Language Choice and attitudes in Public Institutions: The case of the University of Maroua

Rigobert Hinmassia

Faculty of Arts, Letters and Social Sciences, University of Maroua-Cameroon
rigoberthinmassia@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: *This study sets out to investigate on language choice and attitudes in public institutions. The study intends to scrutinize the factors that account for the language choice made by some language users at the University of Maroua, i.e., to choose any other languages different from the two official languages. To do this, a random sampling of 250 participants was used. The instrument used is a questionnaire with a purely sociolinguistic undertone. Spolsky's (2009) Language Management and Fishman's (1972) Domain Analysis backed up the study as frames. At the end of the analyses, it has been shown that, students, the teaching staff (involving some university Administrators) and the support staff have some positive and negative attitudes following the language choices made in relation with where the communication takes place as well as the language situations such as enabling mutual intelligibility, social inclusion/exclusion, intimacy and showing identity, solidarity and work coordination.*

KEYWORDS: Language choice, multilingualism, official public setting, University of Maroua.

INTRODUCTION

Language choice and language in contact

As defined above, some language users choose certain languages due to the wide arrays of languages to be chosen to achieve some communication situations.When two or more languages come into contact, they are more likely to either co-exist side by side, or the host language dominates mother tongue language of immigrants. Fishman (1989) referred to the immigrant language as "intrusive" and the "indigenous" as the host language. He presented three outcomes of language in contact; when the indigenous language interacts with the intrusive, the intrusive

language is lost; when an indigenous language interacts with an intrusive one, the indigenous is lost, or both languages are used side by side but in different domains.

According to Thomason (2001) language contact is the use of several languages in the same place and at the same time, and this usage would cause language change in terms that one language may affect another. Once a new language is learned, it becomes available as part of a speaker's stylistic repertoire. The selected language depends on several factors that determine certain language choice or usage, like the topic, the social scene, the relative status of speakers, their aspirations and feelings of identity. The larger the community of speakers of a given language, the longer the language is likely to be retained.

The concept of domains has been introduced by Fishman (1964). Fishman suggests that these domains make a useful theoretical tool for analyzing minority speakers' attitudes and behaviour towards languages which, in this case, can be referred to as language attitudes.They also determine speakers' choice and usage of languages. Domains are the interactional situations where the use of a specific language is deemed appropriate. These domains can be family, friendship, education, employment, etc. Winford (2003) has examined different types of language contact. He argues that the different outcomes stem from different social situations; which means that language contact can be understood by considering the domains the language is used in. Weinreich (1974) points out that when two languages are in contact the notion of bilingualism emerges causing different problems such as language interference and bilingual individuals. He believes that language change is affected by extra-linguistic factors like geography, indigenousness, cultural and ethnic groups, religion, race, sex, age, social status, and rural vs. urban population.

The functional perspective of language choice

Language choice can be explained as a communicative strategy used for accommodation and promotion of efficient communication between speakers in multilingual communities. According to Hamers & Blanc, (2000) and Myers-Scotton, (2005) speakers choose a particular language in a multilingual conversation to distinguish themselves or highlight their own ethnic

identities. Likewise, they move further to highlight that speakers can switch from one language to another to either gain each other's approval and increase similarity or show distinctiveness and keep a distance. Giles and Powesland (1975) refer to these phenomena as convergent accommodation and divergent accommodation respectively. Appel & Muysken, (2005) suggest that code-switching can be explained in terms the various functions it serves in interactions between individuals. Accordingly, six major functions of CS in individual

interactions have been summarized in this model as in the following:

- The referential function to fill gaps when there is a lack of facility in one language on a certain topic;
- The directive function to involve or exclude specific hearers;
- The expressive function in which speakers mark a mixed identity through the use of two languages in the same discourse;
- The phatic function to imply a change in tone of the conversation as signalling turn taking, or highlighting the information;
- The metalinguistic function - to impress others with a show of linguistic abilities;
- The poetic function for switched puns and jokes as in creating humour or joy (Appel & Muysken, 2005).

Another important factor that influences language choice is issue of identity.

