

## LINGUISTIC IDENTITY AND CULTURAL INTEGRATION OF HAUSA COMMUNITY IN IDIARABA, LAGOS STATE

**Nwagbo, Osita Gerald (PhD)**

Department of Linguistics, African and Asian Studies  
University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria  
osynwagbo@gmail.com

**Okide, Ujubonu Juliet (Mrs)**

Department of Linguistics, African and Asian Studies  
University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria  
ujuokide@yahoo.co.uk

### ABSTRACT

Integration into an alien culture often poses a great challenge to immigrants and minority groups as a result of ethnolinguistic disparities. Among other means of indexing cultural identity, language stands out as a core element. This study aims at investigating cultural integration among Hausa groups resident in Idiaraba, Lagos State with a view to delineating the degree to which they used Yoruba, attitudes to Yoruba (language) and perception of Yoruba (people). The significance of this study is anchored on the dominance of indigenous Hausa in Idiaraba community and its implication on peaceful co-existence with the host community. The ethnolinguistic identity theory was adopted in the quantitative survey. Through stratified random sampling, 300 respondents were sampled and later divided into two strata: Hausa Born in Lagos (HBL) and Hausa Born in the North (HBN). The variable adopted in the study is place of birth and analysis was carried out with the aid of simple percentage. The result revealed that a significant majority of the (HBL) used Yoruba to an appreciable degree, had a positive attitude to Yoruba and a positive perception of Yoruba. Among the HBN, a significant majority used Yoruba negligibly, had negative attitude towards Yoruba and a negative perception of Yoruba. However, the reasons advanced for the negative perception of Yoruba were mainly influenced by stereotypes and prejudice. Evidently, place of birth was a significant predictor of ethnolinguistic integration and bi-culturation. This study posits that ethnolinguistic groups, irrespective of status, should linguistically identify and integrate with the host community as a leeway to cross cultural interaction and understanding, and the benefits of inclusion and diversity.

**Keywords:** cultural integration, ethnolinguistics, linguistic identity

### INTRODUCTION

Urbanization has brought about rapid increase in the population of cities across the world, including Lagos, the biggest city in Nigeria. The population was estimated at just 11.2million in 2011 by the United Nations (Campbell, 2012) while the New York Times estimates that it is now, at least twenty one million, surpassing Cairo as Africa's largest city (Rosenthal 2012). It has been posited that global migration patterns in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century have led to a movement of non-nations or non-nationals to other urban areas and in the future, global economics will continue to ensure the arrival of individuals seeking economic and cultural opportunities in new places (Grillo, 2001; Derlimers et al 2005; Donato et al, 2007; Martin 2009).

Due to its status as the former (political) capital of Nigeria and presently the economic and commercial capital of the country, thousands of Nigerians from the rural/urban centres in the six geographical zones flock to Lagos mainly for economic reasons. The consequence is that over time Lagos has become the melting pot of Nigeria, inhabiting virtually most of the ethnic groups in Nigeria, especially the dominant three (Hausa, Igbo, Yoruba); however the Yoruba are the host community (Fadayomi et al, 1992). The implication of this cosmopolitan and heterogeneous outlook is the frequency of contact between or among ethnolinguistic groups. The asymmetry among the ethnic groups thus raises concern for mutual co-existence, perception of the 'other', inter-ethnic understanding, bonding, cohesion and cultural integration with the host community. The subjects of this paper are the Hausa, who have a strong concentration in Idi Araba, Agege, and Olodi Apapa in Lagos. Evidently the Hausa constitute the largest

ethnic group in Nigeria, according to the census of 1996. However, in Lagos, they represent a minority. This is to suggest that they have a dual status as majority–minority residents.

This background underlines the importance of the broader research question addressed by this study: to what degree have the Hausa group carried their language with them, to what degree have they linguistically integrated into the culture of the host community and what is their attitude to and perception of their host community. The answer to these questions has crucial social implications; it will help us to evaluate the degree to which cultural values are enduring or volatile, and whether cultural values are traits of the individual or attributes of the group. Understandably, culture has multiple dimensions and there are various means of integrating with a culture, e.g. food, dress, religion etc., as culture is an embodiment of a peoples' way of life. However, this study focuses on one important, in fact, the most important indicator of culture –language. The reason for the bias for language is because language is central in the lives of individuals as a veritable means of identification and solidarity within and across cultures (Kim, 2001, Berry, 2008). Furthermore, language has been singled out as the prime symbol of ethnic identity. Fishman (1989:26) highlights the connection between language and ethnicity and states that;

It is precisely because language is so often taken as a biological inheritance that its association with ethnic paternity is both frequent and powerful. It is acquired with the mother's milk... It is saturated with the tears and joys of the ancestors. It is loved with all one's being. How could it be otherwise, particularly since the ultimate Power used (the) language in creating the ancestors and, indeed in creating the world itself.

