

Medumba language use by non-natives: factor of social integration or singularity

[Pratique de la langue medumba par les allogènes : facteur d'intégration sociale ou de singularité]

Madeleine Ngo Ndjeyihamnjeyiha@yahoo.fr

University of Yaoundé I, Cameroon

Jeff Sterline Ngami Kamagouajeffsterlingngami@gmail.com

University of Yaoundé I, Cameroon

Received: Jan 26, 2024; Accepted: Feb 26, 2024; Published: March 26, 2024;

Abstract: The increasing and diversified internal mobility in the periurban and rural areas of Cameroon leads to a proliferation of cultures and a close contact between native and migratory languages. In such a plurilingual context, the coexistence of languages, practices and varieties with varying status and symbolism can be a source of dynamisation or alteration of the autochthonous languages whose intergenerational transmission is challenged by a defy of originality. This article examines the sociolinguistic impact of Medumba language use by non-natives, thereby addressing the following question: what is the sociolinguistic impact of Medumba language use by non-natives ? The theory of interactionism which examines the interaction between language and society in order to understand the language practices resulting from situations of languages in contact, frames this study. It argues that the permanent contact between languages and the interaction between their speakers have a considerable impact on their structures and uses. The analysis is based on previous work, verbal interactions and oral information collected through direct observation techniques, surveys and semi-structured interviews with informants. It reveals that, Medumba language use by non-native speakers leads to the emergence of a composite language, representing an hybrid variety that incorporates the different cultural and social realities of the non natives communities. The use of those composite languages represents a communicative strategy implemented by non-natives to preserve their culture thereby ensuring communication with natives for “un meilleur vivre ensemble”..

Keywords: Medumba language, dynamism, autochthonous languages, non-natives, interaction .

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

La mobilité interne de plus en plus accrue et diversifiée dans les zones périurbaine et rurales du Cameroun entraîne un foisonnement de cultures et un contact de proximité entre les langues autochtones et migratoires. Dans cet environnement foncièrement plurilingue, la coexistence entre langues, pratiques et variétés, aux statuts et symboliques variés peut être source de dynamisation ou d'altération des langues autochtones dont la transmission intergénérationnelle se trouve challengée par un défi d'originalité. Cet article examine l'impact sociolinguistique de la pratique de la langue medumba par les allogènes en adressant la question suivante : quel est l'impact linguistique et sociétal de la pratique de la langue medumba par les allogènes ? La théorie de l'interactionnisme qui examine l'interaction entre la langue et la société en vue de l'appréhension des pratiques langagières résultantes des situations de langues en contact, encadre cette réflexion. Elle soutient que le contact permanent entre les langues et l'interaction entre ses locuteurs impactent considérablement leurs structures et leurs usages. L'analyse se base sur les travaux antérieurs, les interactions verbales et les informations orales collectées par les techniques de l'observation directe, l'enquête par le questionnaire et l'entretien semi-directif avec les informateurs. Elle révèle que l'usage des langues autochtones par les allogènes entraîne l'émergence d'un parler

~~composite représentant une variété hybride qui incorporent les réalités culturelles et sociales des~~
allogènes. L'usage de ces variétés est une stratégie communicative usitée par les non natifs pour préserver leurs réalités culturelles et sociales tout en assurant la communication avec les natifs pour un meilleur « vivre ensemble ».

Mots-clés: langue medumba, dynamisation, langues autochtones, allogènes, interaction

1. Introduction and the Research Problem

Whether in Africa, Europe or in the rest of the world, migratory phenomena are accompanied by language contact and linguistic variation. They create the desire for integration, interaction and generate situations of plurilingualism that gradually make linguistic homogeneity a myth and a scientific curiosity. From a sociolinguistic point of view, this linguistic diversity is reflected on heterogeneous language practices produced by plurilingual speakers with varied linguistic skills, resources, and repertoires (Léglise 2017). In addition, it represents a major challenge for the protection of indigenous and minority languages. According to Piebop (2019), in a situation of multilingualism, there are cases where languages assume equal or different status, strength and power. Some languages may, depending on the types of relationships they have, become neutralized or, on the contrary, become dominant. Some languages may, depending on the types of relationships they have, become neutralized or, on the contrary, dominant. The languages in the process of being dominated can in some ways, develop strategies to revitalize themselves and counter the hegemony of the dominant languages, or they can accept this domination and in some ways, cooperate peacefully. The Medumba cultural area is a multilingual environment characterized by a long term coexistence between indigenous and migratory languages of other localities and regions of Cameroon. . As in all situations of language in contact, this coexistence involves either a peaceful collaboration characterized by an alternate use of indigenous and non-indigenous languages or a conflictual collaboration characterized by a preponderance of indigenous or migrant languages in social communication as well as a structural impact of migrant languages on indigenous languages and vice versa.