Romaine (2000) reinforces the identity issue which appears in course of language choice. She notes that "through the selection of one language over another or one variety of the same language over another speaker display what may be called 'acts of identity', choosing the groups with whom they wish to identify" (Romaine 2000:46). Many linguistic minorities consider their mother tongue as a symbol of identity (Baker 2006, Nambissan 1994 and Skutnabb-Kangas 2008) and they choose their mother tongue as the language of the family domain. According to Bonner (2001), ethnic stereotypes, demographic shifts and nationalism have affected language choice in multilingual contexts of Belize. He further argues that "language choice in multilingual Dangriga is complicated by concerns of status as well as by competing norms of affiliation and identification" (Bonner, 2001: 94). Likewise, Spolsky (2004) argues that 'three major conditions affecting choice are the speaker's proficiency in language (zero proficiency normally preventing choice), the desire of the speaker to achieve

advantage by using his or her stronger language and the desire of the speaker to derive advantage by accommodating to the wishes of the audience' (Spolsky, 2004: 43).People use language choice when they interact each other, in their daily life, they will make language choice to make communication easier. Grosjean (1982:127) said that in the daily interaction with other, people are constantly changing the variety of language they use. People used language choice in their communication because same people may not understand their language. So, many people decided to use language choice in their communication to make the addressee understand what they said.

Based on Holmes (2013:22) language choices is a choice of language interaction that happens in many speech communications. It means that in someone communication, it usually finds some people make a language choice in their communication. Moreover, in multilingual communities will find people using more than two languages. The use of more than one language by the speaker in communication indicates that they make language choice. In other words, they will choose one language or combine the languages when interact with each other. People choose an appropriate language when they speak, people switch language into other language, and they use different language in different context. They try to make themselves confident to communicate with other community, although sometimes they are not fluent to use the language.According to Somarsono (2009:201), there are three kinds of language choice in sociolinguistic field these are; code switching, code mixing, and variation in the same language. Firstly, code switching, the speaker influenced by some factors; participants, topic and situation. Secondly, code mixing; it appears in phrases and words. The last is variation within the same language, it is combining the same language between formal and informal form.

Language attitudes

According to Petty & Cacioppo (1981), the term attitude "should be used to refer to a general and enduring positive or negative feeling about some person, object, or issue" (p. 6). Language attitudes deal with the speakers' feelings towards language (i.e. rich, poor, beautiful, ugly, sweet sounding, etc.) and language maintenance and planning. In other words, language attitudes are

actually "the feelings people have about their own language or the language of others" (Crystal, 1997, p. 215).

Richards, Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1992) show that expressions of positive or negative feelings towards a language may reflect impressions of linguistic difficulty or simplicity, ease or difficulty of learning, degree of importance, and social status. Attitudes towards a language may also show what people feel about the speakers of that language.

Sadanand (1993) maintains that "attitudes towards the use of different languages are motivated by people's perception of the role of each language and the functions it performs in relation to each other".

Dweik and Qawar (2015) conducted a study which aimed at investigating language choice among Arabs of Quebec– Canada. They also explored Arabs' attitudes towards Arabic, French and English in particular and   factors involved in using these languages. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers selected a sample that consisted of (100) Arab respondents who reside in Quebec– Canada, covering different age ranges, gender, and educational backgrounds. The instrument they used for the collection of data was a sociolinguistic questionnaire. At the end of their research, they realised that Arabs of Quebec– Canada have positive attitudes towards Arabic, English and French. They freely use their Arabic language in the domain of home and with family members, in worship places and when listening to the radio. Again, they noted the participants used English and French in Governmental offices and formal applications and in educational institutions. Results also showed that Arabs of Quebec mix these languages in the domain of neighbourhood, with friends, and media.

Dewi and Setiadi (2018) conducted a work on language attitudes and choice. Throughout that study, they noted that the finding emphasized two important points; (1) the students hold the positive attitude toward English, and (2) the factors affecting the students' language choice are the role of the lecturers and language exposure in the academic environment. Furthermore, it was also worthy of note that the positive attitude is shown through the statement of the majority of the students who argued that English is an international language and they also stated that the language offers more career opportunities. The factors affecting the language choice were

the role of the lecturers and language exposure in the academic environment. The students preferred to use English for writing, reading, and listening to classroom delivery from the lecturers but most of them still preferred using Indonesian for speaking out of comfort. Based on the participant and setting observation, English was mostly used to talk to lecturers and in academic environments or situations. Therefore, these two factors determined the language exposure of English speaking to English Department students at Bina Nusantara University.