Demirezen (2006:2) upholds this view by stating that the relationship between language and ethnic identity is 'bi-directional' and Kramsch (1998:69) posits that 'for many cultures, language is one of its main elements, as it is used for passing on culture, especially in cases where language is only spoken and not written by its people. Thus it serves to mark people's cultural membership. Giles et al (cited in Appel and muysken 1987:11) note that

Language is not only an instrument for the communication of messages. With its language a group distinguishes itself. The cultural norms and values of a group are transmitted by its language. Group's feelings are emphasized by using the group's own language and members of the out-group are excluded from its internal transactions.

On the strength of this position, Giles and Coupland (1991) suggest that some natives like the Catalonians consider themselves as half a nation without their language. The depth of this language/ethnic synergy is elaborated by Johnson (2009:171) who states that for the majority of Hispanics, the Spanish language runs deeply into cultural and personal identities, and consequently they see themselves as inseparable from their language; therefore to relinquish Spanish either literally or symbolically is tantamount to relinquishing a significant and powerful dimension of their personal and social identity.

## **LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL INTEGRATION**

Kuran and Sandholm (2007) define cultural integration as a form of cultural exchange in which one group assumes the ideologies, practices and rituals of another group without sacrificing the features of its own culture. The two cultures involved are usually a minority and a dominant culture. As a healthy intermingling of the ways and beliefs of two unique cultures, it is generally seen as positive because the individual does not lose anything.

Language proficiency in the host language has been proven to be a significant positive integrative instrument as it serves as a bridge across two different cultures (CEC, 2005; Markova and Black, 2007; Putnam, 2007). Hall (1993) had earlier posited that language serves as a veritable means of unlocking access to wider social networks and provides a platform for negotiating and transmitting between two cultures. He predicted that the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be faced with the challenge of living with difference –different people, different cultures, and different languages. In order words, language is a medium for imbibing and instilling cultural knowledge which gives non-nations or visitors (as the case may be) the opportunity to engage with associated values, heritage, morals and norms. A crucial European policy framework for integration states that basic knowledge of the host society's language is indispensable to integration and specifically identifies poor language proficiency as a barrier to successful integration (CEC, 2005). The stance of the European Union has been corroborated by scholars who emphasize that

low levels of proficiency in the state language adversely affects migrants' ability to access social services in the host community (Waters and Jimenez, 2005; Alexander et al, 2004). Furthermore, although, it is acknowledged that without the host language migrants can negotiate through strong social networks (Losifides et al 2007; Ryan et al, 2008). It is recognized that lack of proficiency in the new language can result in family tensions, downward assimilation, failure to naturalize and restriction to co-ethnic enclaves (Portes et al 2009; Duncan and Waldorf, 2009; Tardif-Williams and Fisher, 2009).

The overall purpose of integration is social cohesion, inter-ethnic bonding, understanding and peaceful co-existence between the guest culture and the host culture. As duly stated in the resolution 1437 (2005) of the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe, the concept of integration aims at ensuring social cohesion through accommodation of diversity. To this end, language has long been perceived as transcending communication, but a vital instrument of any migrant's integrative repertoire, enhancing mobility and social capital (Bourdieu, 1991; Pfeffer and Para 2009; Ryan et al 2009; McAreavey 2009). One of the consensus adopted by the council of Europe is the capacity for action, sometimes referred to as Social Competences. This is the:

...capacity to live with others, to cooperate, to construct and implement joint projects, to take on responsibilities. This capacity contributes to interculturalism, particularly the need for people to learn several languages. Languages are regarded here not just as tools for communicating with other individuals, but above all, as openings to other modes of thought and ways of understanding other cultures...

It is paramount to emphasize that linguistic integration consists of two elements: the language of the guest and the language of the host community. Kruman and Plutzar (2009) explain that in several resolutions and recommendations the Council of Europe encourages member States to take definite steps to enable migrants to learn the language of the receptive country and to develop their mother tongues as cultural instruments to maintain their link with their culture of origin. Krumen and Plutzar (2009) posit that learning the host language is most effective if it builds upon the existing (linguistic) identity of migrants—that is to say treating them as bilinguals for whom learning a new language does not threaten the status and usage of their first language. They therefore conclude that integration programmes which focus solely on the language of the host community will miss their goal because they fail to take into account the specifics of language acquisition in the course of integration. These specifics relate to the dynamics of negotiating two identities with all its implications for loyalty. Thus Hall (1996) conceives of cultural hybridity as constituting the relative positioning of social groups which relates to displacement and the process of delineation between the centre and the periphery. The centre represents the core culture expressed by the first language which Krumen and Plutzar (2009) see as the kernel of the identity; the language in which people started to see themselves as persons (personal identity), as members of a family and social group (social identity), and through which they developed values important for their lives (cultural/religious identity). On the contrary, the periphery represents the host's language which serves as a gate way to the host community. Porters (1997:3) sees hybridity as being "neither here nor there" but in both places simultaneously. However, Gowricharn (2005:16) opines that "there is no zero sum game where detachment from the sending country means an attachment to the receiving country". Rather there is constant interplay between the two. On the whole, as stipulated by Gatawa (2013), the question of obtaining an adequate measure of social integration is one of the pressing issues in the contemporary political debate. This is largely on account of the fact that integration as a symphonic coexistence and cooperation between different ethnic groups is essential for the purposes of cushioning potential conflicts while preserving valuable synergies by the admixture of culture.

