were multilingual. However, a careful study showed that multilingualism takes root earlier in Zuru than in the other three setting as it recorded higher percentage of response from the children of this age bracket than in the other three settings.

Question 2: How many languages do you speak apart from your mother tongue?

The responses to the above question revealed that many respondents of the three communities had at least a working knowledge of one language in addition to their mother tongues as shown in Tables 4.3.2 a, b and c.

Table 4.3.2a: Distribution of Respondents According to Number of Languages Spoken in Billiri

Response (No. of Languages Spoken)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	4	2.4
2	133	79.6
3	26	15.6
4 and above	4	2.4
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

The above table is meant to show the number of languages the respondents could speak in addition to their mother tongue in Billiri. The survey reveals that out of 167 respondents 4 representing 2.4% of the total number of respondents claimed they could speak one other language in addition to their mother tongue. Another 133 of the respondents representing 79.6% claimed to speak two other, languages in addition to their mother tongue while 26 and 4 respondents representing 15.6% and 2.4% respectively could speak between 3 and 4 languages in Billiri. This shows clear evidence of multilingualism in this setting.

Table 4.3.2b: Distribution of Respondents According to Number of Languages Spoken in Sabongida-Ora

Response (No. of Languages Spoken)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	78	40.8
2	85	44.5
3	25	13.1
4 and above	3	1.6
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

In Sabongida Ora, 78 respondents out of 191 admitted being able to speak one other language in addition to Ora; this represents 40.8% while 85 of the respondents representing 44.5% of the total number of respondents claimed to speak two other languages. In addition, 25 and 3 respondents representing 13.1% and 1.6% respectively claimed to speak between 3 and 4 languages in addition to their mother tongue.

Table 4.3.2c: Distribution of Respondents According to Number of Languages Spoken in Zuru

Response (No. of Languages Spoken)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
1	17	8.9
2	117	61.6
3	47	24.7
4 and above	9	4.7
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Zuru exhibited similar features with the other three settings in the sense that 17 out of 190 respondents representing 8.9% claimed to speak only one language in addition to C'lela. A great number of the respondents in Zuru to be precise 117 representing 61.6% of the total number of respondents agreed they could speak 2 other languages in addition to their mother tongue. On the other hand, 47 and 9 respondents which represent 24.7% and 4.7% respectively laid claim to being able to speak between 3 and 4 languages.

Tables 4.3.2 a, b and c indicated that over 70% of the respondents in the three communities could speak more than one language. However, the number of respondents who speak two languages in addition to their mother tongues appeared higher in Billiri and Zuru respectively with 133 respondents representing 79.6% and 117 respondents

representing 61.6% and Sabongida-Ora with 86 and 85 respondents, representing 48.6% and 44.5% respectively. This seemed to suggest that multilingualism is more widespread and stable in Billiri and Zuru and Sabongida-Ora.

Question 3: What is the Language Combination?

Table 4.3.3a: Distribution of Respondents According to Language Combination in Billiri

Response (Language Combination)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Hausa/English	133	79.6
Hausa/Fulfulde	22	13.2
Hausa/Others	12	7.2
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

Having established that majority of the respondents if not all in the three communities are multilingual, the next issue to determine is the languages they combine among the available ones. In Billiri, 133 respondents representing 79.6% of the population of study claimed to effectively combine Hausa and English in addition to Tangale. Another 22 which represents 13.2% could combine Hausa and Fulfulde while 12 of the respondents agreed that they could combine Hausa with other minority languages like Lunguda, Waja and Tula. Theoretically, therefore, the respondents in Billiri could choose from among the languages they combine to accommodate co-interlocutors depending on context, topic hence an evidence of convergence.

Table 4.3.3b: Distribution of Respondents According to Language Combination in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Language Combination)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yoruba/Bini	17	8.9
Yoruba/Etsako	11	5.8
Yoruba/English	58	30.3
English/others	105	55.0
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The table reveals that out of 191 respondents in Sabongida Ora, 17 respondents representing 8.9% claimed to combine Yoruba and Bini languages in addition to Ora, 11 of the respondents representing 5.8% responded in favour of Yoruba and Etsako, 58 respondents claimed to combine Yoruba and English which is 30.3% of the respondents, while 105 respondents agreed they combined English Language and other languages like Ebira, Nupe, Igala and even Igbo in addition to their mother tongue, Ora.

Table 4.3.3c: Distribution of Respondents According to Language Combination in Zuru

Response (Language Combination)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Hausa/English	133	70.0
Hausa/Dukanci	14	7.4
Hausa/Others	19	10.0
English/Others	24	12.6
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The above table indicates that in Zuru 133 out of 190 respondents which represents 70% of the population of study claimed to combine Hausa and English in addition to C'lela the

mother tongue, 14 respondents agreed that they combined Hausa and Dukanci, 19 of the respondents claimed they combined Hausa and other languages like Fulfulde, Nupe, Yoruba this represents 10%, while 24 respondents which account for 12.6% of the study population claimed to combine English and other Nigerian languages mentioned earlier.

The tables above show that in Billiri a very significant proportion of the population as reflected by the respondents could in addition to Tangale speak Hausa and English i.e. 87 out of 167 representing 79.6% whereas the combination of Hausa and other languages like Fulfulde, Waja, Tula, etc. was about 20% which shows great influence of Hausa and English in the language choice of Billiri people above the other languages of the neighbouring communities. In Sabongida-Ora, the respondents that can speak English and one other Nigerian language constitute the majority with 54% while those who speak Yoruba and English in addition to Ora language ranked next with 30%. This revealed that Yoruba influence is less in Sabongida-Ora. However, surprisingly, respondents who combine Yoruba/Bini and Yoruba/Etsako the languages of their immediate neighbours are fewer, 8.9% and 5.7% respectively. This suggests that though Yoruba influence may not be as strong in Sabongida-Ora, but it is stronger than Bini and Etsako at least. In the case of Zuru, Hausa/English combination ranked highest with 70% while English and other Nigerian languages came next with 12.6%. The situation here is similar to Sabongida-Ora where the language of their immediate neighbours Dukanci had little influence in Zuru as only 7.4% of the respondents could combine Dukanci and Hausa.

Question 4: Did you acquire these languages in one place?

This question is meant to determine the nature and types of multilingualism prevalent in the three settings. The response shows that both compound and coordinate multilingualism were present in the communities as demonstrated in the tables 4.3.4 a, b and c.

Table 4.3.4a: Distribution of Respondents According to Place of Acquisition of Languages in Billiri

Response (Place of Acquisition)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Yes	70	41.9
No	79	58.1
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

This question confirms the claim in section 2.2.4 of this study on types of societal multilingualism, which is either compound or coordinate. In Billiri 70 out of 167 respondents claimed they acquired all the languages in one setting, that is Billiri, this group represents 41.9% of the study population. On the other hand, 79 respondents representing 58.1% agreed they acquired their multiple languages in separate settings.

Table 4.3.4b: Distribution of Respondents According to Place of Acquisition of Languages in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Place of Acquisition)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Yes	80	41.9
No	111	58.1
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The table shows that in Sabongida Ora, 80 out of 191 respondents representing 41.9% agreed that they acquired all the languages they speak in one setting while 111 of the respondents which represents 58.1% claimed they acquired all the languages they speak in separate settings.

Table 4.3.4c: Distribution of Respondents According to Place of Acquisition of Languages in Zuru

Response (Place of Acquisition)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Yes	84	44.2
No	106	55.8
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The above table revealed that Zuru exhibits similar characteristics like the other three settings where 84 of the respondents of 190 representing 44.2% agreed they acquired all the languages they speak in one setting; and 106 of the respondents representing 55.8% claimed that they acquired their multiple languages in separate settings.

The tables above indicated that coordinate multilinguals are slightly more in the three communities as the gap between the kinds of multilingualism is not very wide in all the settings. The implication of this is that reasonable number of inhabitants of these communities appeared to have acquired their second languages outside their respective communities.