This study questions the sociolinguistic impact of Medumba use by non-native speakers. The research question involves a deep analysis of the impact at the level of the language and the society. More precisely, it examines on one side whether the use of Medumba by non-natives is characterized by a decontextualization of the uses or a dynamization somehow. On the other hand, it takes a look on the socialization of non-native speakers with the view to see if their practice of the Medumba language represents a factor of integration or singularity.

In its sociolinguistic acception, the dynamization of a language means the phonological, morphological or lexical enrichment of the language by the introduction of items reflecting the imported realities, foreign to the culture of the natives. In addition, it can lead to the development of alternative language practices, resulting from intercultural assimilation. The decontextualization of a language implies the modification of the language by the non-natives in order to better adapt it to the needs of communication. It is also reflected on conflicts of subsistence between the altered and the original languages.

The first question of the problematic, that is, the impact of the practice of non-natives on the language is observed from the point of view of native speakers through the direct observation of and indirect observations interactions between non-natives and natives. The second question of the problematic, that is, the societal impact of is observed from the point of view of non-natives through the same methodological process. The study is organized as follow: firstly, the state of the research is given through various previous publications addressing different aspects of the phenomenon under study. Secondly, theoretical framework and research methodology are presented. In the fourth point, the results of research are shown and discussed. The study ends with orientations and recommendations regarding the protection of native languages in Cameroon.

2. State of the Research

Languages contact and linguistic interaction between native and non-native speakers have drawn a wide attention in sociolinguistics and still witnessed extensive researches. Many of the publications have adopted an interdisciplinary approach to the discussion of the subject. They have also widened the debate over native languages acquisition and practice by non-natives with relevant issues and unprecedented contributions.

The Zinszer et al's (2014) view of native language acquisition, learning and practice by non-natives focused on lexical categorization and dual challenge in vocabulary learning. They tested Chinese-English bilinguals in China and in the US on a lexical categorization task and examined which L2

learner's language history variables (length of immersion, L2 training, age of L2 onset, and code-switching patterns) and language variables (e.g., native speaker agreement on picture naming) predict performance on this task. The authors reported that words with high name agreement and few alternate names elicited high performance; at the same time, immersion, age of L2 onset and code-switching patterns contributed positively to learners' performance.

Sköldvall (2015) investigated whether a non-native speaker interaction constitutes a good learning situation in the teaching of English as a foreign language in Swedish secondary schools. The discourse analysis performed in his study has provided detailed information on the interaction among intermediate language learners. Through a qualitative mode of analysis, it was possible to show how the pupils assisted each other in order to overcome problems and why the strategies and techniques that they used can facilitate the learning process. Breakdowns in communication occur frequently in the studied conversations between non-natives speakers of English since they acquired it differently. To instantly repair their lacks and achieve collective comprehension, the speakers prefer the other-repair approach. In other words, they collaborate and help each other to produce acceptable contributions to the interaction. When they lack a specific vocabulary item, they replace it with a similar word and incorporate it into the turn. As such, they do not halt the conversation when a key word is missing but find ways to circumvent the problem.

Focusing on behavioral and neuroimaging researches, Pliatsikas & Chondrogianni (2015) indicate that it is largely accepted in the relevant literature that successful learning of one or more non-native languages is affected by a number of factors that are independent of the target language(s) per se; these factors include the age of acquisition of the target language (s), the type and amount of instructions learners have received, as well as the amount of language use that the learners demonstrate. Besides, recent experimental evidence suggests that one crucial factor for efficient native-like performance in the non-native language is the amount of naturalistic exposure, or immersion, that the learners receive to that language. This can be broadly defined as the degree to which language learners use their non-native language outside the classroom and for their day-to-day activities, and usually presupposes that the learners live in an environment where their non-native language is exclusively or mostly spoken.