## **THEORETICAL APPROACH**

The theory of Culture Fusion is an acculturation model postulated by Eric Kramer in 2000. The theory suggests that as a migrant or new comer enters a community, there is mutual adjustment or Co-Evolution, and not merely cultural coercion for the individual to assimilate. Kramer's theory is actually a reaction to the earlier theory of intercultural adaptation proposed by Gudykurnst and Kim in 1997. Gudykurnst and Kim (2003) argue that acculturation involves a psychological process of disintegration and reintegration of the migrant so that he/she will evolve and begin to behave, think and feel like his/her host community. Disintegration involves gradually abandoning the migrants' culture while reintegration involves gradually adopting the new culture. Thus they stress that it is not sufficient to

'do as Romans when in Rome', but they posit that to be functionally fit the new comer must think and feel like Romans. The consequences of failure to adapt in this way are irrationality, immaturity, mental illness and maladjustment. They maintain that acculturation is a single variable where the migrant becomes acculturated only to the extent that he/she de-culturates and unlearns with equal but opposite measure.

Kramer's theory of Cultural Fusion (2000) counters Gudykunst and Kim's stance by arguing that it is not possible for individuals to deculturate or unlearn themselves, and secondly that growth is not a zero sum process that requires the dissolution of one form for another to come into being, but rather a process of learning new languages and cultural repertoires like thinking, playing, working, worship etc. Kramer posits that a migrant need not unlearn his indigenous language in order to learn a new one. Nor does the migrant have to unlearn who he is in order to learn new ways of doing things. Therefore Kramer suggests that cognitive complexity involves the ability to code switch between repertoire, not a zero-growth, zerosum process as Gudykunst and Kim claim. In Kramer's perspective, the old is not lost (that is, the new comer does not need to shed his culture) but is preserved and the migrant has the cognitive capacity to add to his learning by incorporating the host community culture. As a result, migrants can learn new ways of life without jettisoning their indigenous cultural baggage. The consequence of the contact of two unique cultures is the enrichment of the migrant and the host community, as difference accrues.

Kramer's theory had been supported by Berry (2001) in his strategies of acculturation. Berry posits that there are two central issues involved in acculturation: the degree to which individuals have contact outside their group and the degree to which individuals want to give up or maintain their cultural attributes. Berry outlines four acculturation strategies.

1. Integration strategy/Biculturation: An integrated person reflects the desire to retain important features associated with his or her cultural group, while at the same time being willing to adopt aspects of the dominant culture. This strategy is theorized as being the most balanced of all the strategies.
2. Assimilation strategy: An assimilated person rejects his or her ethnic values or ethnic identity or avoids any contact with members of his own group for the purpose of adopting rapidly the culture of the host country and being accepted by it.
3. Separation strategy: A separation strategy is followed when a person rejects the dominant group culture, with the objective of pressing only his or her own heritage culture and being most of the time in contact with members of his or her ethnic group.
4. Marginalization strategy: A marginalization strategy is adopted when a person rejects both the dominant culture and his/her own heritage culture, and avoids any contract with members of either group.

These four strategies (incorporate Kramer's Cultural Fusion) represent a holistic platform for the consideration of migrations and non-nationals who live in another ethno linguistic group. It is evident that all sojourners in an alien community adopt one of these strategies in terms of their socio-cultural relationship with the host community.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Quite a good number of researches have been conducted in the area of language and integration. Most of these studies are based on foreign immigrants (international) while some are premised on local migrants (intra-national). Siegel's (1990) work is on the maintenance of overseas Hindi among Indian migrants in six different countries: Mauritius, Guyana, Trinidad, South Africa, Suriname and Fiji. The study found that the Indians in Guyana, Trinidad, Mauritius and South Africa had adopted the language of the host communities and abandoned their indigenous language (assimilation) while the Indians in Suriname and Fiji had adopted their host community language but preserved their indigenous tongues (integration).

Constant, et al (2009) investigates cultural integration in Germany of immigrants from Turkey, ex-Yugoslavia, Greece, Italy, Spain, Poland and Russian, based on four indicators: marital behaviour, language abilities, ethnic identification and religious distribution. These are indicators which are supposed to capture the cultural integration of immigrants. The result shows that across the groups the second generation immigrants (representing those born in

Germany) had more proficiency in German than the first generation. On the contrary, the first generation immigrants had more proficiency in their language of origin than the second generation. This is to say that the immigrants had embraced integration acculturation; that is, imbibing the host community language while at the same time preserving their own, although in varying degrees.

