EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF COGNITIVE DISSONANCE TO YORUBA-ENGLISH BILINGUALS LANGUAGE SWITCH PRACTICE

Robbin Anjola
Department of Mass Communication & Media Technology
Lead City University, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on language switch and cognitive dissonance in the conversational discourse of Yoruba-English bilinguals. With the use of a questionnaire, it seeks to ascertain the role cognitive dissonance plays in determining or influencing code choice and its resultant effects on the second language.
The study shows that Language switch, borrowing and interference are: (a) strategies of a Yoruba-English bilingual speaker to make up for linguistic gaps created by cognitive discrepancies in the two languages; (b) the effect of a combination of socio-cultural cognitive factor that derives from the dominance or subordination of either of the languages that have come in contact which depends on the audience, topic and setting of conversation.
Keywords: Cognitive Dissonance, Language Switch, Bilingual, Cultural Interference

INTRODUCTION

The concept of language switch (a term, which in this study covers code switching, and mixing) has over the years been extensively researched on by sociolinguists and psycholinguists in attempts to identify those factors that influence the bilinguals, leading them to freely switch codes within a single conversation (Fishman 1967; Myers 1992; Poplack 1977).The English bilingual in an African society brings to the fore two languages that are different in terms of structure, syntax, phonology, morphological rules, as well as the background, education and social network of its users. Studies based on the clash between these two variables (language structure and second language user's cultural background) in the Nigerian context has led scholars to describe the features of the spoken English in Nigeria in an attempt to classify it into varieties (Banjo 1971; Bamgbose,1982; Jowit 1991). Another major criterion that has been used for investigating the cause of language switch is to regard the phenomenon either as a socio-linguistic tool   (i.e. one of the strategies available to a bilingual to convey meaning) or as a means of compensating for some language difficulty that might have arisen as a result of lapses between the two languages. In a multilingual society like ours, therefore, languages are assigned different roles, and the alternate use of more than one language becomes a rule rather than an exception. However, the need to alternate from one language to another is influenced by many factors including level of competence, societal acceptance/rating, desire to show solidarity, switching of role relationship, bridging language gaps and the suitability of a language to capture thoughts and feelings being expressed. English language is very important in the socio-educational and political affairs of Nigerians. It functions as the official language and the language of education right from the primary school up to the university level. In communities where English is used as a second language (henceforth abbreviated ESL), the first language (L1) has already been mastered to a considerable extent before contact with English (the second language or L2). The bilingual is thus faced with using two different languages, each reflecting different cultures, in communicating thoughts and worldview. Language switch is one of the ways this is achieved. It is believed that speaking more than one language within a single conversation is indicative of some linguistic leakage hence a sign of incompetence or confusion in learning more than one language. It is also seen as a transitional stage of learning whereby one language starts dominating the other. However, research has shown that language switch is, as a matter of fact, a very powerful linguistic tool which can be employed by bilingual speakers to negotiate, challenge or change different role relationships.
This study attempts to show the reality of cognitive dissonance among Yoruba-English bilinguals and how it dictates the code choices of the bilinguals. It reviews how this reality manifests itself as interference in the second

*Corresponding Author: **Robbin Anjola** E-mail: anjolaelyon@yahoo.com*

Empirical Analysis of the Contributions of Cognitive Dissonance to Yoruba-English Bilinguals Language Switch Practice

language. The study aims at pointing a search light on the issue of language independence and how it relates to the concept of cognitive dissonance between the cognition of the two languages at the resource of the Yoruba-English bilingual and how it influences and reflects in his code choice. As a useful framework, the functional approach to language is used with a view to exploring the purposes that alternating two different languages serve bilinguals and how these purposes are achieved. This framework seeks to use the theory of cognitive dissonance as a guide to seek to explain whether language is shaped and selected by the cognitive realities of the bilingual. The major research questions that will form the basis of its investigation are as follows:

1.   Do Yoruba-English bilinguals switch codes during conversation?
2.   If they do, what role does cognitive dissonance play in influencing this switch?
3.   What are the characteristic features of such language switch that brings the reality of cognitive dissonance to the fore in either of his code choice?