Research questions

-What accounts for the mapping of a subsidiary setting in a wider setting of communication still in the same location?

-What are the factors which account for the choice of any languages used by language users at the University of Maroua?

METHODOLOGY

These data were gotten from the field by doing participant-observation with tape recorder known as *Wave Editor*. **Wave Editor** was used as tape recorder to secretly capture communication situations on campus, outside the office, inside the office. The observation also had to be done in natural communication situations (During work duties) with the informants of various statuses who were **250** in total. In this respect, they people involved in the communication were identified as workers: the support staff (with colleagues), as the teaching staff (with colleagues), as the administrators who are also one of the groupings but are more generally lecturers though a few of them are not, as the students and their fellow mates or fellow students. There is a total of **05** excerpts which have tackled various issues to be considered in a multilingual setting. The following excerpts display the many communication scenarii and the governing forces on those scenarii. The three workplaces are the Rectorate (inside and outside the offices), the Deanery of the FALSS and the Admission's office of the FALLS of the University of Maroua. As concerns the technique of data collection, participant-observation was used as main means in this respect.

Frameworks

Two theories are used to gauge and analyse data. These are Spolsky (2009) Language Management Theory (LMT) and Fishman's (1972) Domain Analysis.

Spolsky's Language Management (2009)

After having gathered a good quantity of natural data, the research foresees what could then be the apparopriate theorie(s) or approaches to better analyse the data with all the subsuming componentials.

Spolsky's (2009) *Language Management* is the main frame that covers this study. As concerns the tenets of this theory, the trilogy of communication is put forth. These are, Participation-Topic-Location. The trilogy is inspired by Fishman's (1972) language domains. The choice of this theory is ipso facto imposed by the nature of the topic and its sociolinguistic orientations (the sociology of communication as put by Fishman).

With reference to the theory, the author described the language policy theory first so as to lead the reader to the language domains. In fact, as long as the theory of Language Policy dates back in 1964 and 1965 in relation to Fishman's works, it by birth inspired by Fishman himself who wanted to get an understanding of some sociological language use situations. In this respect, the scholar had to call for help from his peers in the field to develop an outstanding theory to back up his works. Furthermore, the language policy theory as noted in spolsky (2004; 2007) is upheld by three major components which are namely, *language practices*, *language beliefs/ideology* and *language management.* So, from there, Spolsky had to narrow down the study on communication domains to language management; which is the third component of language policy. Since some scholars talked of Language Policy and language planning interchangeably, spolsky (2004) believes that there is no way to plan a language, but one can only manage it. As such, he stressed his 2004 works on Language management more particularly to demonstrate the fact that there is no clear way to plan a language as we can only manage it depending on the Participants one meets during the day, the place where the communication will take place (Location) and the Topic(s) or the issues that will be discussed. In short, the language management approach suscribes to the view point that there are language managers but not language planners since planning is always in theory. In practice, the language users can only manage as individuals have different parameters that actually compel them to

choose a particular language depending on a specific participant, a particular location and on a particular Topic raised during the communication situation.

Fishman's 1972 Domain Analysis Theory

The description of the tenets of Domain analysis will be given below with a particular emphasis on the so-famous *'who Speaks What Language to Whom and When'?* Yet, the Wh-questions in this famous title of Fishman's paper published in 1965 considers five (05) domains governing communication in general. These domains are as follows :

- ➤ Family milieu ;
- ➤ Education ;
- ➤ Friendship ;
- ➤ Religion ;
- ➤ And workplace or Employment milieu.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Data and analyses at the Rectorate (outside/ in the offices)

As described above in the methodology, participant-observation was done during worktime at workplace on campus (in/out the offices), namely at the Rectorate, At the Deanery of the FALSS, the Admission's offices of the same Faculty of the University of Maroua. The data presented and analysed under this section are gotten from the Rectorate (inside and outside the offices, that is, on campus). They are related to oral communication on campus.