Liddicoat (2016) provided a deep analysis of native and non-native speakers' identities in interaction. He believes that interaction between native and non-native speakers is characterized by a relationship of power. The relative power of native speakers and non-native speaker's as language users comes to shape the nature of interactions. In interactions with native Speakers, there are two potentially salient positioning for non-native speakers: language user and language learner. As a communicator, the non-native speakers acts as a language user. When, however, the focus of interaction moves from the content of communication to the form of communication, this reconstructs the user as a learner and as a deficient communicator. When this is the case, the native and the non-native speaker are brought into an inequality as speakers of the language that is based on the ideology of the native speaker as the ideal, competent language user. In these interactions, the native speaker takes up a position as having greater cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1982) than the non-native speaker by right of his/her knowledge of the language as native speaker. In such instances, linguistic affiliation is used as a basis for differentiation and to construct an asymmetry that confers status on the native speakers on the basis of the native speakers having something which the non-natives speakers as learner is presumed, to want and to lack linguistic competence.

3. Theoretical Framework

This research is driven in the light of the theory of interactionism as developed by Goffman (1973, 1974, 1987), Gumperz (1962, 1964, 1968, 1969, 1982, 1989a, 1989b, 1989c), Hymes (1967, 1972, 1974, 1984, 1991), (2009), Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974), Strauss (1992), Sacks (1992), Schegloff (1992), etc. which represent the second generation of researchers who contributed to the scientific expansion of interactionism in the 1950's -1990's, and Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1989, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1994, 2005, 2009), Winkin (2001), Becker (2004) Cooter & Reutzler (2004), Codleanu (2009), etc. representing further authors who contributed to the enrichment of this theoretical field. In this section, we will briefly discuss the consistency of interactionism, focusing on languages acquisition and practice.

Interactionism is a multidisciplinary theoretical framework involving sciences of the physical world, human and social sciences. According to Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1998), interactionism is not a homogenous scientific domain, but rather an imported notion from both a geographical and a disciplinary point of view. It is in the field of American sociology that this notion has simultaneously received its theoretical status, and its descriptive effectiveness. In linguistics, social interaction addresses among the others, issues of languages acquisition, language practice, languages interaction and interpersonal communication. It is based on the principle that linguistic structures and uses are formed through interaction and it aims at helping understanding how languages are shaped through interaction. In addition, it assumes that language acquisition is influenced by the interaction of a number of factors such as: physical, linguistic, cognitive, and social (Cooter & Reutzler, 2004).

Following Dell Hymes (1972), social interaction at the language level requires contextualization. Because, it is not enough to use a language or to know how to speak its grammatical and ungrammatical sentences well, but to know the contexts in which languages can be used with relevance within a community. For this reason, he speaks of the ethnography of communication, stigmatized in the notion of "speaking". At the interpersonal communication level, Goffman (1973: 23) speaks about the face to face interaction, which he designated as the reciprocal influence that the participants exert on their respective actions when they are in immediate physical presence of others. On the other hand, Goffman discussed the relevance the notion of stigma in conversational interaction. He indicated that stigmata consist of attaching an image to a speaker, basing on language skills and more specifically on oral competences in a given language.

Thus, interactionism is the most relevant and appropriate approach to understand verbal interaction and address language acquisition and practice issues in linguistics (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1998). The analysis of autochthonous languages use by non-natives initiated in this paper is essentially based on verbal interactions. It involves a deep examination of the different linguistics resources used in interactions, with the prime objective to provide facts that will allow a holistic impact of autochthonous languages used by non-natives. At the methodological level, interactionism is a corpus-based analysis, since it privileges the interpretation of a scientific phenomenon from the point of view of the informant and follows the descriptive empiricism, which implies, work from corpora made up of recordings of interactions that are as authentic as possible. The next section provides information on data collection and method of analysis.