Question 5: What motivated you to acquire these languages?

This question takes us closer to the core issue in this research as it is socio-linguistically established that second languages are acquired or learned for many reasons ranging from

social to economic. The responses from the settings revealed that wide range of factors were responsible for their multilingualism as indicated in tables 4.3.5 a, b and c below.

Table 4.3.5a: Distribution of Respondents According to Motivating Factors for Acquisition of Second Languages in Billiri

Response (Motivating Factors)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Desire	22	13.2
Need	67	40.1
Necessity	74	44.3
Norm	0	0.0
Fashion	4	2.4
Others	0	0.0
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

This table reveals that the motivating factors for acquisition of second languages in Billiri. 22 out of 167 respondents representing 13.2% agreed they acquired second languages out of desire, 67 respondents which represents 40.1% claimed that need was their motivating factor, 74 respondents representing 44.3% agreed that they were motivated by necessity, no respondent agreed that norm was a motivating factor while 4 respondents which constituted 2.4% believed they were motivated by fashion.

Table 4.3.5b: Distribution of Respondents According to Motivating Factors for Acquisition of Second Languages in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Motivating Factors)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Desire	83	43.5
Need	31	16.2
Necessity	65	34.0
Norm	8	4.2
Fashion	4	2.1
Others	0	0.0
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The table above describes the distribution of motivating factors in Sabongida Ora. The respondents who agreed that they were motivated by desire were 83 representing 43.5%, those motivated by needs were 31 constituting 16.2%, necessity had the second highest occurrence with 65 respondents agreeing they were motivated by it, this constituted 34.0%, norm and fashion recorded 8 and 4 respondents which accounted for 4.2% and 3.1% respectively.

Table 4.3.5c: Distribution of Respondents According to Motivating Factors for Acquisition of Second Languages in Zuru

Response (Motivating Factors)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Desire	52	27.4
Need	73	38.4
Necessity	45	23.6
Norm	10	5.3
Fashion	10	5.3
Others	0	0.0
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

This table explains the situation in Zuru in terms of motivating factor for acquisition of second languages. The respondents who believed that they were motivated by desire were 52 out of 190 representing 27.4%, those motivated by need were 73 which constituted the highest with 38.4%. Necessity come next with 45 respondents accounting for 23.6% while norm and fashion recorded 10 respondents each representing 5.3% in both cases.

It is necessary to throw some lights on these factors before proceeding in their interpretations. By *desire* we mean the inner drive and interest that motivate speakers to acquire or learn a second language. *Need* is external and informed by either social or economic interest. *Necessity* on the other is equally external but occasioned by ugly or pleasant experience which may compel a speaker to acquire or learn a second language. *Norm* is closely related to cultural behavior expected of every member of a society while *fashion* is informed by the need to be in tune with other members of the society without any compelling reason.

In view of the above explanation, the data in tables 4.3.5 a, b and c shows some level of differences in the factors that motivated speakers in the three settings under study to acquire second language. In Billiri for instance, necessity is the strongest factor with occurrence of 44% followed closely by need with 40% and desire came a distant third with only 13%. In Sabongida-Ora, desire came first as the strongest factor with 43% but closely followed by necessity as second significant factor with 34% occurrence and need came third with 16%. However, in Zuru contrary to the other settings, need came top as the strongest factor with 38% occurrence while desire and necessity ranked as the next significant factors with 27% and 23% respectively. The implication here is that

Sabongida-Ora shared different factors that motivated acquisition of second languages from Billiri and Zuru demonstrated different characteristics as revealed by the above data.

Question 6: When and how do you speak any of these languages you have acquired?

The analysis of the motivation for the acquisition of second languages above leads us to the next crucial question of how these languages are used in the three communities. In other words, what factor(s) constrain the choice of any of the languages in interaction at a given moment? This is where the theoretical framework adopted for this study comes to play. How speakers attune their speech to accommodate other interlocutors in order to achieve desired communicative objective. The data in tables 4.3.6 a, b and c gave us an insight.

Table 4.3.6a: Distribution of Respondents According to Factors Constraining Choice of Languages in Billiri

Response (Constraining Factors)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Topic	33	19.8
Domain	71	42.5
Role-Relations	60	35.9
Others	3	1.8
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

The above table depicts the factors that constrain choice of language in Billiri. Out of the factors listed for determination, 33 respondents out of 167 agreed that topic of discussion is the determining factor in their choice of language and this group represents 19.8%, in theory therefore, they attune their speech and select the language they deem appropriate

in discussing certain topics while engaging other interlocutors in this setting on the other hand, the respondents who claimed that they were constrained by domain of interaction in their choice of language ranked highest with 71 representing 42.5%. In this case, the context or environment where interaction takes place is paramount. Therefore, interlocutors are likely to shift to the codes they consider appropriate in certain domains whether it is home, school, workplace, market, church or playground. The language chosen is meant to accommodate other interlocutors hence a convergence.

Lastly, 60 respondents representing 35.9% agreed that they were constrained by role-relations. In this case the relationship between interlocutors. This group of respondents attune their choice to accommodate other interlocutors depending on the social gap between them. For example, father-son, son-father, teacher-pupil, friend-friend and so on. In accommodation theory, where the social gap is wide like in teacher-pupil a more formal language would be chosen and this also depends on the domain of interaction i.e. whether it is at school or at home, the ultimate goal in accommodation theory is for the interlocutors to choose a language that will enhance interaction and allow the communicative objective to be achieved, hence a convergence. Other factors that are not listed accounted for 1.8%.

Table 4.3.6b: Distribution of Respondents According to Factors Constraining Choice of Languages in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Constraining Factors)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Topic	68	35.6
Domain	79	41.4
Role-Relations	43	22.5
Others	1	0.5
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Sabongida-Ora had a similar picture with Billiri with slight modification. Here, the respondents who claimed to be influenced by topic were 68 amounting to 35.6%, domain had 79 respondents with 41.4% and role-relations 43 representing 22.5%. Domain is the dominant factor in language choice in this setting; however topic had equally strong influence on language choice as shown above. Therefore, the range between the interlocutors who accommodate others by domain and those who do so by topic was close. Therefore, these two factors are critical in language choice in Sabongida-Ora.

Table 4.3.6c: Distribution of Respondents According to Factors Constraining Choice of Languages in Zuru

Response (Constraining Factors)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Topic	81	42.6
Domain	55	28.9
Role-Relations	52	27.4
Others	2	1.1
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The above table depicts the scenario in Zuru where 81 respondents accounting for 42.6% agreed that they were constrained by topic in their choice of language, this group had the highest distribution, followed by domain with 55 respondents representing 28.9% while role-relations had 52 respondents representing 27.4%. In theory therefore, more speakers in Zuru are likely to accommodate co-interlocutors in their choice of language by virtue of topic of discussion.

The data in the above tables revealed significant differences among the three communities regarding the factors that constrain choice of language. In Billiri, the dominant factor was domain, that is context of situation or the very institutional environment where interaction takes place like home, school, market, the church or mosque, playground etc. with 42% while role-relations ranked next with 35% occurrence; this means the relationship between the interlocutors. It means that speakers were willing to attune their speeches to that of their co-interlocutors in order to accommodate which is a case of convergence. In Sabongida-Ora, domain is also the major factor with 41% occurrence followed closely by topic with 35% and role-relations came third with 22% as against Billiri where it came next to domain. Zuru exhibited a completely different characteristics from the other settings as most of the respondents submitted that the most compelling factor that constrain language choice in their setting is topic with occurrence of 42% thereby relegating other factors like domain and role-relations to second and third positions respectively, meaning therefore that the topic of discussion more than any other factor determines language choice among interlocutors. In essence speakers are likely to choose language they consider appropriate in handling certain topics during interaction. Accommodation theory can be used to explain language behavior too as refusal to speak

the language considered appropriate for the discussion of certain topic may be viewed as divergence. Details will feature in the discussion segment of this chapter.

Question 7: What language would you prefer to use for cultural discussion?