Analyses and discussions

Here, once the transcriptions of conversation situations are done, there was a need to identify the various languages found in the conversation situations. So, it should be said that, all the observation data were gotten with a tape recorder when doing participant-observation. At the same time, note-taking was also important to jot down the paralinguistic features of communication such as facial gestures, smiling, laughing etc. which could be referred to as socio-pragmatics of speaking. That said, the table below will present the number of occurrences of words stretches in sentences that will be given in numerical forms. The counting followed

one element of the writing mechanics such as punctuation marks. For instance after a comma (**,**) a colon (**:**); a dash (**-**)**,** suspension marks (**…**), full stop (**.**)**,** question mark (**?**), semi-colon (**;**), exclamatory mark (**!**) square brackets, inverted commas ("…") etc., we considered them as *words stretches* or *groups of words* which are not up to the sentence level. The colours used indicate the languages spoken or used. Since the languages identified are seven in number (07). So, after a sequence of conversations, the languages chosen or spoken are put in brackets (where necessarily indicative of movement of languages) such as the French language, the Fulfulde language, the English language the Massa language, Tupuri language, the pidgin language and lastly, the Camfranglais sociolect or slangs.

Spolsky

Table1: Frequencies of words stretches in communication situations on the campus of the University of Maroua

Languages spoken on campus inside/outside the offices	Occurrences and percentages
French	**297** Occurrences (80.92 **%**)
Fulfulde	**31** Occurrences (**08.44 %**)
English	**15** Occurrences (**04.08 %**)
Massa	**08** Occurrences (02.17**%**)
Tupuri	**07** Occurrences (**1.9%**)
Camfranglais	**06** Occurrences (**1.63%**)
Pidgin English	**01** Occurrences (**0.27%**)
Other sociolects	**02 Occurrences (0.55%)**

The above calculations are done as follows:

Occurences *100/Overall Number of occurrences

Here, we can quantitatively see from the table that the dominant language is French while Fulfuldé comes second with words stretches in communication situations on campus (in/outside the office). The reasons accounting for this phenomenon is the fact that French is first of all, one of the official languages (see 1996 Constitution Article **1** Paragraphe **3** about language policy). Secondly, the French language also benefits from a natural environment which is highly Francophone one. This is why the **80.92 %** can be justified.

As regards Fulfulde, it is the major lingua franca in the Region and therefore, is somewhat privileged with the **08.44 %**. It can be also anlysed from the perspective that, Fulfulde is socio-pragmatically a factor of social identification or inclusion as such or, any means of social acceptance to have some administrative or service privileges. Having looked at the two languages topping the observation, it can be inferred that the choice of Fulfulde or French as means of communication in public institutions, receive positive attitudes as compared to the remaining languages.

Also, one of the components of language management being *language beliefs,* is clearly attested as regards the theory analyzing these data. To connect this to English, which is even an official language, the lecturers (with some administrators), the support staff and the students believe that they can easily have their services or objectives fulfilled if they choose to speak French or Fulfulde. So, English, though an official language, receives a negative effect of 04.08**%** as can be seen in the percentages and the number of occurrences of its words stretches in table above. The other issue may be that, the workplace is highly francophonised with an 'embedded language' known as Fulfulde which, in some circumstances, takes advantage over English if, under normal circumstances is the embedded language in relation to English which is considered here as the Matrix Language. The negative affect and behaviour towards English can be explained by the fact that it has lesser speakers.

For the case of Tupuri and Massa languages, respectively represented by **1.9%** and **02.17%**, it should be noted that, these languages receive negative affect in terms of language policy at the macro level (Government) but they rather receive a positive affect as the speakers (at the micro

or individual level) of those languages may want to identify with their peers with the Cues of contextualization to show family ties or solidarity, ethnographic identification as pointed out in the Gumperzian Contextualisation Cues (Gumperz, 1992). For other sociolects, a percentage of **0.55%** was attested. The explanations behind this is that, most of the people who generally use this form of speech are majorly youths sharing some ideolects to contextualize their communication as illustrated by the Gumperzian contextualization cues.This can also be analysed from the angle that, the interlocutors may use the communication cues or clues to talk about private issues (secrecy) in office therefore, creating a sub-setting of communication. For Pidgin and Camfranglais respectively with **0.27%** and **1.63%.** The explanation could be that they are viewed as fanciful or new trends, fashions etc. Some of these factors accounting for the choices and attitudes towards some languages, will be given in the following section which will present and analysed the language alternations with the directions of movements intra or inter sentential.