4. Data Collection and Method of Analysis

This study is accompanied by a flood of publications on the subject, which helped to have the necessary information resources to design the conceptual framework of the analysis and to grasp the significance and the relevance of the problem. Using the sample of convenience, the data were collected from natives and non natives through individual and collective interviews, which have been addressed to them at the different stages of the research (between 2022-2023), in order to collect progressively, necessary and useful information of the analysis. The native speakers have been chosen following some principles like the age and the mastery of the language and the Medumba community history. The factor of age was determinant to provide a diachronic study of the interaction and influence relationship between native and non-native languages over the years. We selected participants of 70, 50 and 30 years so that we shall obtain sufficient linguistic elements to discuss the above mentioned issue. As for non-natives, we have selected the necessary participants in the two localities retained as the sample of the analysis. The aim was to provide an objective analysis based on data from linguistic communities geographically or not geographically related to the Medumba community. Considering the affective factor that governs the relationship between Medumba and its geographically close languages, the languages of the Grassfields for instance, we considered as relevant, the inclusion of data provided by the Grassfield communities present in the Medumba cultural area. We assumed that the complementary relationship between Medumba and several Grassfields languages characterized by the introduction of processes such as code switching and code mixing in order to ensure an inter-comprehension and a representativeness of the codes, impacted the use of Medumba.

The data obtained was made up of discourses through the direct observation; oral, qualitative (and quantitative) information which particularly provide more insight to the understanding of the

phenomenon. As indicated earlier, the analysis follows in general the empiric-inductive, a corpus-based approach involving interpretation of scientific phenomena from the point of view of informants, i.e., through corpora made up of authentic recordings of interactions and discourses that shall lead to the deep understating of the different segments of a phenomenon before any analysis and interpretation. In particular, a morpho-syntactic study of the data leads to the identification of word and word processes through which items have been introduced in the discourse by non-natives and accepted by the Medumba community for communication purposes. Pragmatics involves here deals with contextual features of interactions. The context is used at the basis for interpreting what is said and decoding why it is said (Ehineni 2016). In this case, the study of the data from a socio-pragmatic standpoint contributes to the understanding of the logic of the insertion and acceptance of lexical items in the Medumba discourse and by extension, the Medumba linguistic community. Also, it helps to understand the context and motivation surrounding the alternation between native and non-native languages in the Medumba cultural area.

5. Results and Discussion

The results of this research will be presented and discussed in this section which is the core point of the study in which the descriptive and analytic scheme of the linguistic impact of Medumba language used by non-natives is constructed. It is designed in the discussion of the following questions addressed to informants through individual and collective semi-structured interviews.

5.1. The linguistic impact of Medumba language use by non-natives

This first subsection is dedicated to the impact of the Medumba language used by the non-natives at the level of the structure and the practice of the language. Let's remind that the analysis has been provided basing on the point of view of the native speakers. After a clear explanation of the phenomenon and the key concepts, these questions have been addressed to the informants.

Conclusion

This study aims to determine the level of stress and satisfaction of pre-service teachers in online learning during the Covid 19 pandemic. The study was able to identify the level of stress and satisfaction of Pre-service teachers in an online learning set-up during the Covid 19 pandemic. It was revealed that pre-service teachers are unsure if they are stressed in online learning before the covid 19 as they have no experienced online learning before the covid 19 outbreak but very stressful during the covid 19

pandemic. On the other hand, it was also revealed that the preservice teachers were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the online learning set-up that they had experienced during the Covid 19 pandemic.

- 1) Do you know some non-natives that are among you?

| Answers | Numbers | Percentages |
|---------|---------|-------------|
| Yes | 50 | 100 % |
| No | 0 | 0% |

Table N⁰1: Identification of the non natives 1

- 2) If yes where do they come from?

- A- *The West region*
- B- *Bamenda and Anglophones communities*
- C- *The Northern part of Cameroon*
- D- *The rest*

| Answers | Numbers | Percentages |
|---------|---------|-------------|
| A | 50 | 100% |
| B | 50 | 100 % |
| C | 50 | 100 % |
| D | 5 | 10% |

Table N^o2: Identification of the non natives 2

This question was a strategic introduction of the study, leading us to perceive the level of knowledge of the Medumba community by the natives. As the answers indicate, the Medumba community that is at the localities of the Ndé Division is made up of non-natives originating from various regions of Cameroon. Let us noted that we conducted the survey in Tonga and Bangangté, given the strong attractiveness of these localities and the fact that they provide a general view of the phenomenon under study. The participants indicated that they have a perfect knowledge of the foreigners present among them. They noted a strong presence of people coming from the West region, that they called "Ngraphi" meaning "Grassfields". In addition, they indicated a strong presence of people from Bamenda and others Anglophone communities of the North-West Region. In the answer C, of the second table, respondents indicated a strong presence of the people originated from the North regions, that they usually called "Nordistes" for the young and "Yaoussa" for the less young. The fourth category of foreigners very weakly represented in the Medumba community is what we call "the rest". It includes foreigners from all other localities other than those mentioned above. The natives call them "nkrwah", a name very commonly used to designate the Beti-fang and the people of the coast.