This question is intended to elicit responses that will elucidate the preceding discussion. It is assumed that speakers are likely to prefer the choice of their indigenous languages for cultural issues because certain cultural terms or beliefs are better expressed in the indigenous languages.

Table 4.3.7a: Distribution of Respondents According to Preferred Language for Cultural Discussion in Billiri

Response (Preferred Language)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Tangale	100	59.9
Hausa	45	26.9
English	12	7.2
Others	10	6.0
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

In Billiri, 100 out of 167 respondents believed that they could handle cultural issues better in their mother tongue hence the preference for Tangale; this group constituted 59.9% of the population of study. However, significant number i.e. 45 respondents representing 26.9% equally agreed that they could handle cultural discourse in Hausa, English Language came distant third with 12 respondents representing 7.2% and the respondents who agreed that they could handle cultural discussion in other languages like Fulfulde, Lunguda and Tula were 10 accounting for 6.0%. In accommodation theory therefore, convergence rate is higher with Tangale when cultural issues are discussed in Billiri.

Table 4.3.7b: Distribution of Respondents According to Preferred Language for Cultural Discussion in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Preferred Language)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Ora	95	49.7
Bini	12	6.3
Yoruba	15	7.9
Etsako	7	3.6
English	42	22.0
Others	20	10.5
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

In this setting Ora, the mother tongue of Sabongida-Ora people recorded the highest responses of 95 out of 191 representing 49.7% as the preferred language for cultural discussion. Surprisingly here again, English recorded the second highest responses of 42 constituting 22.0% over and above indigenous languages like Bini with 12 respondents which was 6.3%, Yoruba 15 which was 7.9% and Esako 7 which was 3.6%. Other speakers believed that they could handle cultural discussions in other languages like Ebira, Nupe, Igala, etc. This group constituted 10.5%.

Table 4.3.7c: Distribution of Respondents According to Preferred Language for Cultural Discussion in Zuru

Response (Preferred Language)	`	Percentage (%)
C'lela	86	45.3
Hausa	56	29.5
Dukanci	4	2.1
English	21	11.0
Others	23	12.1
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

This table shows that higher number of speakers in Zuru also believed that they handled cultural discussion better in C'lela than other languages, thus 86 respondents representing 45.3% fell within this category. Hausa followed closely with 56 respondents which constituted 29.5%, English recorded 21 responses which was 11.0%, Dukanci 4 which was 2.1%. Other speakers also agreed that they could discuss cultural issues in other languages like Fulfulde, Nupe, etc.

It can be inferred from the tables above that sociolinguistic rules can constrain speakers to choose appropriate codes whether the domain of choice is relatively broad or restricted. For instance, in the above data it is revealed that greater percentage of respondents in all the settings believed that the appropriate language to discuss their cultural affairs was their mother-tongues i.e. Tangale for Billiri, Ora for Sabongida-Ora and C'lela for Zuru.

However, a closer examination showed that this choice is not absolute in all the settings. In Billiri for instance 26% of respondents claimed they can equally handle cultural discussion in Hausa. In Sabongida-Ora, Ora ranked highest with 49% and followed by English with 22% as the preferred language for cultural discussion. In Zuru, Hausa competed favourably with C'lela as the preferred choice of language for cultural discussion as it recorded 29% responses against C'lela's 45%. This points to the fact that while Hausa has made significant in-road in the language and culture of the people of Billiri and Zuru in the Northeast and Northwest respectively, Yoruba has not done the same in Sabongida-Ora in South-South.

Furthermore, the fact that no one language is absolutely sufficient or exclusively used to discuss cultural matters in all the settings revealed the stability of multilingualism in all the settings. This also brings into focus the accommodation theory in which speakers were willing to converse with others who may not be sufficiently proficient in their mother-tongues to handle a particular topic by switching to a language all of the interlocutors can handle.

Question 8: In what language would you prefer to discuss matters like politics, economy and religion?

This question is meant to determine whether the sociolinguistic claim earlier stated is justifiable i.e. that the more complex the topic is the greater the frequency of code-shifting.

Table 4.3.8a: Distribution of Respondents According to Preferred Language for Political, Economic and Religious Discussion in Billiri

Response (Preferred Language)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Tangale	20	12.0
Hausa	89	53.3
English	58	34.7
Others	0	0.0
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

The table reveals that in Billiri Hausa is the most preferred language for political, economic and religious discussion as 89 out of 167 respondents representing 53.3% responded in favour of Hausa. English came next with 58 respondents agreeing that they handled political, economic and religious issues better in the language; this group

constituted 34.7%. contrary to the position of Tangale when it comes to cultural affairs, it recorded the least occurrence in political, economic and religious matters as only 20 respondents agreed they could handle those issues in Tangale which is just 12.0% of the respondents. Therefore, more speakers agreed that Hausa had the higher propensity to accommodate more people when the issues were those of politics, economy or religion.

Table 4.3.8b: Distribution of Respondents According to Preferred Language for Political, Economic and Religious Discussion in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Preferred Language)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Ora	12	6.3
Bini	3	1.6
Yoruba	4	2.1
Etsako	1	0.5
English	165	86.4
Others	6	3.1
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Sabongida-Ora revealed similar scenario in this regard. In this setting as high as 165 respondents out of 191 agreed that they handled political, economic and religious issues better in English than other languages. The mother tongue of the people, Ora, came distant second with only 12 respondents representing 6.3%, Yoruba 4 respondents which was 2.1% and Etsako 1 respondent which was 0.5%. So, English language equally had the highest convergence rate when the issues were political, economic or religious.

Table 4.3.8c: Distribution of Respondents According to Preferred Language for Political, Economic and Religious Discussion in Zuru

Response (Preferred Language)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
C'lela	32	16.8
Hausa	58	39.5
Dukanci	0	0.0
English	96	50.5
Others	4	2.2
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The picture in Zuru revealed that the other languages apart from Dukanci were highly competitive when it comes to political, economic and religious discourses. In this regard, English recorded 96 out of 190 respondents representing 50.5%, Hausa ranked next with 58 respondents agreeing they could handle political, economic and religious discussions in the language. C'lela the mother tongue of the people came third with 32 respondents representing 16.8%. The table shows that the distribution is more even in Zuru than in the other three settings.

The data in the preceding tables revealed some interesting scenario particularly in Billiri where 53% of the respondents agreed that they handled political issues better in Hausa than in any other language especially against English with 34% respondents. It means therefore that Hausa possesses enough terminologies to express political issues among residents of Billiri. In Sabongida-Ora and Zuru English seemed to be the preferred language for political and economic discussion, however, like in Billiri Hausa proved very vital in this area as it came a close second with 30% responses to English that recorded 50%. Therefore, Hausa again has proved very strong in Zuru and Billiri as a

veritable tool for political activities. This may not be too surprising as the communities are heavily infiltrated by Hausa speakers.

Question 9: Is your attitude towards the speakers of these other languages positive or negative?

Table 4.3.9a: Distribution of Respondents According to Attitudes to Speakers of the Other Languages they speak in Billiri

Response (Attitude of Speakers)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Positive	148	88.6
Negative	10	6.0
Undecided	9	5.4
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

The above table is meant to measure the attitude of Billiri people to speakers of the other languages they speak; for instance Hausa, Fulfulde, Lunguda, Tula or English. In the survey carried out, 148 respondents representing 86.6% agreed that they were positively disposed to speakers of other languages apart from Tangale. Only 10 respondents representing 6.0% agreed that they were negatively disposed to speakers of other languages in this setting and 9 respondents representing 5.4% were undecided.

Table 4.3.9b: Distribution of Respondents According to Attitudes to Speakers of the Other Languages they speak in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Attitude of Speakers)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Positive	148	77.5
Negative	18	9.4
Undecided	25	13.1
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

In Sabongida-Ora the situation was the same as 148 respondents out of 191 agreed that they were positively disposed to speakers of other languages, this constituted 77.5%. Only 18 respondents believed they were negatively disposed representing 9.4% while 25 respondents representing 13.1% were undecided.