METHODOLOGY

The data used in this study was collected from 100 Yoruba-English bilingual undergraduates selected from University of Ibadan and IgbinedionUniversity,Okada. The selection was made from English department and any two departments in the humanities from the two institutions. The questionnaire used is divided into three sections. Section A elicits personal information such as age, sex and time of acquisition of the second language. Section B elicits responses relating to choice of code in different situations, the reason and effects created, while Section C deals with attitudinal questions in which respondents are required to indicate their levels of agreement/disagreement with certain statements about the use of Yoruba or English, or Yoruba and English. The questionnaire sought answers to how, with whom, and why bilinguals code switch. The statistic analysis to be used is Independent Sample Test. This is used to compare the means of two independent samples. There are two key concepts here: the measurement, whose average or mean will be taken in two separate groups, that is the null hypothesis, which we presume to be true, and the alternative hypothesis we accept to be true if the facts against the former are strong enough. The research hypotheses are subjected to this statistical hypothesis testing procedure which produces a p-value. If this p-value is less than 0.05, then we reject the null hypothesis and assume the alternative hypothesis to be true.

This research resulted in the generation of the following hypotheses which this study sets out to test:

(a)   Language switch is not a regular feature among Yoruba-English bilingual undergraduates.
(b)   The cognition (knowledge) of first language does not in anyway influence that of the second language.
(c)   There is a one-to-one correlation between the referents of a first language and that of a second language as different languages express the same worldviews.
(d)   Yoruba-English bilinguals switch languages only as a socio-linguistic tool and not as a means of compensating for some language difficulty caused by cognitive dissonance.

BILINGUALISM/THE BILINGUAL

The concept of bilingualism has been extensively researched by scholars from different perspectives such as the psychological, sociological, linguistic and anthropological standpoints, all with the aim of ascertaining who exactly is bilingual, the consequences of bilingualism, the societal effects and advantages of being bilingual as well as its function. Being a multidimensional concept, bilingualism refers to several levels of proficiency in two languages, and the non-linguistic dimensions like, competence, cognitive organization, age of acquisition, socio-cultural status and cultural identity (Hamer and Blanc, 1990). Pertinent to this study is the description of bilingualism proposed by Macney (1968:556) who defined bilingualism as behavioral pattern of mutually modifying linguistic practices which varies in *degree, function, alternation* and interference.

The question of "*degree*" deals with how well an individual knows a language; in other words, how bilingual a person is. "*Function*" has to do with what a person uses the languages in his speech repertoire for, i.e. the roles his languages play in his total pattern of linguistic behavior. Macney explained the "*alternation*" of how a bilingual code switches from one language to another and the conditions that guide the change, "*Interference*", that is how well the bilingual keeps his languages apart and how one language influences the other. However, to say that a bilingual is fluent in a second language is like equating his competence in all the components of language (syntax, phonetics, semantics, and morphology) with that of a native speaker.

A bilingual may be Coordinate (A bilingual with the ability to speak two different languages differently with the knowledge of the roles each can play), Subordinate- (the bilingual who is fluent or competent in one language but not as fluent in the other), compound bilingual would have one set of meaning with two linguistic systems tied to them. The coordinate bilingual has two sets of meaning and two linguistic systems tied to them (Weinreich,

1968). Lastly, the Incipient bilingual is however, at a transitional or elementary stage of learning where communication is highly deficient and with prolonged contact with the second language, proficiency increases, which makes this type of bilingualism transient. This coexistence of languages puts languages at rivalry and in conflict with each one favoured or not by various factors such as their usefulness, their prestige and their diffusion. The individual, the individual is bilingual; is directed toward making choices between the languages, alternating the languages (CS), mixing the languages(CM), as well as the languages overlapping each other(Interference) at all levels of language (semantic, linguistic, phonological, syntactic).These inevitable consequences of bilingualism can occur at both the individual and the community level.