Garcia (2011) examines the integration and socio-linguistics attitudes of Africans (Morocco, Algeria, Senegal, Gambia, Mali, Nigeria) living in Jaen, Spain on the basis of assimilation and multi-culturation. The result showed that the african immigrants were positively disposed to multi-culturation as a majority of them combined loyalty to their indigenous tongues with favourable attitudes towards the host language, Spanish. The immigrants expressed a willingness to preserve their language of origin due to the fact that their languages served as a link to their culture, religion, custom and also linked them to their countries. However, the strong loyalty to the linguistic origin did not prove to be an obstacle towards acquiring Spanish as a significant majority expressed willingness to achieve high proficiency in Spanish.

Simard (2007) examines the integration features of Quebec's multinational immigrants who chose to locate and remain in non-metropolitan regions. He focused primarily on young members of the family and their linguistic, professional, social and cultural integration. Half of the youth investigated were of European origin while the other comprise of nationals of non-European countries: Africans, Asians, Latin Americans and Haitians. The result indicates that in this predominantly French speaking area the youths had a high value for their languages of origin which they considered a legacy to be preserved and transmitted to their future generation. At the same time they acquired the language of the host community, giving them a multicultural stance. Thus they evinced a multiple identity and allegiance to the host community and countries of origin. They reported a sense of belonging to Quebec and also a sense of belonging to their country of origin.

Isphording (2015) examines the major drivers of language proficiency among immigrant groups. He found that some immigrants learn the language of the host country while others do not. His finding indicates that those who learn the host country language were mainly immigrants which arrived during childhood and others who had spent a considerable number of years in the host culture and so had constant exposure with members of the host community. He also found that those who failed to learn were hampered by greater linguistic distance between the native language and the host country language. Also living in ethno linguistic enclaves reduced exposure to the host country language and thus opportunities to use it regularly. His finding revealed that those immigrants who learnt the host community language also preserved their home languages (integration) while those who did not learn the host country language used only their home country language (separation).

Guerini's (2006) case study on Ghanaian immigrants in Northern Italy revealed that the immigrants had a bicultural strategy. He found that they highly evaluated their language of origin, Akan which they used to index their ethnic and cultural identity. At the same time they learnt Italian for purposes of communication with the local Italian community with all its utilitarian benefits. Mugaddam (2005) investigates the pattern of national migrants in Khartoum, the capital of Sudan where the dominant language is Arabic. He found that the younger generation had a positive inclination towards Arabic, the host language which they learnt but lacked proficiency in the ethnic languages (Assimilation). On the contrary, their parents preserved their ethnic tongues but lacked proficiency in Arabic (separation).

## **AIM AND OBJECTIVES**

The general aim of this study is to ascertain the ethno-linguistic integration patterns of the Hausa community in Idi-Araba, Lagos. The study seeks to address the following objectives: to examine to what extent the Hausa group had acquired Yoruba, to examine to what extent the Hausa group had preserved Hausa, and to evaluate the social perception of the Hausa group about Yoruba.

Based on the variables and objectives of the study we developed two hypotheses. The Hausa born in Lagos (HBL) would find it easy to linguistically integrate to Yoruba. The Hausa born in the North (HBN) would find it difficult to integrate to Yoruba. Both HBL and HBN would retain their indigenous languages.

The variable under study is place of birth. Several studies have found a discrepancy in the integration patterns of different generations of immigrants (Mugaddan, 2005; Guerini, 2006; Simcard, 2007). The first generation represents the parents who came to the new country or city as visitors while the second generation represents the children of the first generation, who were born in the new country. The result will either give credence or validate the earlier studies or disprove them.

## METHODOLOGY

This study was anchored on a quantitative approach due to the need to obtain a numerical data on which to base some conclusions. Consequently a structured questionnaire was distributed to the respondents in Idi-Araba, through a research assistant who was proficient in Hausa. The data elicitation, however suffered from the difficulty of establishing person-to-person contact with the respondents and getting them to cooperate. Random sampling was used to elicit information from 100 Hausa residents in Idi-Araba, Lagos. The number was limited to 100 due to the need to elicit on-the-spot, face to face information from the respondents. This approach was based on the understanding that most of the respondents were semi-literate. The drawback of this approach is that the responses may be tainted with bias. The sample was later stratified into two strata: Hausa born in Lagos (HBL) and Hausa born in the North (HBN). The HBL were 50 while the HBN were 50. The questionnaire sought information concerning the following areas: demography (sex, age, place of birth and length of stay in Lagos), language information (first language, second language, others), identity with Yoruba and Hausa, attitude to Yoruba and Hausa, and perception of Yoruba people. The HBN reported several places in the North where they were born including Kano, Kaduna, Katsina, Sokoto, Kebbi, Bauchi. There were three types of questions in the questionnaire: Yes/No question, likert scale questions with four scales (Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D) in order to restrict them to specific answers. The third type of questions is open-ended question for the purpose of eliciting their own subjective opinion.