Table 4.3.9c: Distribution of Respondents According to Attitudes to Speakers of the Other Languages they speak in Zuru

Response (Attitude of Speakers)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Positive	167	87.9
Negative	15	7.9
Undecided	8	4.2
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

In Zuru, 167 out of 190 respondents constituting 87.9% agreed that their attitudes towards speakers of other languages in their community was positive. Only 15 respondents representing 7.9% agreed that they had negative attitude while 8 respondents which was 4.2% were undecided.

The data above revealed that the three communities were favourably disposed to the groups whose languages they speak as all of them recorded high positive responses 88% in Billiri, 77% in Sabongida-Ora and 87% in Zuru respectively.

Question 10: Are the attitudes of the speakers of these other languages towards you positive or negative?

Table 4.3.10a: Distribution of Respondents According to Attitudes of the Speakers of these Other Languages towards them in Billiri

Response (Attitude of Speakers)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Positive	144	86.2
Negative	13	7.9
Undecided	10	5.9
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

On the contrary when the question was asked about the attitudes of the speakers of these other languages which they have acquired, the response revealed a slight increase on the negative. For instance, in Billiri 144 respondents representing 86.2% agreed that the attitudes of the speakers of these other languages towards them is positive which was 2.4% less than the positive response recorded in their attitudes towards them. Likewise, 13 respondents constituting 7.9% claimed that the attitude of the speakers of the other languages towards them was negative, and 10 respondents representing 5.9% were undecided.

Table 4.3.10b: Distribution of Respondents According to Attitudes of the Speakers of these Other Languages towards them in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Attitude of Speakers)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Positive	135	70.7
Negative	21	11.0
Undecided	35	18.3
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

In Sabongida-Ora the picture was virtually the same as 135 respondents constituting 70.7% agreed that the attitudes of the speakers of the other languages towards them was positive, 21 respondents representing 11% claimed it was negative while 35 respondents representing 18.3% were undecided.

Table 4.3.10c: Distribution of Respondents According to Attitudes of the Speakers of these Other Languages towards them in Zuru

Response (Attitude of Speakers)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Positive	158	83.0
Negative	21	11.1
Undecided	11	5.9
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Zuru equally recorded similar responses as 158 respondents representing 83% agreed that the attitude of the speakers of the other languages towards them was positive, 21 respondents constituting 11.1% claimed it was negative and 11 respondents representing 5.9% were undecided.

The data above showed that in spite of the fact that there was general belief among the residents of the three communities that the speakers of the other languages they speak particularly the majority languages, have positive attitude towards them with over 70% of the respondents attesting to this in all the settings, the reaction is not entirely favourable as there were pockets of apprehension among the residents of the three communities about the attitude of the majority language speakers towards them, in Billiri it is 7.9% Sabongida-Ora 11% and 11% also in Zuru.

Question 11: How often do you speak these other languages?

The rate and frequency of use of other languages apart from the mother-tongue in the three communities is quite high which signified that multilingualism is stable and widespread in the areas under study.

Table 4.3.11a: Distribution of Respondents According to Frequency of Use of Other Languages apart from the Mother Tongue in Billiri

Response (Frequency of Use of Other Languages)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very often	56	33.5
Often	94	56.3
Not very often	17	10.2
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

This question is meant to elicit response regarding the frequency of use of other languages by the respondents. The respondents who agreed that they use other languages very often in Billiri were 56 representing 33.5%, another 94 respondents agreed they used the other languages just often this group constituted 56.3%, while 17 respondents representing 10.2% agreed they don't use the other languages very often.

Table 4.3.11b: Distribution of Respondents According to Frequency of Use of Other Languages apart from the Mother Tongue in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Frequency of Use of Other Languages)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very often	62	32.5
Often	87	45.5
Not very often	42	22.0
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Sabongida-Ora's situation was similar as 62 respondents representing 32.5% agreed they use the other languages very often, 87 respondents which was 45.5% also agreed they use the other languages often and 42 respondents representing 22% claimed they don't use the other languages very often.

Table 4.3.11c: Distribution of Respondents According to Frequency of Use of Other Languages apart from the Mother Tongue in Zuru

Response (Frequency of Use of Other Languages)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Very often	78	41.1
Often	84	44.2
Not very often	28	14.7
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

The picture in Zuru regarding the frequency of use of other languages was equally impressive. In this setting, 78 respondents which were 41.1% of the population of study agreed they use the other languages very often, another 84 respondents representing 44.2% claimed they use the other languages often, while 28 respondents constituting 14.7% agreed that they do not use the other languages very often.

The data above showed the rate of use of other languages in the three communities, particularly among those who used these languages very often and those who used them just often was over 70% in all the settings. It therefore implied that multilingualism is very vibrant in these three communities.

Question 12: Do you believe that your ability to speak many languages has influence on your behavior towards the speakers of these other languages?

There is an assumption that multilingualism has positive impact on the behaviour of people particularly towards those whose languages they speak. This also is the core argument of Communication Accommodation Theory which asserts that people who speak the same language converge or rather speakers tend to attune their speech behaviours to those they seek to communicate with by converging at a point. The data below therefore is aimed at testing this assertion.

Table 4.3.12a: Distribution of Respondents According to Influence of Multilingualism on Behaviour of speakers in Billiri

Response (Influence of Multilingualism on Behaviour)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Strongly Agree	66	39.5
Agree	95	56.9
Disagree	4	2.4
Strongly Disagree	2	1.2
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

In Billiri, the respondents who strongly agreed that they were influenced by multilingualism were 66 representing 39.5%, another 95 respondents which was 56.9% agreed that they were positively influenced, 4 respondents constituting 2.4% disagreed and 2 respondents representing 1.2% strongly disagreed. It therefore shows that the speakers who converge using the same languages or attune their speech behaviours to accommodate others were high.

Table 4.3.12b: Distribution of Respondents According to Influence of Multilingualism on Behaviour of speakers in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Influence of Multilingualism on Behaviour)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	76	39.8
Agree	87	45.6
Disagree	14	7.3
Strongly Disagree	14	7.3
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

In Sabongida-Ora 76 respondents strongly agreed that they were influenced by their ability to speak many languages in their interaction with other speakers, this group constituted 39.8%, another 87 respondents representing 45.6% agreed they were influenced in their behaviour towards other speaker, 14 respondents which was 7.3% disagreed and another 14 also strongly disagreed with this assertion.

Table 4.3.12c: Distribution of Respondents According to Influence of Multilingualism on Behaviour of speakers in Zuru

Response (Influence of Multilingualism on Behaviour)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	78	41.1
Agree	99	52.1
Disagree	12	63
Strongly Disagree	1	0.5
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Zuru was not quite different from the other three settings as 78 respondents representing 41.1% strongly agreed that their behaviour towards the speakers of other languages was

influenced by their ability to speak multiple languages, another 99 respondents constituting 52.1% agreed that they were influenced, 12 respondents representing 6.3% disagreed while only 1 respondent representing 0.5% strongly disagreed with this assertion.

As revealed in the above tables over 80% of the respondents in the three communities shared the belief that they were greatly influenced by their ability to speak many languages. This shows that multilingualism has great influence on the behaviour of the people, particularly their attitude toward strangers or the groups whose languages they speak. This may be due largely to their awareness of the advantage of being multilingual which has also gone a long way to confirm the Communication Accommodation Theory.

Question 13: Are you as fluent in these other languages as you are in your mother-tongue?

If the minimal qualification for multilingualism, which is the working knowledge of second language is to be considered, then virtually everyone in the three communities studied may be considered multilingual. But the members of the three communities do not only possess the ability to speak many languages, they believe themselves to be quite fluent in those languages as tables 4.3.13 a, b and c indicated.