Analyses of language alternations in communication situations on campus

By alternations is meant the various movements from one language to the other; either in the same sentence or in two different sentences. These alternations are two in number: Code-Mixing and Code-Switching. Also, this section endeavours to show the directions of the various intra/entersential movements.

Code-Mixing and language directions

Code-Mixing according to Myers-Scotton (1993) is expressions in which mixture of the grammar of one language and another language is used without altering the grammar of the first language. However, wardhaugh (1992: 107-108) believes that code-mixing is 'a deliberate mixing of two languages without an associated topic change'. He says that code-mixing is usually used as a solidarity marker in multilingual communities.

The Excerpts below attest the fact that, there are cases of code-mixing on campus though an official setting. The analyses are done qualitatively.

Extract 1

A: Bonjour! C'est comment (French)?

B: Bonjour (French**), Chair** (English)! *(borrowing)* (**CS-CM**)

This is one instance of code-mixing using a borrowed word in the same sentence.

> *Extract 2*

A: A timmini djangugo naa?

B: Mi ɓadi timmingo kam.

A: Ohoo! (Fulfulde)

B: Mi ɗone djangina haa (Fulfulde) Faculté des Arts et Lettres (French).

A : **Ohoo** (Fulfulde), **c'est bon ! félicitations** (French)! (**CM-CS**)

B : Ohoo (Fulfulde**). Merci. Ça fait déjà trois ans que** (French**) mi ɗone habda** (Fulfulde**).
Je suis dessus. On va se battre** (French). *(B talking about one of his challenges lying ahead)*
(**CS-CM**)

A: Merci beaucoup (French)**! (**an implied way of saying "see you…" to **B** *for his paying of
visit***)**

B: …………… (**B** *closing the door to leave the said office*)

A: **Bonne journée** (French) **mone way** (Fulfulde**)!**

D *:* **Merci** (French)!

As can be seen in the above-excerpt, it is clear that the administrators (sometimes lecturers),
the support staff and the student code-mix for various purposes.

The most productive directions here are French-Fulfulfe and then Fulfulfe-French. There is just
one case of French-English as can be seen in: **Bonjour** *(French),* **Chair** *(English)***!**

Just by looking at the excerpts or extracts of excerpts, it is clear most directions are:

-French-Fulfulde

-Fulfulde-French and

-French-English (01 instance)

The other cases are no that significant in terms of productivity.

Here, one can notice the presence of the types of code-switching even though not in prevalence,
as it is the intra-sentential code-switching here as can be seen in '**Bonjour** *(French),* **Chair**
*(English)***!'**

Code-Switching and matrix language

According to Myers-Scotton (1993: 47) Code-switching is defined as the use of two or more languages in the same conversation, usually within the same conversation turn, or even within the same sentence of that turn. It is thus, the shifting from language **A** to language **B.** the excerpt below testifies the definition of code-switching in public institution as it is the case here in the University of Maroua.

Extract 1

A: Grand, XXXX (French)! *(Implied greetings).* **Mi saani** (Fulfulde)!   **(CS)**

B: President (English**)!** *(Replying in English to A)*

A **Djabbama** (Fulfulde**)!** *(welcoming A)*

A: Hahaha…. *(A mocking at B'*s *Fulfulde*)**. Ça va** (French)!

B: Hahaha….

A: Le travail? *(enquiring on work activities)*

B: le travail c'est là (French) **noh** (Camfranglais)**; ………c'est toujours là**… (French) **(CS)**

A: Toujours là! Hahaha…

B: Toujours ! Le travail… (French)

Extract 2

D*:* **Il est là?** (French)

A: **Il est dedans** (French). **Couso** (Camfranglais), **c'est quel genre de bancs que vous compliquez là** (French) **noh (**Camfranglais)**? (CS-CM)**

C : **Est-ce que c'est moi ?**

A : **Tu es venu nous trouver hein. Donc, tu es dans le lot** (French)? (*Making reference of something secret (professional)).*

D: Tu es venu trouver*……….(walking).* **Je vais dire au Boss que je n'ai pas de carburant – le XXX (**French**)***. (XXX refers to the Boss **D** named out with his rank title).*

Extract 3

A: Bonjour !