CS is thus a dynamic linguistic choice, which serves as a mark of skill rather than performance errors where the speaker makes linguistic choices according to linguistic and social constraints in the society. And a switch in language emphasizes a change in situation or the topic (Bloom and Gumperz,1982)

According to Auer (1984), by this contrast, speakers are able to construe the conversational context in two ways: (1) they are able to display, as well as ascribe to other participants, language competence and preference; and (2) they are able to accomplish conversational tasks, e.g indicate side remarks, introduce new topics, setoff reported speech, mark preferred responses.

THEORY OF COGNITIVE DISSONANCE

Cognitive dissonance theory developed by Leon Festinger(1957) , is concerned with the relationships among cognitions. Cognition, for the purpose of this research, may be regarded as a piece of knowledge. Such knowledge may be an attitude, behaviour or a value. For instance, the knowledge that I like the colour pink is cognition and the knowledge that my uncle is also my father is cognition. Since people hold a multitude of cognitions simultaneously, these cognitions thus form *irrelevant, consonant and dissonant relationships* with one another. Cognitions are said to be irrelevant when they have nothing to do with each other; they are consonant when they follow or fit into the others. Two cognitions are said to be dissonant if they follow the opposite of each other or they are in disagreement. What then happens when people discover they have dissonant cognitions? The answer to this question forms the basis of Festinger's theory. He states that a person who has discrepant/dissonant cognitions is said to be under a psychological tension that is like a drive for water or food, only that it cannot be satisfied that easily. Festinger(1957) went on to identify four factors that affect the magnitude of dissonant cognition. First, dissonance increases as the degree of discrepancy among cognitions increases. Secondly, dissonance decreases as the number of discrepant cognitions decreases. Thirdly, dissonance is inversely proportional to the number of consonant cognitions held by the individual. Lastly, the relative weight or importance given to consonant/dissonant cognition is readjusted by the importance in the mind of the individual. Are there then solutions to dissonant cognitions? Festinger proposes that when there are dissonant cognitions, one of the following is bound to occur in the individual:

a) **Changing cognition**: If two cognitions are discrepant, we can simply change one and make it consistent with the other, or we can change the cognition in the direction of another.

b)   **Adding cognition**: The magnitude of dissonance can be reduced by adding to it one or more consonant cognitions.

c) **Altering importance**: The dissonant cognitions are weighed by importance to suit situational and individual needs.

Relating Festinger's theory to language, changing cognitions (i.e. making discrepant cognitions consistent with one another), reveals itself as INTERFERENCE- a re-arrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of a foreign element into the domains of morphology, syntax, phonemic system, vocabulary and discourse of the first language. For instance, in an attempt of the Yoruba-English bilingual to speak the English language, the system of the Yoruba language, which is in dissonance with that of English language at the levels of grammar, lexis, phonology and semantics, are transferred into that of English. **Phonic interference** suggests transfer of rules guiding the sound of a dominant language to the subordinate or target language which occurs at the phonemic (i.e. sounds ;) stress, syllable and the intonation levels.

Grammatical interference: In this, the grammatical system of the mother tongue intrudes into that of the target language. This depends solely on the level of competence of the speaker involved (i.e. mastery of the structural rules of the target language.) **Discourse Interference:** This exhibits itself basically at the level of greeting, which

for instance is brief and straight to the point in English, but extended in the Yoruba Language. Using English for extended native greetings exhibits this interference.

Lexical Interference: caused by linguistic and cultural factors. Lexical interference was viewed under the following headings:**Semantic contrast:** Items in Nigerian English (NE) that have equivalent items in native English but express different meanings.**Semantic Extension:** Items that have equivalence in native English but express wider meaning in NE. **Semantic transfer:** Some items present in NE but the concept they express here are absent in the British English. **Loan creations:** Certain items present in NE denote NE experiences, which are also present in Native English but expressed differently.