Table 4.3.12a: Distribution of Respondents According to Fluency Rate in these Other Languages in Billiri

Response (Fluency Rate)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very fluent	43	25.0
Fluent	70	41.9
Not very fluent	52	31.1
Not fluent	2	2.0
Total	**167**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2016

The number of respondents who believed themselves to be very fluent in the other languages they speak in Billiri were 43 representing 25%, 70 respondents representing 41.9% claimed they were just fluent, 52 respondents representing 31.1% agreed they were not very fluent while only 2 respondents representing 2.0% claimed they were not fluent at all.

Table 4.3.12b: Distribution of Respondents According to Fluency Rate in these Other Languages in Sabongida-Ora

Response (Fluency Rate)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very fluent	59	30.9
Fluent	92	48.2
Not very fluent	31	16.2
Not fluent	9	4.7
Total	**191**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Sabongida-Ora situation is slightly better as 59 respondents accounting for 30.9% of the population of study believed they were very fluent, 92 of the respondents representing 48.2% claimed they were just fluent, 31 other respondents constituting 162% agreed they

were not very fluent and only 9 respondents representing 4.7% claimed they were not fluent at all.

Table 4.3.12a: Distribution of Respondents According to Fluency Rate in these Other Languages in Zuru

Response (Fluency Rate)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very fluent	70	36.8
Fluent	71	37.4
Not very fluent	39	20.5
Not fluent	10	5.3
Total	**190**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Zuru had almost equal number f respondents were very fluent and fluent. 70 respondents representing 36.8% claimed they were very fluent, and 71 of the respondents believed they were quite fluent, this group constituted 37.4%, another 39 respondents representing 20.5% agreed they were not very fluent and 10 respondents representing 5.3% agreed that they were not fluent at all.

In Billiri between 39% and 56% respondents rated themselves as being between very fluent and just fluent. On the other hand, Sabongida-Ora recorded between 30% and 48% in that regard and Zuru people responded in the range of 36% and 37% in the same regard. However, while it can be claimed that fluency rate was high in all the settings, it appeared highest in Sabongida-Ora than in the other settings, followed by Zuru, then Billiri.

4.4 Comparison of the Three Communities

This section is aimed at throwing some lights on the preceding analysis regarding the similarities and differences among the three communities selected for this study. Starting with the motivating factors for acquisition of additional languages, the data as indicated in Tables 4.3.5 a,b and c revealed that in Billiri *Necessity* had the highest distribution of 44.3%, this was also the case in Sabongida-Ora with 43.5% distribution. Zuru on the other hand revealed that *Need* was the motivating factor with 38.4% responses. This shows that Sabongida-Ora share different characteristics in terms of motivating factor for acquisition of additional languages from Billiri and Zuru.

Similarly, in examining the factors that constrain choice of languages in conversation, the communities differ in this regard. The respondents in Billiri for instance, considered *Domain* of interaction as the most significant factor constraining choice of language, meaning that more interlocutors are more likely to converge on domain than other factors, in accommodation theory therefore; speakers prefer to use a particular language in certain domain because other speakers are likely to be able to participate effectively. Sabongida-Ora like Billiri revealed that domain was the most significant factor with 41.4% whole the respondents in Zuru considered *Topic* as the dominant factor in language choice. In this regard again, Billiri and Sabongida-Ora share similar characteristic while Zuru exhibited different characteristics (see tables 4.3.6 a, b and c).

On the preferred language for cultural discourse in the three communities, the data showed that all the selected communities favoured their mother tongues in this regard although to different degrees. For instance, 59.9% of the respondents in Billiri preferred

Tangale for cultural discourse, while in Sabongida-Ora 49.7% preferred Ora to other languages when culture is involved and in Zuru 45.3% agreed that C'lela was their preferred language for cultural discussion. However, a closer look at the data revealed that while Hausa exerted some degree of influence in Billiri and Zuru even when cultural discussion was the issue with Hausa coring 26.9% and 29.5% in both settings respectively, Yoruba did not show that degree of influence in Sabongida-Ora, in fact English language fared better than Yoruba in that setting (see tables 4.3.7 a, b and c). In this regard, Billiri and Zuru revealed similar characteristics as opposed to Sabongida-Ora.

Conversely, when political discourse was put to test, the result were different in the sense that while one expected English language to be the dominant language for political discourse in all the settings studied, it was not so in all the settings. In Billiri for instance, 53.3% of the respondents believed they handled political issue better in Hausa than in any other language in use in the setting including Tangale their mother tongue. The result was different in Sabongida-Ora where most of the respondents preferred English language for political/economic discussion to other languages, the distribution was 86.4% in favour of English language.

Zuru equally shared similar characteristic with Sabongida-Ora in this regard with 50.5% of the respondents preferring English language for political discussion. However, Hausa came close with 39.5% of the respondents agreeing they could handle political discourse in the language. Therefore, Sabongida-Ora and Zuru were similar in this regard while Billiri differed.

The above comparison therefore, shows that the three settings selected for this study shared certain characteristics while they differed in some others. More importantly is the fact that proximity of the communities does not automatically translate to similarities in characteristics as there were instances where Billiri in North-East shared certain characteristics in common with Sabongida-Ora in South-South and differed with Zuru in North-West.

4.5 Discussion of Findings

A careful consideration of the preceding data on multilingualism in the three communities under scrutiny and the analysis thereof which was aimed at determining language choice on the part of the individual speakers and the social and contextual variables constraining this choice, it is clear that the model adopted for this study recognizes that choice between or among alternate codes is prevalent in multilingual settings, depending on the various factors in speech events.

In addition to the data collected through questionnaire, information was equally obtained through interaction on a number of communication situations both formal and informal, observation of language behaviour as it took place. In the process, the researcher became curious in any instance where a language other than the mother tongue was being used. This in turn led to a number of discussions about the contexts of use of other languages. It should be noted however, that it is not the aim of this study to completely predict code choices among the speakers of these three communities, which is the reason why more than one code can be employed in every communicative event.

In Billiri and Zuru where the first language adopted by speakers in any conversation is Hausa until circumstance warrants speakers to switch to Tangale or C'lela as the case may be. On the other hand, in Sabongida-Ora the Yoruba influence appeared to be waning as many speakers between the ages of 5 and 25 may not be able to speak the language like the elderly ones. However, most of them still bear Yoruba names, for instance the two informants used for this research in Sabongida-Ora both bore Yoruba names; Owolabi and Tunde even though they are natives. In addition, certain areas or streets are named in Yoruba, for example there is a place called Óké New, Oke in Yoruba means upland. The older people admitted that they learnt Yoruba largely through the missionaries as Christianity seemed to have spread to the area through Yoruba land, the bible and the hymns they used were all written in Yoruba. This is the reason why the second most significant factor for acquiring or learning a second language in that setting is necessity see table 4.3.5b.

In Sabongida-Ora, it is the Ora language and occasionally Nigerian Pidgin English that is dominant at home. In other settings, the characteristics are the same. However, in Billiri and Zuru the situation is radically different as the home domain has completely been taken over by Hausa language. In fact parents lament the rate at which Hausa language and culture is eroding their indigenous languages. To illustrate this, my informant called one of his children and showed him groundnut and asked him to give the name and the child said "Gyada" which is the Hausa name and when asked what the Tangale name was, the child was helpless, whereas the Tangale name for groundnut is "Kondo". In the same vein, the playground elicited almost completely Hausa except in the neighboring villages around Billiri and Zuru where one could find children playing in Tangale and

C’lela respectively. Among adults in Billiri and Zuru, Hausa and Tangale/C'lela were predominantly used in the home domain while office elicited a combination of Hausa, English and occasional Tangale/C’lela depending on the other speaker(s). The church revealed more of Tangale/C’lela and Hausa with occasional switch into English. The leisure period revealed that for both communities i.e. Billiri and Zuru except where necessary, Hausa is the dominant language used particularly because Hausa is the only language that can accommodate other speakers within the communities that are non-native speakers of Tangale/C’lela. The extent to which Hausa language has permeated the two communities can be demonstrated by the situation in which a significant number of residents of these communities believe they could even handle the affairs of their culture in Hausa language, see tables 4.3.7a and c respectively. The findings showed that not only did the responses of the inhabitants of the three communities differ in some respects, for instance while Billiri people believe that the strongest factor(s) for language choice in their community is domain, Sabongida-Ora like Billiri equally believe that domain is the strongest factor but Zuru regarded topic as the major factor see tables 4.4.6 a, b and c. There is also an indication from the findings that language death appears more likely in Billiri and Zuru as a result of the overbearing influence of Hausa than in Sabongida-Ora where Yoruba has not been able to exert the same amount of influence on the local languages.