3) Do you speak the Medumba language with non-natives ?

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 38 | 76 % |
| No | 12 | 24 % |

Table N^o 3: Medumba language use by non-natives 1

4) If yes, how do you appreciate the use of medumba by them?

A- *Foreigners have a decontextualized communication style;*

B- *Foreigners express themselves in a rudimentary style;*

C- *Foreigners communicate by including expressions specific to their cultures*

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| A | 10 | 20% |
| B | 15 | 30 % |
| C | 25 | 50 % |

Table N^o 4: Medumba language use by non-natives 2

The issue of language used by non-native speakers is not unanimous among the respondents. As we can see in Table 3, the minority of informants indicates that foreign speakers do not speak the native language. The reasons given by the later are related to the motivation for learning and using the language. Therefore, to ensure an efficient communication, natives prefer to speak French language with foreigners coming from the French-speaking regions and English or Pidgin-English most of the time, with those coming from the English-speaking regions. Thus, the possibility of using French and Pidgin-English as palliative linguistic choices is a fundamental motivation for the lacks observed in Medumba learned and used by foreigners. Also, cultural preservation is an additional motivation of the lack of practice of the language by non-natives. Informants believe that non-natives do not learn and practice the local language in order to preserve their culture and protect themselves from the phenomenon of cultural engulfment or alteration.

In the second language acquisition process, several studies have examined the factors that frame the practice and demonstrated that cultural preservation may be at the root of resistance to native language use. According to Bretegnier (1999), second language use, whether socially high or minority, is problematic for community integration and acceptance. Learning and practicing the language is a means through which speakers can feel recognized in the linguistic community to which they are seeking admission. However, it implies somehow the loss of the language and the redefinition of the linguistic identity, which calls into question the real social identity of the subject. In another form, Laponce (1984) thinks that acquisition, prior to the practice of the language, is essentially motivated by intention. When

the intention is instrumental and the effect is also purely instrumental, linguistic identity is not in question. However, an intention which, at the beginning, could be purely instrumental can have disintegrating effects. We then observe, in certain subjects who fear losing their basic linguistic identity, a certain resistance to the acquisition of the second language. He adds that speaker need the foreign language as an instrument of communication, so he learns it; but he fears that its acquisition will separate him and distinguish him from the ethnic group which gives him his social identity.

The great majority of informants believe that the Medumba language is a means of communication very often used by non-native speakers in their interactions with native speakers. In order to obtain a global opinion of the practice of the Medumba language by non-natives, we questioned the informants about the use of this language among children, young people and old speakers. The answers of the respondents provided relevant informations that we have grouped into three levels of language, namely common speech, decontextualized speech and composite speech, allowing us to follow the objective of the study.

Common speech is used by non-native speakers with a basic knowledge of the language. It is more used by children and young people and is characterized by a rudimentary expression. Decontextualized speech is used by speakers with a good knowledge of the language, of the community and with a communicative style close to that of the native speakers, but different with regard to contextualization. The expressions produced are certainly well pronounced and arranged in terms of syntax and semantics, but from the point of view of the context and pragmatic constraints, they lack of certain components, notably proverbs, appreciative expressions, adages, adjectives, etc. The informants noted that this communicative style is recognized in people who have spent a very long time in the community and have learned the language in immersion, that is, in a context of exposure to the realities of the language. Language learning in a language immersion context has specificities and similarities with acquisition that many researchers in second language acquisition have scrutinized. According to Moret (2011), learning is a more laborious process because it is "conscious" and requires effort, whereas acquisition is a more natural phenomenon that occurs (almost) unconsciously. The immersion method is certainly on the borderline between the two processes. At the root of immersion, is the assumption that learning a foreign language can be based on mechanisms similar to those underlying natural language acquisition. In the immersive perspective, communicative competence benefits from a real-life communicative context and a broader and easier level of adaptation to interactions. Immersion can be applied in different ways. However, the continuous exposure to language practice leads to the development of new communicative skills in a more natural way.