Back to Festinger's theory, *Adding cognition (*i.e. reducing dissonance between cognitions by adding one or more consonant cognitions) may exhibit itself in language as BORROWING that is occasional use of items from one language in utterances of another language. Akindele and Adegbite(1999) used the term "domestication" which connotes "made native" or "adopted and tamed to suit the Nigerian environment" to describe the phenomenon of *adding cognition.* Domestication of language is an attempt to resolve the dissonance between the native language and English. He identified domestication at all the levels but the lexical level best explains adding cognition. They identified the types as *Hybridization*; whereby a word in the indigenous language is combined with a word or sense of a word in English e.g. Kiakia Bus. *Coinages or Neologism*, which occurs where entirely new terms are created for new experiences e.g. *cash madam, go slow, senior brother's wife*. Transfers of culture or sense of meaning from native language to English e.g. *take in* (becomes pregnant) *drop* (alight) He also identified direct translation or transliteration e.g. *bush meat.* (eranigbe)

Lastly, *Altering importance,* in which discrepant cognitions are weighed by importance to suit individual needs, manifests in language as **code-switching**and its types which have been extensively discussed in the previous section.

CULTURES, LANGUAGE AND KNOWLEDGE

Culture, as defined by Taylor (1871) is, "an inventory of discrete, equally important phenomena, which include knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of the society". Hudson (1980) defined culture as knowledge or cognition, which is learnt from other people either as direct instruction, or by watching their behaviour. He went further to distinguish three types of knowledge: *Cultural Knowledge*, which is learnt from other people;*Shared non-***cultural** *knowledge***,** shared between people within the same community but not learnt   and **Non shared cultural knowledge,** which is unique to the individual.

Based on the notion that linguistic items are concepts used in analyzing our experience, Hudson identified four points at which language makes contact with knowledge.

1. **Linguistic items are concepts:** As concepts, each lexical item represents a combination of phonological and semantic property; just the same way the concept of "fruit" represents a combination of properties related to the object e.g. eaten, sweet/savoury and so on.
2. **Meanings are concepts:** There is a widespread agreement that the meaning of a linguistic item is its sense   (i.e. what is permanent about it to the world) It is safe to identify the sense of an item with the concept to which it is related in the speaker's memory (e.g. the sense of the word *cat* is the concept *cat.)*
3. **Linguistically relevant social categories are concepts:** People categorize speakers and circumstances in terms of concepts based on prototypes. This means that people try to locate themselves in a multi-dimensional space relation to the rest of their society and locate each action of speaking relative to the rest of their social life. Each of these dimensions (space and act) is defined by the concept of a typical speaker or situation. This phenomenon, he noted, is referred to in socio-linguistics as metaphorical code switch.
4. **Sentence-meanings are propositions:** In this regard, linguistic items that are stored in memory have concepts as their meanings but the sentences formed by combining those express propositions.

Hudsonconcluded by stating that what is stored as a language system is a set of remembered concepts, which are items of language. Together the concept/proposition that constitute meanings, define the social distribution. He states further that when we speak or listen, we make use of concepts we already know to infer proposition (meaning of sentences) and also to infer social categories, which in turn is defined by terms of concepts. Using a diagram, Hudson further draws the link between language and culture, establishing that society's language is an aspect of its culture. He added that there are some items in some languages, which express meaning not expressed in others. This he observes is seen in difficulties of translating between languages that are associated with different cultures. When such need arises, however, there are two solutions as prescribed by Hudson:

(i) The language can be changed, introducing a new one or word to carry the desired meaning (code switching) or (ii) the existing language can be used to unpack the meaning expressed. For example, the word 'university' might be expressed with equivalent of "a place where people go to learn difficult things when they are above 18".

He further states that linguistic items are closely associated with the culture of the people and two different linguistic items might be associated with/or may activate different sets of beliefs and values. Concluding, Hudson noted that ideas shape language, and ideas are overall, an independent process relative to language, hence the universe is directed along the lines laid down by communicative and cognitive needs.