B: Bonjour (French)! **Noy kam** (Fulfulde)**?**   **(CS)**

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK

A: Ça va (French**). Noy gal ma'a ɓô** (Fulfulde)?   **(CS)**

B: Ça va (French). **En ɗone. ɗone yaha'a (**Fulfulde).   **(CS)**

A: Le boulot?

B: On se bat (French).

(*A undertaking another conversation with C***)**

A: Bonjour ! ça va (French)? **Noy kuugal kadinn, ɗone yaha'a** (Fulfulde) **?**   **(CS)**

C: **kugal ɗone yaha'a. Mi saani** (Fulfulde).

A: **Mi ɗone gal mone** (Fulfulde). **Je suis là! Je vais visiter certaines personnes-là…..(**French**)**
(with happiness on the face)   **(CS)**

With reference to code-switching, one can obviously notice that there is code-switching in between French and Fulfulde and vice versa. There is only one instance of code-switching, that is, moving from French to Camfranglais as in extracts of excerpts above illustrate it. Most of switches are from French to Fulfulde with French earning higher records of instances against Fulfulde.

So, when the support staff, the teaching staff and the students choose to speak some languages on campus, they are facing major challenges such social inferences to show solidarity, relationship, understanding, doing administrative duties. This is attested in the theories which govern this thesis, especially Spolsky's (2009) language management. To clearly illustrate it, the language practices which is the first component of language management is actively used here as we see language direction in code alternations known as code-switching and cod-mixing. Again, Spolsky's trilogy of communication clearly demonstrates that. This can be inferred from the data presented that code alternations may have witnessed some socio-pragmatic forces such as the participants and their location (in the offices or outside in this case), participants and the topics being discussed (may be of different perspectives: amicality, administrative duties etc.). So, all these driving-forces can influence the attitudes of the support staff, the students and the teaching staff (with some administrators) to adopt certain *affect* conditioned by what is *cognitively admitted* and perceived as functional by the brain therefore giving room to the linguistic communication *behaviour* out there. Here, reference is made to Cooper and Fishman (1977) on attitudes towards language as mental constructs.

Tabe (2012) on her part, focused on code-mixing, code-switching and social interactions in Cameroon. When conducting her study, the researcher advocates the fact that the mixing codes and code-switching are a danger for the future of the two official languages of Cameroon being English and French. This is because there are many lingua francas used everywhere even in official situations. She also noted that many Cameroonians view these language practices as an act of discrimination destruct, discrimination, and a breeding for tribalism. To do this, the researcher collected data from formal and informal contexts of conversations and writings. The theories which underlied the analyses of data were Fishman (1972), Tay (1989), Myers-Scotton (1993 &1995). The findings showed that CM and CS are linguistic resources that seek to improve social interactions, national culture and identity in Cameroon.

For the implementation of the theories underlying this thesis, it should be recalled that, both Spolsky's (2009) Language Management Theory (LMT) and Fishman's (1972b) Domain Analysis are attested in the analysis of the data gotten from observation. So, as concerns Spolsky, all the three components are known as: **(1)** *Language practices*, **(2)** *Language beliefs* or *the beliefs one has about the function* of an X or Y language, **(3)** *the Language policy* which is the third subsuming component of Language Management put forth by Spolsky as he was inspired by his Language policy theory in (2004); which shows of course how the theory has evolved.

With respect to Fishman's language management theory, it tackles domains of communication or the 'tropicalisation' of communication with five main domains, notably: *family, education, friendship, Religion* and *workplace* or *employment*. Yet, the domain analysis theory still encompasses the four aspects also found in Spolsky's trilogy of communication under language practices. It therefore cares about the *participants* involved in the communication, *the topics or issues* being discussed, *the location* or *place* and *the circumstances* under which communication takes place which are put under his umbrella paper "*Who* speaks *What* language to *Whom* and *When*? Again, Fishman and Cooper (1977) which are also theories can also back up this thesis in terms of analysis even though it will be chiefly used. So, in the analyses, the elements of Fishman's theory revealed that there are various factors accounting for language choice and the

attitudes of the support staff, the students and the teaching staff (also administrators) to adopt depending on the domain analysis, the location, the language practices and beliefs and the language policy.