The third level of language expression is the composite speech, characterized by a code mixing, a practice by assimilation and a lexical, semantic and pragmatic incorporation. It is more used by older people (between 50 and 65) with a proven knowledge and easy expression in both codes. In addition, it is more used by speakers of the Grassfields community, due to the proximity between the Medumba language and the Grassfield languages. Informants indicate that it is a communicative style that is very much integrated in the interactions between natives and non-natives speakers of this age group and especially a dynamic style in the practice of Medumba. It is a specific language, modeled by the older generation, because it reflects their perception that a young person can neither understand nor use. Piebop (2019) believes that this practice contributes to the dynamization of the language, insofar as it creates changes in the language that covers for the most part the areas of borrowing, proso-/ phonology, connotations of idiomatic expressions, derivation, trans-categorization, periphrases, calques, onomatopoeia, etc. In the same vein, Blanchet (2010) believes that a society is a system of cultural exchanges with symbolic values. In any society, ethno-socio-linguistic communication is fundamental to ensure understanding and communicative harmony between individuals. Regular social relations with people lead either to an occultation of otherness (ignorance of the relativity of cultural systems, and thus linguistic systems), or to a progressive integration of the interpretative references of others into one's own linguistic and cultural repertoire. The encounter with people leads to an appropriation of linguistic and cultural reference points and resources in the form of an uncontrolled, possibly insecure juxtaposition.

1.1. The social impact of Medumba language use by non-natives

This subsection is focused on non-native speakers. It aims to capture the social effect generated by

their use of the Medumba language. After a clear explanation of their scope, we addressed the following questions to the informants:

5) Why are you speaking in Medumba ?

A- *Only for communication*

B- *To integrate easily into the Medumba community*

C- *To communicate and be accepted*

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| A | 10 | 28,57% |
| B | 15 | 42,85% |
| C | 10 | 28,57% |

Table N° 5: motivation of Medumba language use by non-natives

This question was addressed purposely, considering the impacts of motivation in language learn, use and social integration. As the table indicates, the minority of informants indicate that they communicate in Medumba for strictly communicative purposes, that is, when a specific situation requires the use of the language. This type of motivation is found among non-natives who are strongly represented in the Medumba community, particularly non-natives from the Northern part of Cameroon and speakers from English-speaking regions. The majority of the informants indicated that they use the Medumba language to communicate. In a general observation, we find people who have a real project of inclusion and participation in the life of the community and who see the language as an entity carrying an additional cultural identity to which they wish to be defined. In order to facilitate the integration of foreign communities, community leaders, including the Chieftancies and representatives of community groups have implemented a number of strategies. At the level of the higher chieftaincy, land has been granted to foreigners to allow them to settle down and develop their abilities. This is how new neighborhoods have been created in the community, such as the Hausa quarter. At the neighborhood level, a mandatory neighborhood committee has been implemented to bring together natives and foreigners for mutual and deep knowledge and assistance. In these committees, foreigners have the opportunity to express themselves in the official languages, Pidgin-English or Medumba. In the community groups, communication is mainly done in the local language. Although there is no official requirement to speak the local language, members need to know it in order to interact easily. This represents a challenge for non-natives who want to integrate into these groups.

6) Does speaking the Medumba language allow you to integrate into the community?

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| Yes | 35 | 100 % |
| No | 0 | 0 % |

Table N° 6: Medumba language use as a factor of integration of non-natives 1

7) If yes, how would you describe this integration?

A- *The community accepts us as part of theirs*

B- *The community includes us in their community activities*

C- *The natives constantly communicate with us in the local language*

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| A | 0 | 0% |
| B | 20 | 57,14 % |
| C | 15 | 42,85 % |

Table N° 7: Medumba language use as a factor of integration of non-natives 2

As we can see in Table 6 above, the issue of language practice as a factor of integration is unanimously supported by the respondents. They believe that language use represents a strong lever of social integration; it breaks down barriers of inclusion and reveals an effort of integration that is rewarded by interaction with native speakers in the local language and the inclusion in community activities (see Table 7). However, language use alone does not ensure a full integration. Consider the following questions:

8) How can you describe the non-integration of native speakers?