Vygotsky(1978), in his study that relates the theory of cognitive dissonance to language observed that the bilingual is placed in an unpleasant state of inconsistency in his attitude and behaviour. This dissonance, he observes, motivates the bilingual to re- arrange language in order to re-establish consistency when the communicative behaviour is no longer effective enough. He also noted that this does not only happen to bilinguals with poor knowledge of the L2, but also those who have mastered it but are unfamiliar with the various functions of language in another culture. He added that knowledge of a foreign language is inefficient for true intercultural competence, the ability to decipher critical information encoded in verbal signals and values, which is often hindered by the incompatibility of the two languages. Reinforcing this, Hudson describes a bilingual as a bicultural person who has found himself on the cross- roads of two different cultures with actions and reasoning being guided by customary value. However,a true bilingual can only be bicultural if he entered into the two cultures at a very tender age; hence the two languages are acquired early. The bilingual can thus flirt easily between two tongues in term of structure, pattern and belief. Seelye(1993) adding to Hudson's contribution, noted that to maintain adequate language communication, the bilingual must not only learn to speak like the native speaker but to think like him. Seelye observed that language is "*to a great extent conditioned by mastering all the cultural baggage accompanying its use*" – (43)

HYPOTHESIS 1
Language switch is not a regular feature among Yoruba-English bilingual undergraduates.

This hypothesis shall be tested using an independent t-test between items 6-12 (Table 1, communication in formal and informal situations) and items 13-17 (Table 3, language switch as a socio-linguistic tool).
Table 1

t-value	df	Standard Error	Mean 1	Mean 2	p-value
1.040	198	0.41	14.85	15.28	0.30

Since our p-value (0.30) is greater than 0.05, it means that language switch is not a statistically significant regular feature among Yoruba – English bilingual undergraduates hence the null hypothesis not rejected.

This is reinforced from the statistics shown on Table 1: when respondents are conversing with lecturers, 66% and 3% speak Yoruba only or English only respectively. Also, in the classroom 57% of respondents would rather speak English language alone even with their classmates outside the classroom with only 1% conversing in Yoruba only. In an informal setting however (i.e. with parents and siblings), a high level of admixture of English and Yoruba occurs with 58% and 61% respectively. This outcome shows that Yoruba-English bilingual undergraduate would rather speak English alone within the university when conversing with lecturers and classmates in and outside the classroom. This reinforces findings from previous studies that situation plays a significant role in dictating code choice. Worthy of note also is our findings on table 6: bilinguals agreed that people who do not understand Yoruba react coldly when they code switch. It is then only natural that Yoruba–English bilingual undergraduates will converse more often in the language of the wider majority – English.

HYPOTHESIS *The cognition (knowledge) of the first language does not in anyway influence that of the second language.*

Table 2

T-value	Df	Mead. Difference	R-value	Standard error
60.4	99	15.14	0.08	0.25

Table 2 shows the t- statistics and corresponding P-value of table 5 (items 24 – 29).
The result shows that there is a statistically significant influence of the first language (L1) on the second language (L2) since our p-value (0.00) is less than 0.05.

Empirical Analysis of the Contributions of Cognitive Dissonance to Yoruba-English Bilinguals Language Switch Practice

The alternate hypothesis is that the cognition of L1 has significant influence on that of the L2. This is further strengthened by the statistics on Table 5in which, 88% of respondents agreed to express themselves more accurately in their MT, 89% to the strong link existing between language and culture and an equally high percentage (74%) agreed that there are disagreements between cultural knowledge of Yoruba and English language.

HYPOTHESIS 3
There is a one to one correlation between the referent of L1 and L2 as different languages express the same worldview.
Table 3

t-value	Degree of freedom	Standard Error	Mean 1	Mean 2	P-value
23.94	198	0.26	12.3	6.17	0.00

Table 3 shows the independent T-test statistics between items 24 – 27 and items 28 and 29.
Our result shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the referent and L1/ and that of L2. Our p-value (0.00) is less than 0.05. Therefore we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis: There is no one to one correlation between the referent of the L1 and the L2 as different languages express different worldviews.
The result implies that a major reason for a switch is to present a particular worldview more accurately in the other language in which it is experienced. Statistics from Table 5 established that there is a link between culture and language (89%) and that language expresses thoughts, which is also embedded in speakers cultural realities (48%). Items 28 and 29 also reveal clearly that language switch is necessitated when there is a need to *bridge language gaps* created by cultural difference.