The above findings therefore, have confirmed the relevance of Howard Giles’ Communication Accommodation Theory in explaining language choice in multilingual setting, which was the model adopted as theoretical framework for this study. Giles argues that when people interact, they adjust their speech, vocal patterns and even

gestures to accommodate others. The theory is concerned with the links between language, context and identity and explores the various reasons why individuals emphasize or minimize the social differences between themselves and their interlocutors in conversation. Therefore, whether the choice was constrained by domain, topic or role-relations the ultimate goal is to accommodate the co-interlocutors and choose the code that can serve the purpose for that interaction at that given time.

From the findings, language choice and by extension multilingualism has produced a number of implications for the three communities that have been studied. They are as follows:

(a) The fact that similar factors do not constrain language choice in all the communities to the same degree. In essence some factors are stronger in certain settings than the others see tables 4.3.6 a, b and c.

(b) That the indigenous languages of these communities are being influenced by the majority languages.

(c) That code-switching is rampant in these communities as this has been observed to be the only way out of this linguistic quagmire, particularly when they get to a point where they cannot find relevant words to express certain phenomenon in their mother tongues.

(d) That minority languages in the North-East and West are more likely to go into extinction faster than their counterparts in the South-South parts of Nigeria.

In essence, the data gathered from the three settings has been able to provide answers to the following questions asked in the statement of the problem, which are:

1. What similarities exist among multilingual speech communities? This question has been addressed in the sense that certain characteristics pervade all the communities but to different degrees like Billiri and Sabongida-Ora show that domain is the dominant factor in language choice.
2. What factors influence code choice in different multilingual speech communities? Tables 4.3.6 a, b and c have addressed this question. By implication this question has been answered by the explanation provided by the tables mentioned in question 1 above.
3. What domains of language behaviour elicit what response from the speakers in the different multilingual speech communities? The analysis and discussion have proved that while the home domain tends to yield the mother tongue in Sabongida-Ora, the case is different in Billiri and Zuru where Hausa has made significant inroads even in the home domain. Other domains exhibited a combination of all the languages spoken in these communities.
4. How do the speakers converge and diverge using the various languages in their settings in line with Communication Accommodation Theory? In this connection, the two components of this theory have been proved which is convergence as speakers were able to accommodate others in interactions either by topic, domain or role-relations, and divergence which was demonstrated in Sabongida-Ora where one interlocutor refuses to speak the language of the co-interlocutor as a way of showing resentment for his disrespectful behaviour.

5. What are the implications of the choices the speakers make of their various languages? This explanation has been provided earlier in this section, see 4.5 above.

4.6 Conclusion of the Chapter

In the final analysis, language choice in Billiri, Sabongida-Ora and Zuru are constrained by mutually reinforcing factors such as topic, domain, and role-relations. The findings and the analysis confirm that there are as many differences regarding language choice among the selected communities as there are similarities. There is also an indication that some communities stand greater risks of losing their languages than the others.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

5.0 Preamble

This chapter presents the summary of the study. It also accounts for the summary of the findings and the conclusion arrived at based on the findings.

5.1 Summary

The study has examined the language choice of three selected speech communities in Nigeria spread across three geopolitical zones namely: Billiri, North-East; Sabongida-Ora, South-South; and Zuru, North-West, and the implications this sociolinguistic phenomenon has produced in these communities. It has been established in this research that there is sociolinguistic basis for code choice in multilingual speech communities.

The study appraised the historical circumstances which necessitated the multilingual nature of these communities, the background to the study, statement of problem, aim and objectives of the study, the justification for the study and scope and delimitation were covered.

The literature review dwelt on the concepts such as sociolinguistics, multilingualism, language choice, speech communities, diglossia, code-switching and mixing and their effects on a multilingual environment. This study equally reviewed some authors who had worked on related topics and an attempt was made to locate the gap in their works which this study intended to fill.

The methodology adopted for this study is survey, while questionnaire and interview were used as data collection instruments. They were equally backed by non-participant observation method as well as recorded conversations in all the settings.

In the data presentation, both qualitative and quantitative data collected from the settings of this research were analyzed. The findings have confirmed to a large extent the relevance of Howard Giles Communication Accommodation Theory to the explanation of code choice in multilingual setting.

5.2 Conclusion

This research began with an assumption that language choice in a multilingual setting has some implications for individual speakers in that setting and the community at large. Consequently, the data obtained from the settings have proved that the assumption has a basis. The findings and the subsequent analysis had shown that multilingual speakers do not use the many languages they speak randomly. It is discovered that certain extra-linguistic factors like topic, domain and role-relations are key determinants of choice of language.

The study has also revealed that much as there are similarities among multilingual societies, there are also marked differences especially with regards to the manner in which these factors constrain choice of language i.e. some societies consider certain factors more significant than the others.

Ultimately, this study has come to the conclusion that most multilingual speech communities in Nigeria are exposed to the danger of losing their own languages at the expense of the majority languages. This threat appears more imminent in the northern part of Nigeria than the southern part as revealed by the findings.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

1. This study is a comparative analysis of language choice in three different multilingual speech communities across geo-political zones, it may not have

accounted for all linguistic behaviours found in all the setting with similar features.

2. There is also a possibility that new factors may emerge in these settings after this research which can alter some of the facts presented in this study.
3. As a result of limited resources and the fact the research cannot continue indefinitely, the researcher could not go beyond the present level to obtain a wide range of data on language behaviours of the people of the communities concerned.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies

1. This study has compared three different multilingual speech communities with regards to their language choice, however, many similar speech communities abound in Nigeria that have not been studied. Other researchers may take it further.
2. This research has not claimed that the implications of language choice unraveled in this work are the only ones that can be found in these settings. Therefore other implications may arise thereafter which can be unearthed in subsequent studies in other communities.
3. A lot more studies need to be undertaken by sociolinguists on minority languages and speech communities that are faced with threat extinction of their languages so as to take steps to prevent it.

5.5 Contributions to Knowledge

1. The study has afforded readers the opportunity of comparing and contrasting three different multilingual speech communities at a glance.

2. This research has been able to ascertain that proximity has little or no effect in the characteristics shared by speech communities. In essence, speech communities that are far apart may share similar characteristics while those close may not.
3. The study has been able to draw attention to the fact that minority languages in certain geo-political zones of Nigeria are more exposed to danger and are likely to die faster than those from other zones as shown in the study.

REFERENCES

Adams, Y., Matu, P.M. and Ongarora, D.O. (2012). Language Use and Choice: A Case of Kinubi in Kibera, Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences. Vol. 2*, No. 4.

Adekunle, M.A. (1990). Language in a Multi-Cultural Context. In Emenanjo E.N. (ed), *Multilingualism, Minority Languages and Language Policy in Nigeria.* 239-247. Agbor: Central Books Ltd.

Adendorff, R. (1996*).* The Functions of Code Switching among High School Teachers and Students in Kwazulu and Implications for Teacher Education. In: K. Bailey and D. Nunan (eds.) *Voices from the Language Classroom: Quantitative Research in Second Language Education* (Pp. 388 – 406). Cambridge: C.U.P.

Akere, F. (1977). A Sociolinguistic Study of a Yoruba Speech Community in Nigeria: Variation and Change in the Ijebu Dialect of Ikorodu. An Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Anchimbe, A.E. (2007*).* Linguabridity: Redefining Linguistic Identities among Children in Urban Areas. In: Anchimbe, A.E. (ed.), *Linguistic Identity in Post Colonial Multilingual Spaces*, Pp. 66 – 68.