## RESULT, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The result is here presented in relation to the items in the questionnaire. The language information provided by the respondents show unsurprisingly that all reported Hausa as their first language. A majority reported English as the second language while other languages included mainly Yoruba, and other minority languages. This is presented below:

**Table 1:** Language information

Characteristics	Language	Frequency	Percentage
1 <sup>st</sup> language	Hausa	100	100%
2 <sup>nd</sup> language	English	70	70%
	Pidgin	22	22%
	Others	8	8%
Other languages	Yoruba	60	60%
	Others	40	40%

## INTERACTION IN YORUBA

In relation to conversation with Yoruba, the respondents were asked if they interacted with Yoruba in Yoruba language. The result of this query is important because it serves to validate the claim made by respondents about Yoruba being one of their languages in their linguistic repertoire. The result is presented in the table below:

**Table 2:** Interact with Yoruba in Yoruba language

	Yes		No	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
HBL	50	100	-	-
HBN	11	22.0	39	78.0

The result indicated that virtually all the HBL respondents reported that they interacted with Yoruba in Yoruba language. This is to suggest that they had attained proficiency in Yoruba. This is in consonance with earlier studies which found that the second or later generation of migrants learn the host community language (Simard, 2007; Guerini, 2005; Constant, et al 2009) and sometimes act as interpreters to their parents. On the contrary, there is a discrepancy in the report of the HBN; a majority among the HBN reported that they did not interact with Yoruba in Yoruba while a minority attested that they did. It seems reasonable to suggest that the majority of HBN interacted with Yoruba in either English or pidgin as the case may be. However, a minority among them (22%) reported interacting with Yoruba in Yoruba. This result is significant because it shows that there are other considerations that serve as a motivator to acquire the host community language. The next consideration is the respondents' interaction in Hausa, their own language of origin.

### INTERACTION IN HAUSA

In terms of conversation with their own in-group members, the respondents were asked if they interacted with their kin in Hausa. This inquiry is important because it helps to evaluate the state of the respondents' indigenous language vis-a-vis their cultural identity, and issues of inter- generational transfer of their indigenous language. The result of this report is presented below:

**Table 3:** Interact with Hausa in Hausa Language

	Yes		No	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
HBL	50	100	-	-
HBN	50	100	-	-

The results show glaringly that the respondents (HBL and HBN) interacted in Hausa, irrespective of place of birth. This result should not be taken for granted, or as given, because in big cities like Lagos, first language shift of second generation immigrants is common. The fact that the HBL interacted in Hausa means that they had not abandoned their language of origin in the process of learning Yoruba, the host community language. In other words, their parents had successfully transmitted their indigenous language to them. Expectedly, the HBN had arrived Lagos with their ethnolinguistic baggage and so it is normal (unmarked) for them to carry on interaction in Hausa. The implication of this result is intra-ethnic solidarity, but with respect to integration, the HBL had attained a hybrid linguistic status which entitles them to a sense of belonging to two district cultural spheres. This finding upholds the three hypotheses in this study. Firstly, the HBL had linguistically integrated into Yoruba while the HBN did not. Secondly, HBL and HBN were able to preserve their indigenous languages, thus maintaining their cultural identity in Lagos.

### ATTITUDE TO YORUBA

The inquiry about attitude was premised on two cognitive fronts: the guest-host disposition which is related to the understanding and expectation that the guests should speak the language of the hosts and not the reverse (Korth, 2005), and the importance of language as a bridge between two cultures. Respondents were required to mark their answer based on a 4 point likert scale ranging from strongly agree (SA) to strongly disagree (SD). The result is presented below:

**Table 4:** Attitude to Yoruba

	Yoruba is important because we live in their land								Yoruba helps to understand the people and culture							
	SA	%	A	%	D	%	SD	%	SA	%	A	%	D	%	SD	%
HBL	42	84.0	8	16.0	-	-	-	-	48	96.0	2	4.0	-	-	-	-
HBN	10	5.0	6	12.0	26	52.0	13	26	8	16.0	22	44.0	15	30.0	5	100

The result indicates that the HBL were more favourably disposed to Yoruba than HBN. With respect to the first consideration, a significant majority of the HBL (84.0%) agreed that Yoruba is important because they lived in Yoruba land. On the contrary a majority among the HBN disagreed. An underlying fact in this inquiry is the understanding and acceptance among the respondents, that they were non-natives, or temporary occupants and therefore were obligated to be loyal to the native land owners. That the HBL wholly accented to this inquiry implies that they had been nurtured to believe that despite their proficiency in Yoruba, they are not Yoruba. Seemingly, the position of the HBN is that being a non-native neither reduces your cultural status nor optimizes the cultural status of the native. This response may stem from the fact that most Hausa in Lagos live in enclaves, one of which is Idi-Araba, and their numerical strength provides avenues for regular interaction in Hausa. The socio-cultural implication of this position is the acceptance of the status of a guest and a recognition of the territorial dominance of the hosts.