HYPOTHESIS 4
Yoruba-English bilinguals switch language ONLY as a socio linguistic tool and NOT as a means of compensating for language difficulty caused by cognitive dissonance.

Table 4

t-value	Df	Standard Error	Mean 1	Mean 2	P-value
15.24	198	0.31	8.88	13.53	0.00

Table 4 shows the t-statistics and corresponding t-value of items 14-16 (table 3 language switch as socio-linguistic tool) and items 17-21 (table 4 language switch as a means of compensating for language difficulty).
From the result, our P-value (0.00) is less than 0.05, which is statistically significant. It implies that we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis that Yoruba/English bilingual undergraduates switch language BOTH as a socio linguistic tool AND as a means of compensating for language difficulty caused by cognitive dissonance. The result also implies that language switch functions as socio-linguistic tool and as bilinguals escape route from linguistic gaps created by cultural and cognitive differences.
Almost all the respondents (81%) agreed that mixing two languages is not often a show of fancy rather it is often unavoidable and 77%, 76% and 75% agreed strongly that language switch occurs when one changes topics, establishes a new role relationship or shows solidarity respectively.

DISCUSSION
The societal expectation or currency is bilingualism, the situation is thus set where interference will occur (occurs) and societal norm moves to the inclusion of language switch (code switching) which in this respect, may be viewed as interference as it comes out of a need to compensate for a language difficulty, born out of cognitive difficulty. Cole and Scribner(1974), In relating cognition to language defines cognition as the process by which man acquires, transforms and uses information about the world. This study establishes the existence of cultural differences in language cognition. Relating code switching to language acquisition, Chomsky (1972) advocates a need for exposure to contextual second language use, stressing the elements required to express universal structure appropriate to actual social requirement of the bilingual. Chomsky's study proposes that when exposed to such samples, the bilingual is able to provide adequate translation into the L2. This will reduce switches and

less subsequent interference as time progresses.No doubt code switching and code mixing have become common features of the Nigerian bilingual behaviour. Banji (1996) observes that a change in code results in communication encounter so as to ensure minimum effort. Therefore, the cognitions of the interlocutors playa dominant role in the maintenance of the language chosen by the interlocutors. We shall now examine our hypotheses to see whether our findings on them have been supported or otherwise. Hypothesis 1 states that language switch is not a regular feature among Yoruba/English bilingual undergraduates. It is observed that one of the domains of language is the institutional context. This claim is that the dominance of one language over another is determined by examining the various domainsin which language is habitually employed. Fishman (1967) explained further that certain languages are associated with context, setting, topic and relationship between the interlocutors (62). The Yoruba- English bilingual undergraduates find themselvesin a defined formal setting where technical issues and terms are discussed this necessitates "constant unpredictable switch", also the language of wider majority becomes the order of the day. Akindele and Adegbite refer to this as a metaphorical switch when code is chosen both to accurately communicate both the topic of "learning" and to reach all the "learners". Among the undergraduates in this research therefore, English becomes the language of learning that cuts across the learners being the language of formal education. Using Myers ScottonsMarkedness model, code-switch among the Yoruba-English bilingual serves both as a "marked *choice" and to make a* "marked choice".