Andre, G. (1971). The Influence of English on West African Languages. In J. Spencer (ed.), *The English Language in West Africa*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Ankruma, N.H.S. (2005). Reconstructing African Past: Sources and Prospects of Tangale History. Jos: Ehindero (Nig.) Ltd.

Attah, A.B. (2004). The Tangale Nation in Billiri L.G.A. of Gombe State. Gombe: Jamil Press Ltd.

Ayeomoni, M.O. (2006). Code-Switching and Code – Mixing: Style of Language Use in Childhood in Yoruba Speech Community. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, *15*(1): 90 – 99.

Azu, T. (2013). Impact of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism on English Language Education: The Case of Arunachal Pradesh, India. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 4,* No. 11.

Baker, C. & Prys Jones, S. (1998). Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bamgbose, A. (1971). The English Language in Nigeria. In: J. Spencer (ed.), *The English Language in West Africa*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

_____ (1991): Language and the Nation: The Language Question in Sub-Saharan Africa. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Banjo, A. (1983). Aspects of Yoruba-English Language Mixing. *Journal of Nigerian Languages*. *1*:17-25.

Bashir, A. (1996*).* Language Choice and Use in Maiduguri Metropolis: An Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of English and Literary Studies. A.B.U, Zaria.

Bentahila, A.Y. and Davies, E.E. (1983). The Syntax of Arabic French Code-Switching. *Lingua Amsterdam*. *59*:301-330.

Bloom, J and Gumperz, J. (1972). On Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code – Switching in Norway. In: Gumperz, J and Hymes, D. (eds.); *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication.* New York. 407 – 434.

Bloomfield, L. (1933): Language. Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Bokamba, E. (1989). Are There Syntactic Constraints on Code Mixing? *World Englishes 8*(3).

Cheng, L and Butler, K. (1989). Code-Switching: A Natural Phenomenon Vs Language "Deficiency". *World Englishes 8*(3).

Clyne, M. (2003). Dynamics of Language Contact. Cambridge: C.U.P.

Coates, J. (1993). Women, Men and Language. London: Longman.

Dettweiler, S.H and Dettweiler, S.G. (2005). Sociolinguistic Survey (Level One) of the Lela People. New York: SIL International.

Dorian, N.C. (1981*).* Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Duranti, A. (1997). Linguistic Anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elugbe, B. (1973). Linguistics and Prehistory. In B.S. Chumbow (ed) *Applied Linguistics in Africa.* Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Fadong, A.A. (2017). The Interrelation of Language, Ethnicity and Identity. *Lapai Research in Humanities*, Vol. 4, *No. 2.*

Feagin, C. (1996). Peaks and Glides in Southern States Short-a. In G.R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin & J. Baugh (Eds.), 135-160.

Ferguson, C.A. (1972*):* Language Structure and Language Use. California: California University Press.

Fishman, J.A. (ed.), (1972): Language in Socio Cultural Change. California: Stanford University Press.

_____ (ed.) (1976): Advances in Sociology of Language. New York: Yeshiva University Press.

Gal, S. (2007). Multilingualism. In: Llamas, C. et al. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Giles, H. (1977). Communication Accommodation Theory. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grimes, B.F. (1992). Ethnologue: Languages of the World, (ed.) Dallas Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Grosjean, F. (1982). Life with Two Languages. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1968). The Speech Community. In D.L Sills (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 381-386. New York: Macmillan.

_____ (1982). Discourse Strategies. Cambridge: C.U.P.

Gunn, H.D. and Conant, F.P. (1960). Dakarkari Peoples of the Middle Niger Region, Northern Nigeria, 29 – 49. Ethnographic Survey of Africa. Western Africa, Part XV. London: International African Institute.

Gwani, U.S. (1999). Administrative Systems in Tangale Kingdom Before and Since Colonial Rule in Nigeria, Vol. 1. Maiduguri: University of Maiduguri Press.

Harris, P.G. (1938). Notes on the Dakarkari People of Sokoto Province. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 68*: 113 – 152.

Hockett, C. (1958). A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: Macmillan.

Holmes, J. (2008): An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. (3rd Edition), London: Person Education Ltd.

Hudson, R.A. (1998): Sociolinguistics. (2 ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1962). The Ethnography in Speaking. In: T. Gladwin (ed.), *Anthropology and Man Behaviour*: Washington: Harvard University Press.

_____ (1968). The Ethnography of Speaking. In Fishman, J. (ed.) *Reading in the Sociology of Language.* The Hague; 99 – 133.

_____ (1974): Language in Culture and Society. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Jegede, O.O. (2012). "Roles of Code Switching in Multilingual Public Primary Schools in Ile-Ife, Nigeria". *American Journal of Linguistics*. *1*(3). 40 – 46.

Kachru, Y. (1989). Code – Mixing, Style Repertoire and Language Variation: English in Hindu Poetic Creativity. *World Englishes 8*(3).

Kamwangamalu, N. (1989). Code – Mixing and Modernization. *World Englishes 8*(3).

Kristiansen, G. and Driven, R. (2008). Cognitive Sociolinguistics. (ed). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Gumb H and Co.

Kudo, A. (2005). A Case Study on Management of Language Choice by Multilingual in Japan. *International Journal of Multilingualism, Vol. 4,* No. 3.

Labov, W. (1989). The Exact Description of the Speech Community: Short-a in Philadelphia. In R. Safold & D. Schiffrin (Eds.). *Language Change and Variation*, 1-57. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lipiski, J.M. (1982). Spanish – English Language Switching in Speech and Literature: Theories and Models. *The Bilingual Review 9*:9 191-212.

Llamas, C., Mullany, L. and Stockwell, P. (2007). The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Lüdi, G. (2004*).* Multilingual Repertoires and the Consequences for Linguistics Theory. In the Fergusonian Impact. Vol. 6: *Sociolinguistics and the Sociology of Language.* J.A. Fishman et al (eds.), 217 – 236, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lyons, J. ed. (1970). New Horizons on Linguistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mackey, W.F. (1980). The Ecology of Language Shift. In: A. Fill and P. Muhlhauster (eds.), *The Ecolinguistics Reader* (Pp. 67 – 74). London.

McCarthy, S. (1999). Nigengo nibunka heiyo no igi (The Significance of Becoming Bilingual and Bicultural). In M. Yamamoto (Ed.), *Bairingaru no Sekai (World of the Bilingual),* Pp. 133-159. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.

_____ (2003). East-West Cultural Differences in Basic Life Stance. *GLOCOM Platform.* Tokyo; Center for Global Communications, International University of Japan. Retrieved January 15, 2009, from http://www.glocom.org/special_topics/colloquium/20030526_mcCarthy_east/

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A. and Leap, W.L. (2009*).* Introducing Sociolinguistics. (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Meyerhof, M. (2006). Introducing Sociolinguistics. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Milroy, L. (1982). Observing & Analyzing Natural Language. New York. Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Milroy, L. and Gordon, M. (2003). Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Muaka, L. (2011). Language Perceptions and Identify among Kenyan Speakers. Proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics. Edited by Bokamba, E.G. Somerville. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ngefac, A. (2010). Linguistic Choices in Post Colonial Multilingual Cameroun. *Nordic Journal of African Studies 19*(3) 149 – 164.

Nkwain, J. (2012). Does Language Contact Necessarily Engender Conflict? The Case of Cameroonian Quadrilingualism. *Linguistik Online 43*, 3/10.

Obuhoro, A. (2001). The History of Luleha People of Owan. Benin: Occasional Publications.

Oyeleye, L. (ed) (2004): Language and Discourse in Society. Ibadan: Hope Publications.

Pfaff, C.W. (1983). Syntactic Constraints on Code-Switching: A Quantitative Study of Spanish - English. A Paper Presented at the Linguistic Society of America Annual Meeting. San Francisco, California.