CONCLUSION

From the above, after due analyses with the use of Spolsky's (2009) *Language Management* and Fishman's (1972b) *Domain Analysis*, the study can provide the reader with various issues treated here.

As regards language choice and attitudes, many issues and factors coupled with the components of the theories, clearly demonstrate that, the support staff, the students, the lecturers (sometimes administrators), choose some language for specific purposes (when practising the language in offices) in relation to the beliefs they have about the functions of the language in the public setting as in the University of Maroua and the language policy put forth by the State (1996 Constitution Article 1, paragraphe 3 promoting two official langugaes and protecting the many national/identity/heritage languages). Also, the domains of use had some influences on the language users at the University of Maroua. So, as Fishaman's Domain Analysis considers five (**05**) domains of analysis such as familily milieu, education, friendship, religion and workplace or employment are attested in the attitudes or language behaviours on the part of the support staff, the students, the lecturers (administrators sometimes).

Notwithstanding, the Macro-language policy (at the Governmental level) and the Micro-language policy (at the individual level) are in some sort of soft war yielding some effects attested in the analyses such as code-switching and code-mixing which are also referred to as language alternation issues under an en umbrella expression 'language choice'.

References
Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Bohner, G. (2001). Attitudes. In Hewstone, M. & Stroebe, W.(2001) (Eds.).   *Introduction to Social Psychology.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
Crystal, D. (1997). *A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.Sage.
Fishman, J. (1965). Who speaks what language to whom and when? *Linguistics, 2,* 67,   88.

Fishman, J. A. (1964). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of in quiry. *Linguistics, 9*, 32-70.

Fishman, J. A. (1989). *Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). Domains and the relationship between micro-and macro-sociolinguistics. In *J.J.Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.) Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. Oxford : Basil Blackwell.

Fishman, J. (1972b). *Language and Nationalism : Two integrative Essays*. Rowley, MA : Newbury House.

Giles, H. and P. F. Powesland (1975). *Speech Style and Social Evaluation*. London: Academic Press.

Grosjean, F. (1998). Studying bilinguals: Methodological and conceptual issues. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 1*, 131-149.

Gumperz, J. J. (1992). Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon , 11,* 229–252, *Studies in the social and cultural foundations of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamers, JF.& Blanc, MHA. (2nd ed). (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman

Holmes, J. (2008). *Introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002a). Frequency and intentionality in (un)marked choices in codeswitching: ''This is a 24-hour country''. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 6, 205-219.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002b). *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1999). Explaining the role of norms and rationality in codeswitching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32, 1259-1271.

Myers-Scotton C. (1998). A theoretical instruction to the markedness model.In C Myers-Scotton (ed.) *Codes and consequences.Choosing linguistic varieties.*New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton C. (1995). *Social motivations for codeswitching.Evidence from Africa.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structures in Code-switching. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Petty, E. & Cacioppo, T. (1981). Attitudes and Persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches. Iowa: Dubuque, Wm. C. Brown.

Richards, C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied lLinguistics. UK : Longman Publishers.

Romaine, S. (1994).Language in Society.*An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sadanand, K. (1993). Assessing Attitudes to English and Language use. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19* (1), 123-139.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic Genocide in Education - Or Worldwide*

Diversity and Human Rights. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Towards a Theory of Language Management*. Cambridge: CUP.

Spolsky, B. (2007). Towards a Theory of Language Policy. *Working papers in   Education Linguistics, 22* (1), *1-14*.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tabe, Camilla Arundie. (2012). Code-mixing, Code-switching and Social Interactions   in Cameroon: An Exploratory Study. Cameroon Journal of Studies in the   Commonwealth (CJSC) 1(1), 29-49.

Thomason, G. (2001). *Language Contact: An introduction*. Edinburgh: EUP.

Winford, D. (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.