From our findings we see that more of English language is used over Yoruba although the use of the two codes among bilinguals is a norm, the frequency, is, subject to setting, topic and social factors. The frequency of code switching within the university environment thus becomes a less *regular feature.* This enhances communication among bilinguals as proper usage of language is determined by the topic vis-à-vis the participants. Hypothesis 2 focuses on whether or not the cognition of the first language influences that of the second in anyway. The bilinguals used in this study are compound bilinguals. It is therefore established that the first language, its rules and functioning have been acquired before learning the second language. This creates what Festinger(1957) described as dissonant/inconsistent cognition. All the dissonant cognition manifests itself as interference at all the levels of language. Bilinguals manifest interference at some or all the levels i.e. phonic, semantic, lexical, grammatical, and discourse levels .To align cognitions the language is then"domesticated". Hudson (1980) asserts that some language items express meanings, not expressed in others and ideas/belief closely related to the people; language is then "unpacked" to 'suit' use and 'people'. The reality of interference in a bilingual's use of the second language is a strong proof that cognitive differences abound between not only Yoruba language and English language alone, but also other languages of the world. As reinforced, by findings in this research, 'the reordering of language (interference) is necessitated by the different cultures different languages project. Hypothesis 3 sought to ascertain if there is a one- to- one correlation between the referent of the first language and the second language as different languages express the same worldviews. Taylor describes culture as an important phenomenon including belief, art, morals, law, custom and habits acquired by man that make him a member of a society. Language however is also the medium through which culture is passed to man. This makes language and culture almost a "Unism". In other words, language is used to analyze and internalize our experience – culture hence what is stored as language is a set of remembered-shared concepts. Cognition is acquired in the course of life through language so our cognition or knowledge forms a set of socially acceptable signs denoting objects, events, actions etc. As language is a system of perceptible signs, then our language worldview is not only perceptible to us, it is agreeable with our culture. The bilingual's cognition/knowledge provides accurate and profound reflection of realities since linguistic items are so closely related to the culture of the people that two different linguistic items activate different sets of belief and values. He also observes that this is the reason for the difficulty of translating from one language to another that is not associated in culture these differences result from parallel cognitive difference existing in languages. The disposition of a Yoruba man to the extended family and communal life for instance, explains why the English word "father" covers for both biological father and all men old enough to father him. Hence there is a clash between the African indigenous worldview and the westernized worldview portrayed by the English language. Our finding about greeting system and proverbs of the Yoruba also reinforce this, hence our hypothesis is upheld. Hypothesis 4 states that Yoruba-English bilinguals switch languages only as a socio-linguistic tool and not as a means of compensating for language difficulty caused by cognitive dissonance. Scotten in her study supports the claim that CS encodes interpretational dynamics rather than linguistic deficiencies. This does not also eliminate the fact that switch occurs because speakers find themselves unable to express a thought adequately in the initial code initiated for the exchange.

Empirical Analysis of the Contributions of Cognitive Dissonance to Yoruba-English Bilinguals Language Switch Practice

Our finding shows that language switch is often motivated by role relationship, prestige, solidarity and situation; there is a great role played by cognition in determining language choice. Language choice is based on the consideration of both the extra individual and extra linguistic purposes or social needs of the bilingual. Our hypothesis is further upheld by the findings of Hudson who found that when cognitive dissonance arises the language can be changed; introducing a new one that carries the desired meaning i.e. language switch.

This hypothesis is thus upheld since the "switch between languages is most appropriate and often unavoidable". A switch is necessary to show solidarity, prestige, personal contact, togetherness, social relationship and to uphold users' cultural values.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

From the foregoing, we have been able to establish that our culture (i.e. our way of life and belief) forms a basic part of our knowledge/cognition that is passed on and reflected in our language. Acquiring a new language then means having to understand a different world-view. This, in most bilingual society, is almost impossible. As a result, when the L_2 is used, dissonance occurs between the worldview portrayed by the two languages; hence, 'what is meant (which is compatible with cognition) is not what is said' (looking at it from the native users' angle.) as in the following:

"My in-law like tiger", Where the Yoruba-English bilingual meant to say "My dependable in-law". We find then that to capture his thoughts, influenced of course by his culture, the bilingual would rather switch codes or unconsciously bend the L_2 to reflect his L_1 thoughts and worldview. Language switch and borrowing are thus seen as strategies of a bilingual speaker to make up for gaps created by cognitive discrepancies in the two languages. Often times, the phenomenon of language switch expresses a seemingly lack of the needed word equivalent in the base language or target language to accurately express a thought. The bilingual thus immediately selects appropriate lexical item from either the base or second language that serves as a compensation for such lack. This paper has also revealed the inevitability of cognitive dissonance in human speech and the characteristic effects of the setting and topic serving as socio-linguistic content, which dictates the code used by the speaker. This research shows that in the university system, English language is used. This high rate of English usage indicates the dissonance between the cognition of literacy, civilization and modern technology inherent in the English language, which is absent in the Yoruba Language. However, the dominance of the English language exists more at the level of usage. In practice, most bilinguals still see, think and speak their thoughts in their first language. This explains why the level of interference is relatively high for better communicative purposes. The result of this study seems to suggest that when there is language switch, it is often a device by the speaker to make him better understood.Language switch is therefore a function of audience, topic and setting of conversation; the phenomena can both be conscious or subconscious. Also, it is a combination of socio-cultural cognitive factor that derives from the dominance or subordination of either of the languages that have come in contact. This aligns with a language acquisition theory which believes that bilinguals view the world in the first language and attempt to present it in another.

It is therefore recommended as follows:
1. The indigenous languages should be developed, modernized and standardized so as to widen their cognitive frames.
2. Language switch should be seen and treated as rich and a veritable communication tool because of its role in the process of communication.
3. The status of the indigenous language should be brought at par with English language so that it will no longer be seen as the language of the less educated.
4. Each language should be seen as completely rich and capable of presenting realities not viewed or experienced in other languages.
5. Borrowing should be encouraged as a means of preserving cultural items missing in other languages.

REFERENCES

Adegbija, E. (1989). "*Lexico-semantic variation in Nigerian English"* World's Englishes, Vol 8, No 2, pp 165—177.

Akindele, F.,&Adegbite,W.,(1999). *The Sociology and Politics of English in Nigeria: An Introduction.*Ile-Ife: ObafemiAwolowo UP.

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation.*Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bamgbose, A(1982).Languages in Contact Yoruba and English in Nigeria. *Education and Development.* (2), 329-342

Banjo, A. (1971). Toward aDefinition of Standard Nigerian English. *Linguistique* , 165-175. Chomsky, N. (1972). Language and Mind.Harcourt Brace Jovanovich: New York.

Cole, M.,& Scribner, S.(1974) .*Culture and Thought: A Psychological Introduction.*New York; John Wiley.

Fishman, J.(1967). Multilingualism With and Without Diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism.*Journal of Social Issues,* (32), 29 – 38.

Goke-Pariola, A. (1983). Code-mixing Among Yoruba-English Bilinguals.*Anthropological Linguistics,* 25(1), 39-46.

Harmers D.,& Blanc, M (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism.*Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Hudson,R.(1980). *Sociolinguistics.*Cambridge UP: New York.

Jowitt,D.(1991). *Nigeria English Usage: An Introduction.*Ikeja: Longman.

Lambert,W.(1977). Effects of Bilingualism on the Individual. Ed. P.A. Hornby. *Bilingualism: Psychological, Social and Educational Implications.*N.Y: Academic Press, 15-27.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif..

Mackey,W.F(1968). "The Description of Bilingualism".In Fishman J., *Reading in the Sociology of Language.* The Hague: Monton,51-70.

Myers-Scotton C.,(1992). Motivations for Code-switching.Oxford: Oxford UP.

Ogunsiji, Y.(2004) ."Aspects of Code-mixing and Code-switching in the Conversational Discourse of Yoruba-English Bilinguals in Ibadan Metropolis: A Sociolinguistic Study" Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Poplack, S.(1977). A Model for Polyglossia and Multilingualism.*Language and Society* (6), 361 – 378.
- - - "(1980) Towards a Typology of Code-Switching.*Linguistics* (18), 581-6.

Seelye, H.N.(1993). *Teaching Culture: Strategies for Intercultural Communication.*Lincoln Wood: National textbook company.

Trudgill, P. (1973). *Sociolinguistis: Language and Society*, Harmondsmith England: Penguin Books.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes, Trans. & Ed. by Cole, M., John-Steiner, J., Scribner, S., &Souberman, E. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Weinreich, U. S.(1953).*Language in Contact.* The Hague: Mouton.