A- *The community considers us as foreigners although we speak the language*

B- *The natives communicate with us with difficulty in the Medumba language, considering our practice as singular*

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|--------|--------|------------|
| A | 18 | 51,42% |
| B | 17 | 48,57% |

Table N° 8: Medumba language use as a factor of singularity of non-natives

As Table 8 shows, speaking the local language does not guarantee to be considered as a native speaker. The differentiation or singularization of non-native speakers is perceptible in the subjective reactions of the speakers, which can consist of stigmatization or attestation, the valorization or devaluation of a particular phonic realization, a particular syntactic structure, the use of a particular lexeme, etc. Social integration is a more global and profound look on the practice of the language. It involves the implementation of communicative strategies that contribute to the apprehension of the communication apparatus in a given linguistic community. As Gumperz (1972) points out, in the broader perspective of a description of the speech patterns of an individual, a group or an entire society, the study of integration represents a possible look at a whole that includes: attitudes, opinions and values; economy of speech; personal voice. Attitude, as a response to a situation, has a dynamic character. Focusing on his experiences, a speaker readjusts his attitudes, seeking to adopt those that are more successful, that integrate him more. The attitude is therefore not a data constructed in an isolated way: it is in the interaction and according to the others that the subject adopts such or such attitude. Thus, the attitude has a primordial function in the social integration process, since it is a means of expressing one's values and opinions (Bretegnier 1999).

2. Conclusion and Perspective

This article examines the sociolinguistic impact of the practice of the Medumba language by non-native speakers, in a context characterized by internal migratory phenomena in Cameroon. The analysis of the data, in the light of interactionism theory, reveals that the use of the Medumba language by non-native speakers leads to the emergence of three levels of language speaking, namely the common language, decontextualized and composite speech. At the social level, the use of the language is an asset for the integration of Non-Natives speakers into community groups, representing what we call the third level of social integration, implemented in the community, in which communication is essentially in Medumba. However, this integration is limited, given that the natives consider the language practice of the non-natives as singular and different from their own. This situation leads to the use of official languages, namely French and Pidgin-English to communicate respectively with the French and English-speaking non-natives. This research is in line with the current socio-political context in Cameroon, given that the state is looking for a way to live together among citizens. It can safely come to the conclusion that these communities are a model of “vivre ensemble”. It shows how the natives and non-natives of the Medumba community at Bangangté and Tonga interact from the language use point of view, live together and closely with their respective communities when necessary, without any alteration of their social relationship as well as their living together.

3. Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

4. Fundings

The study has been driven with the author's fund. It has not benefited from any external fund.

5. The survey

The data of the study have been collected using two survey, namely the survey adressed to native s and non-native. They have been written in French considering the fact that 80% of the informants are Francophones.

REFERENCES:

- Bourdieu, P.**, (1982). *Ce que parler veut dire. L'économie des échanges linguistiques*. Paris : Fayard.
- Blanchet, Ph, Coste, D.**, (2010). *Regards critiques sur la notion d'«interculturalité» : Pour une didactique de la pluralité linguistique et culturelle*, Paris, L'Harmattan, pp. 9-20.
- Chiss, J-L. & Puech, C.**, (1989). Enonciation, interaction, conversation : les théories linguistiques entre le psychique et le social. In *Histoire Epistemologie Langage*, 11-11, 7-36.
- Cooter, R. B. & Reutzel, D. R.**, (2004). *Teaching children to read: Putting the pieces together*. Upper Sadle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Calafato, R.**, (2019). The non-native speaker teacher as proficient multilingual: A critical review of research from 2009-2018. In *Lingua* 227 (2019) 102700. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2019.06.001>
- Codleanu, M.**, (2009). Linguistique interactionniste et enseignement des langues. In *Synergies Roumanie*, n° 4, pp. 189-200.
- Gregori, N.**, (1996). Question et enchaînement conversationnel. In *Interaction & Cognitions*, 1, 79-89.
- Hymes. D. H.**, (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In McNamara (éd.), *Problems of bilingualism*, Journal of Social Issues, XXIII, 2.
- , (1972). Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life. In John J. Gumperz & Dell Hymes (Ed.). *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. New York, Chicago: Holt Rinehart and Winston, pp. 35-71.
- , (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics. An ethographic approach*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania University Press.
- , (1984). *Vers la compétence de la communication*. Paris, Hatier-Crédif
- , (1991). *Vers la compétence de communication*, Hatier-Crédif, (LAL), Paris, 219 p.
- , (2000) *Vers la compétence de communication*, Paris, Didier.
- Kerbat, Orecchioni, C.**, (1989). L'approche interactionnelle en linguistique. In *L'interaction*, association des sciences du langage, Buscilla, 7-25.
- , (1990). *L'interaction verbale*, T1. Paris, Armand Collin
- , (1992). *L'interaction verbale*, T2. Paris, Armand Collin
- , (1994). *L'interaction verbale*, T3. Paris, Armand Collin
- , (1997). *L'énonciation. De la subjectivité dans le langage*, Paris, Colin, 290 p.
- , (1998). La notion d'interaction en linguistique : origine, apports, bilan. In *La linguistique comme discipline en France*. Langue française, n°117, pp. 51-67. <https://doi.org/10.3406/lfr.1998.6241>
- , (2005). *Le discours en interaction*. Paris, Armand Collin
- , (2009). La place de l'interprétation en Analyse du Discours en Interaction. In *Signes, Discours et Sociétés [online], Perspectives croisées sur le dialogue*. <http://www.revue-signes.infodocument.php?id=821>
- Liddicoat, A. J.**, (2016). Native and non-native speaker identities in interaction: Trajectories of power. In *Applied Linguistics Review*, August 2016
- Grumperz, J.**, (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: CLP.
- Leglise, I.**, (2017). Multilinguisme et hétérogénéité des pratiques langagières. Nouveaux chantiers et enjeux du Global South. In *Langage et Société*. Paris: Maison des Sciences de L'homme, pp.251-266.
- Liddicoat, A. J.**, (2016). Native and non-native speaker identities in interaction: Trajectories of power. In *Applied linguistics*. August 2016. <https://www.doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2016-0018>
- Becker, H. S.**, (1999). The Chicago School, so-called. *Qualitative Sociology*, 22, 3-12.
- , (2004). Quelques idées sur l'interaction. In BLANC M. & PESSIN A. (dir.), *L'Art du terrain. Mélanges offerts à Howard S. Becker*, Paris, Éditions L'Harmattan, pp. 245-265
- Strauss, A. L.**, (1992). *La trame de la négociation : sociologie qualitative et interactionnisme*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Goffman, E.**, (1973). *La mise en scène de la vie quotidienne. Tome 1: La présentation de soi*, Paris, Éditions de Minuit, coll. "Le Sens Commun".
- , (1974). Perdre la face ou faire bonne figure? In E. Goffman (Éd.), *Les rites d'interaction*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, pp. 9-42.

Gumperz, J. J. & Hymes D. H. (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. New York, Chicago: Holt Rinehart and Winston

Gumperz, J. J., (1964). Linguistic and social interactions in two communities. In *American Anthropologist* n° 66 : 37 - 53.

-----., (1968). The speech community. In *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, vol. 9 : 381 - 386.

-----., (1969). Communication in multilingual Societies. In S. TYLOR (éd.), *Cognitive anthropology*, Holt, Rinehart, et Winston.

-----., (1982). *Discourse Strategies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

-----., (1989a). *Sociolinguistique interactionnelle. Une approche interprétative*. Paris : l'Harmattan.

-----., (1989b). *Engager la conversation. Introduction à la Sociolinguistique interactionnelle*. Paris, Minuit.

-----., (1989c). Cadrer et comprendre. Une politique de la conversation. In Erving Goffman *Le parler frais d'Erving Goffman*, Actes du Colloque "Lecture d'Erving Goffman en France", Cerisy-la-Salle, 1987, Minuit, Paris.

Piebop, C. M. G., (2019). Vers un Pidgin-English jeune en zone anglophone du Cameroun ? In *Cognition, représentation, langage* [En ligne], Vol. 13, N° 2, DOI : 10.4000/corela.4132, <http://journals.openedition.org/corela/4132>

Pliatsikas, C., Chondrogianni, V., eds. (2015). *Learning a Non-Native Language in a Naturalistic Environment: Insights from Behavioural and Neuroimaging Research*. Lausanne: Frontiers Media. <https://www.doi.org/10.3389/978-2-88919-639-5>

5.

.