Reginer, C.D. (2003). A Sociolinguistic Survey of the People of Fakai District. (ed) Stephen and Sonia Dettweiler. New York: SIL International.

Romaine, S. (Ed.). (1982). Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities. London: Arnold.

_____ (2000): Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. (2nd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sam, G. & Joseph, H.D. (1975). Experimental Psycholinguistics: An Introduction. New Jersey: L.E.A. Publishers.

Sankoff, G. (1972). Language Use in Multilingual Societies: Some Alternative Approaches. In Pride, J.B. and Holmes, J. (eds). Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth. Penguin Books Ltd.

Sauzier-Uchida, E. (2011). Language Choice in Multilingual Mauritius – National Unity and Socio-Economic Advancement. *Nordic Journal of African Studies, 19*(3) Pp. 100 – 130.

Scotton, M.C. (1995). Social Motivation for Code-Switching: Evidence from Africa. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____ (2009). The Matrix Language Frame Model: Development and Responses. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Code Switching World Wide II* (Pp. 23 – 56) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Shapson, S. & D'Oyley, V. (Eds.) (1984). Bilingual and Multicultural Education: Canadian Perspectives. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Spolsky, B. (1998): Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sridhar, K.K. (1996). Societal Multilingualism. In S.L. McKay and N.H. Hornberger (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: C.U.P.

Tay, M.W. (1989). Code – Switching and Code – Mixing as a Communicative Strategy in Multilingual Discourse. *World Englishes 8*, 407 – 417.

Thornborrow, J. (2004). Language and Identity. In Thomas, L. et al (eds). Language, Society and Power. London. Routledge.

Trudgill, P. (2001). Linguistic and Social Typology. In Chambers, Trudgill & Schilling-Estes (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Variation and Change.*

Ugot, M. (2010). Language Choice, Code Switching and Code Mixing in Biase. *Global Journal of Humanities, Vol. 8*, No. 2: 27 – 35.

Vershik, A. (2004). Aspects of Russian Estonian Code Switching: Research Perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *8*/47, 427 – 448.

Wardhaugh, R. (1986). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Oxford: O.U.P.

_____ (2006): An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. (5^{th} ed.) Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Yoneyama, S. (2008). The Era of Bullying: Japan under Neoliberalism. *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus, 1*-3-09. Retrieved January 12, 2009.

Yul-Ifode, S. (2001). An Introduction to Language in History and Society. Aba: NINLAN Books.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LANGUAGE CHOICE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS IN SELECTED MULTILINGUAL SPEECH COMMUNITIES IN NIGERIA

This questionnaire is meant to obtain data on the topic of this research. Therefore, any information collected will be restricted to academic and will be treated with confidence. The topic is a dissertation being undertaken in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Degree in English Language of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

1. How old are you? Tick where appropriate.
   - (a) 5 – 10 years ( )
   - (b) 11 – 15 years ( )
   - (c) 16 – 20 years ( )
   - (d) 21 – 25 years ( )
   - (e) 26 years and above ( )
2. What is your educational qualification? Tick where appropriate
   - (a) First School Leaving Certificate ( )
   - (b) W.A.S.C. ( )
   - (c) N.C.E/OND ( )
   - (d) First Degree and above ( )
3. Place(s) where the schools were attended
   - (a) Primary_____
   - (b) Secondary_____
   - (c) Post-secondary_____
4. After completion of education did you move out of your hometown?
   - (a) Yes ( )
   - (b) No ( )

If Yes, indicate where_____

And also indicate your present place of work_____

5. What is your occupation? _____

6. How many languages do you speak apart from your mother-tongue?

_____

7. What are these languages? _____

8. How did you acquire these languages?

(a) formally ( ) (b) informally ( )

9. Did you acquire these languages in one place?

(a) Yes ( ) (b) No ( )

10. What motivated you to learn or acquire these other languages?

(a) desire ( ) (b) need ( ) (c) necessity ( ) (d) norm ( ) (e) fashion ( )

(f) others specify_____

11. When and how do you use or speak these other languages you have acquired?

(a) the topic determines ( ) (b) the situation ( )

(c) the relationship between the other speakers and myself ( )

(d) other specify _____

12. In what language do you discuss matters relating to your culture?

Specify_____

13. In what language do you discuss other matters like politics, religions, economic problems and social issues? Specify_____

14. Is your attitude towards the speakers of these other languages positive or negative?

_____

15. Are the attitude of the speakers of these other languages towards you positive or negative? _____

16. How often do you speak these other languages?

(a) very often ( ) (b) often (c) not so often ( )

17. Do you believe that your ability to speak many languages has influence on your behavior towards the speakers of these languages?

(a) strongly agreed ( ) (b) agree ( ) (c) disagree ( )

(d) strongly disagree ( ) (e) any of the above chosen ( )

18. Are you as fluent in these other languages as you are in your mother-tongue?

(a) very fluent ( ) (b) fluent ( ) (c) not very fluent ( ) (d) not fluent ( )

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL INTERVIEW

1. How many languages do you speak?
2. What are these languages?
3. Where and how did you acquire them?
4. What motivated you to acquire these languages?
5. When, where and how do you use these languages?
6. What language would you prefer to use to discuss your cultural affairs?
7. What language would you prefer to use for political, economic and religious discussions?
8. What is your attitude towards the speakers of these other languages you speak?
9. What is the attitude of the speakers of these other languages towards you?

APPENDIX III

TEXT OF ORAL CONVERSATION

Billiri

a) The following conversation took place at a market in a village called Kalmai about ten kilometers outside Billiri.

Buyer: Lele ka pissi

Seller: Lele. Shi lekong nan?

Buyer: Wonthon wobok *somthe* ma ki puwad.

Seller: *Somthe* ma di puwad wayim? Tam katiji kwing am ma won dok.

Buyer: Wonthon ma won dok an tam mo ya lori.

b) The following conversation took place at a market in Billiri town.

Buyer: *Mangoron* an titiga?

Seller: *Kashi* ko mala an won rab

Buyer: Padan *kowane kashi* won dok ka ki puwad.

Seller: Ku lekong *kashi* tiga?

Sabongida-Ora

a) The following conversations occurred at a market in Umhomora, an Ora speaking settlement about eight km outside Sabongida-Ora between a young man and an elderly market woman in Ora language.

Buyer: Mama Edio Ma

Seller: Laoba Ovbi me

Buyer: Ekai khi Ema?

Seller: Ekpa Eva

Buyer: Mama Uyawa i Ekpa okpa?

Seller: Eye Ovbime

Buyer: Mama Khakon Sken I Me

Seller: Mui Ekpa Okpa Bi Ushomo Re

Buyer: Ohomon Iyon Ma I Muy Ode Vbai Me

b) The following conversation took place at a market in Sabongida-Ora between a young buyer and an elderly seller.

Buyer: Who dey sell for here?

Seller: me me o obvime.

Buyer: How much for basin of garri?

Seller: Ekpa Ogban bi Ihen Ushomo.

Buyer: Mama how much you go sell am last?

Seller: Ovbime Ubo we.

Buyer: You no sell for five thousand naira?

Seller: Eye Ekpa Ogban.

Zuru

a) The following conversations took place at a market in Bedi village about 5 kilometers outside Zuru town, in C'lela language.

Buyer: M'zana.

Seller: M'zan bade.

Buyer: Iyne Yala?

Seller: Ihonidn s'bais iloh

Buyer: Hebeme.

Seller: M'honomnai v'toni ne?

Buyer: M'tonk m'hon'n nase

Seller: T'mhab kwech'ilon opa

Buyer: To, mbonk whedi

b) The following conversations took place at a march in Zuru town, in C'lela language.

Buyer: Iyne ch'*Lemu*?

Seller: *Kashi* didn kwech tan.

Buyer: Legsem kwech nase *mana*?

Seller: *Kashis* ney' vtoni ne?

Buyer: *Kashis* Tochu.

Seller: *To* nocta kindi.