The second inquiry is based on the importance of language as a veritable tool for inter cultural understanding, and cohesion. Expectedly, a significant majority of the HBL (96.0% and 4.0%) accented to the proposition that speaking Yoruba helps to understand Yoruba and their culture. Incidentally, a majority among the HBN (16.0% and 44.0%) also accented to the proposition, despite the fact that most of them did not speak Yoruba. This result underscores the relative importance of language as a bridge across cultures. Proficiency in the language of the ‘other’ person opens a door to understanding the ‘others’ way of life, world view, normative behavior, value system all which are encapsulated and expressed by the language. This is not a suggestion that intra-cultural misunderstandings do not exist; in fact they are more common, but they do not usually lead to high social tension as intercultural misunderstandings do. However, a minority among the HBN dissented to the proposition, thus suggesting the irrelevance of understanding the hosts and their culture. Though this is a submission of a minority, it has far reaching consequences for the group, anchored on the ideology that every individual belongs to a group. Unwillingness to access and acquaint oneself with the hosts and culture represents cultural aloofness, distancing from the out-group, the creation of ethno linguistic boundaries and a tendency to restrict interaction to members of the in-group. This is typical of the separatist acculturated individual who deals with the out-group from the perspective of difference, and strangeness. The singular factor driving this notion is ethnocentrism whereby the individual is so cocooned within his/her own culture that he/she sees other cultures as irrelevant.

**ATTITUDE TO HAUSA**

The inquiry about attitudes to Hausa is related to identity projection and ancestry. Identity is about the individual’s self-perception, and cultural image while ancestry is about the origin of the speakers in the geo-political entity. The result is presented below:

**Table 5:** Attitude to Hausa

	Hausa shows whom we are								Hausa shows were we came from							
	SA	%	A	%	D	%	SD	%	SA	%	A	%	D	%	SD	%
HBL	50	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
HBN	50	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	100	-	-	-	-	-	-

The result demonstrates that the respondents were conscious of their socio-cultural image as well as their heritage. Identity is the act of projecting oneself to others, and language serves as a veritable means of doing so. Both the HBL and the HBN endorsed that Hausa represents their cultural identity as a group. With respect to the HBL, it is evident that place of birth (in Lagos) has not negatively impacted their sense of belonging and cultural image. With respect to the HBN, distance has not eroded their consciousness of their cultural identity. The implication of this identity projection is that the respondents were aware, as a group in Lagos, that they are different from others, linguistically and culturally.

In terms of ancestry and origin, both groups (HBL and HBN) were conscious of their origin, that is, they are from elsewhere. Although they are resident in Lagos, although they may claim to be Lagosians (a social parlance) but they are not from Lagos; in other words they are strangers. Of particular concern is the report of the HBL; ordinarily place of birth is a legitimate ground to claim citizenship of a place. The knowledge that they came from elsewhere is an indication and reflection of years of psychological modeling by their parents and guardians, and probably by their

host community, in one way or another. This mind adjustment could be borne out of the fear that the HBL may become so rooted in their place of birth, so emotionally attached to the land of their birth, so marooned, and functional in the socio-cultural networks of their birth place, that they forget their real origin and ancestry. This is to confirm Kramer's (2000) position that detachment from ones origin does not mean attachment to a different culture. But Kramer's position is not as simple as that; physical detachment does not translate to spiritual or psychological detachment. That is possible only when the person is not rooted in his/her indigenous culture. An individual who is properly rooted in his/her culture has become one with the culture and so is spiritually attached. Such a person would not find it easy to detach from the culture of origin and attach to a new culture, even if by comparison the new culture is a haven. Rather than detachment, a culturally rooted person can afford to attach himself/herself to a new culture, which is to become culturally rooted in a new culture; thus blending the old and the new into a synthesis and assuming a hyphenated identity which is the central ethos of Kramer's cultural fusion and Berry's biculturalism. It is postulated that this is the experience of the HBL in this study. They must have undergone cultural rooting through incessant exposure and participation in their culture, in their nuclear enclaves in Lagos, otherwise parental tutelage would not be sufficient to save them from detachment from the old and attachment to the new (assimilation) which is GudyKurnst and Kim's position.

### PERCEPTION OF YORUBA PEOPLE

The inquiry about perception is anchored on interpersonal relationship between the guests and hosts, although from the point of view of the respondents. The investigation is important because it highlights how the guests see their hosts in terms of character and behaviour. More importantly, it is needful to evaluate how the two groups of respondents (HBL and HBN) saw their hosts, and this will help to predict the patterns of inter-cultural relationship that exist between guests and hosts. The respondents were therefore required to give their subjective opinion about their guests on the basis of peace and reception. The result of this investigation is shown below:

**Table 6:** Yoruba people are peaceful and hospitable

	SA	%	A	%	D	%	SD	%	MISSING	TOTAL	
HBL	12	24.0	24	48.0	3	6.0	3	6.0	7	4.0	100%
HBN	4	8.0	4	8.0	14	28.0	20	40.0	8	16.0	100%

The result demonstrates a discrepancy and asymmetry in perception between the HBL and HBN. A significant majority of the HBL perceived their hosts as peaceful and receptive while a minority disagreed. On the contrary, a significant majority of the HBN disagreed to the proposition that their hosts are peaceful and receptive, while a minority accented. It is possible that the cultural bridge created by a high proficiency in Yoruba, by the HBL had granted them so much unhindered access to Yoruba that, over time, the hosts ceased to see them as different, or strangers, but as one of them; hence a relaxed interpersonal relationship. But the HBN, who had not accessed that bridge were seen as different, strangers, outsiders, hence a charged and tensed interpersonal relationship. It is admitted here that the HBN interacted with their hosts in English or pidgin as the case may be but these are neutral languages and are not sufficient to grant one access to the host culture nor does it impress on the minds of the hosts that you are one of them. As a matter of fact English or pidgin, although formal languages and languages of wider communication respectively, are seen as 'outsider' languages, and so do not play integrative functions. The report of the minority among the HBL who disagreed with the proposition, and the minority among the HBN who accented to the proposition should not be trivialized. Evidently, it marks the difficulty and confusion of describing a group in holistic terms given the fact that there are always exceptions. Nevertheless, the result suggests that intercultural asymmetry creates thick ethno linguistic boundaries and promotes difference and social dissonance while intercultural symmetry dissolves ethnic boundaries, and promotes diversity and social concord.

The last inquiry is a fall out of the previous one; the respondents who disagreed with the proposition were required to submit their own subjective opinion about the host community. This sub inquiry is relevant because a disagreement with the positive proposition does not mean agreement with the negative reverse. That is, that Yoruba people are not peaceful and hospitable does not mean that they are violent and inhospitable. Overall, out of the 40 respondents who disagreed to the proposition (HBL: 6 and HBN: 34) only 22 (55%) respondents submitted their

subjective opinion about the character of Yoruba people, while 18 (45%) did not submit. Out of the 22, HBL: submitted 20 (90%). The submissions were categorized according to their description and these are presented below:

**Table 7:** Yoruba people are not peaceful and hospital

Respondent	Description						
	Abusive		Arrogant		Troublesome		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
HBL	2	9.1					9.1%
HBN	10	45.5	2	9.1	8	36.3	90.9%
Total							100%

The result indicates that the host community were seen by the respondents as abusive, troublesome and arrogant, in that order. A majority submitted that the hosts were 'abusive' (HBL: 9.1% and HBN = 45.5%) while the rest submitted that they were troublesome (HBN = 36.3%) and arrogant (HBN = 9.1%). There are two conclusions that could be drawn from this report. It is possible that the HBL had become so involved with the hosts that the hosts' idiosyncratic behaviour were taken as natural. It is also possible, and this seems more likely, that the submission of the HBN represents an outsider perspective and so could be biased, prejudicial and stereotypical. Stereotypes are ethnic or notional labels used by groups to identify other groups (Hudson, 2001; Bloor and Bloor, 2007). Thus to say of a member of another language group that he or she will always exhibit a certain characteristic behaviour is to offer a stereotype (Wardaugh, 1996); such labels are mainly negative and inclusive. Bloor and Bloor (2007) submit that one effect of prejudice is the creation of stereotypes. Thus, certain qualities, real or imaginary are taken as typical of a particular group and it is assumed that all members of that group manifest the same behavior. Consequently, a character trait exhibited by one or few individuals is used to classify the entire group, sometimes without exception. Viewed from this angle, it is fair to posit that the perception and judgment of the outsider is tainted with bias and prejudice and by no means reflects the reality.

## CONCLUSION

Undoubtedly, language proficiency in the hosts' language has been proven to be a very paramount prerequisite in the process of social and cultural integration. In a situation where individuals voluntarily relocate to a new cultural space, cultural integration is a necessary requirement for survival and participation in the new society. It is endorsed that beyond communication, language is instrumental in the projection of identity (personal, social, cultural) and a medium for accessing and participating in the 'other' culture.

Generally, this study focused on the integration patterns of two groups of Hausa living in Idi-Araba, Lagos: the HBL and the HBN. With respect to the first objective it is obvious that the respondents had preserved their linguistic identity. Both the HBL and HBN interacted with their kin in Hausa thus identifying and promoting their culture of origin in Lagos. On the basis of this finding, we can say that to a great extent, the Hausa had carried their linguistic baggage with them. In terms of the host community language, only the HBL and a fraction of the HBN adopted Yoruba thus indexing biculturalism or a sense of belonging to two cultural spheres. Kramer (2003) described the situation as the paradoxical experience of someone who is both familiar and foreign at the same time. Simply put, it amounts to being here (new country) and there (state of origin). The effect of this biculturalism or linguistic syncretism is a positive attitude towards the language of the hosts as well as their own language of origin (objective two), in addition to a positive perception of their hosts (objective three). It could be drawn from this result that migrants who speak the host language have scaled the barrier called difference and so tend to have a better understanding, better mental disposition and better perception of their hosts and by extension, a better relationship. Otherwise, inter-cultural cohesion and co-existence will be marred by ethnocentrism, prejudice, mutual suspicion, fear, tension, and complicated by difference and boundaries. The assessment of the HBN lends credence to the notion that migrants who fail to integrate tend to have a negative perception of their hosts, (some of which are unfounded), and also a problematic relationship.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, C; Edwards, R and Temple B (2004).Using Interpreters to access services. Users view, York: Joseph Romtra Foundation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2009) “Strong Ties, Weak Ties and Human Capital”: Latino Immigration Empowerment outside the Enclaves. *Rural Sociology*, 74 (2) 241 – 269.
- Berry, J.W (2001). “A Psychology of Immigration”, *Journal of social Issues*, 57, 015-031.
- Bloor, T and Bloor.M. (2007).*The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis*. U.K: Hodder.
- Bourdien, P (1991). Language and Symbolic Power J.B Thomson (ed).
- Commission for European Communities (2005). “A Common Agenda for Integration Framework for the integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union.
- Constant A.F; Nottmeyer, O. Zimmerman, K.F (2009).“Cultural Integration in Germany”.*IZA Discussion paper* No. 4675.
- De Lima, P; Jentsch, B; Wheltoon, R (2005) “Migrants in the Highlands and Islands”.*Inverness: Highland and Islands*.
- Donato, K.M; Tolbert, C.M; Nucci, A and Kawano, T. (2007) “Recent Immigration Settlements in the Nonmetropolitan United States: evidence from Internal Census Data”. *Rural Sociology*, 72 (4) 537 -559.
- Garcia, F. F. (2011). “Integration and language attitudes of the African Population living in Jaen”.*Language Design* 13 (1) 5-27.
- Gowrichan, R (2009). “Changing form of Transnationalism” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 32 (9) 1619 – 1638.
- Gritto, R. D (2001).Transnational Migration and Multiculturation in Europe. Oxford: ESRC *transnational Communities Working Paper* WPTC-01-08.
- Hall, S (1980). “Cultural Identity and Diaspora, in Jonathan Rutherford (ed). *Identities Community, Culture, Difference*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Isphording. I.E. (2015) “What drives the language proficiency of Immigrants? *IZA World of Labour* , paper 177.
- Jimenez, T. R and Walter, M (2005) “Assessing Immigration Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges”. *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:105-125.
- Korth, B. (2003). *Language Attitudes Towards Kyrgyz and Russian*, Bern: Peter Langue.
- Kramer, E. M (2003). *The Emerging Monoculture: Assimilation and their model minority*. Wesport CT: Prager.
- Kramer, E.M. (2000). “Cultural Fusion and the Defense of difference. In M.K. Asante and J.E. Mim (eds) *Sociocultural conflict between African and Korean Americans*, New York: University Press of America.
- Kruman, H.J and Plutar, V (2008) Tailoring Language provision and requirements to the needs and capacities of adult migrants <http://www/spx.tu-darmstadt.de/projekt>.
- Losifides, T; Laventiadou, M; Petracon, E and Kontis, A (2007). “Forms of Social Capital and the incorporation of Albanian Immigrants in Greece”. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 33 (8) 1343 – 1361.
- Markova, E and Black, R (2001) *East European Immigration and Community Cohesion* York: JRF.

- Martin, P (2009). *Importing Poverty: Immigration and the changing face of Rural America*. New Harm CT: Yale University press.
- McAreevey, R (2009) "Transcending cultural difference: the role of language in Migrants Integration". *Translocations: Migrants and Social change*.
- Parlento, P (2005). *Emotions and Multilingualism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perrenia, K.M; Chapman, M.V; Stein, G.1 (2006) "Becoming an American Parent, Overcoming Challenges and finding strength in a new immigrant Latino Community". *Journal of family issues* vol. 27 (10) 1383 – 1414.
- Pfeffer, M.J and Para, P (2006). *New Immigrants in Rural Communities: The Challenge of Integration*. *Social text* 24 (3) 81-98.
- Portes A (1997) "Immigration Theory for a new century: Some problems and opportunities". *International migration review*, vol. 31 (4) 799-825.
- Portes A and Rumbant, R (2001) *Legacies: The story of the immigrant Second generation* Berkely, CA: University of California Press.
- Ryan, L; Sales, R, Tifki, M and Sara B: (2008) "Social Support and Social capita: polish Migrants in London", *Sociology* 42 (4) 672 – 690.
- Simard, M. (2007). *Immigrant Integration Outside Montreal*. Institute national de la rechercheScientifique, University du Quebec.
- Tardif-Williams, C.Y and Fisher, L (2009) "Classifying the link between acculturation experience and parent-child relationships, among families in cultural transition: The promise of contemporary critiques of acculturation psychology". *International Journal of Intercultural relations* Vol. 1 (1) 1-18.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2000). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, U.K: Blackwell Publishers.