

**A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY OF THE PATTERNS OF NONSTANDARD
ENGLISH WORDS USAGE IN FORMAL CONTEXTS: A CASE STUDY
OF STUDENTS OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS IN KADUNA STATE**

BY

**MARTHA NGUEMO TERNA-ABAH
(PhD/ARTS/2212/08-09)**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA
NIGERIA**

JULY 2014

**A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY OF THE PATTERNS OF NONSTANDARD
ENGLISH WORDS USAGE IN FORMAL CONTEXTS: A CASE STUDY
OF STUDENTS OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS IN KADUNA STATE**

BY

**MARTHA NGUEMO TERNA-ABAH
(PhD/ARTS/2212/08-09)**

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY ZARIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD) IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES,
FACULTY OF ARTS, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA, NIGERIA.**

JULY, 2014

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this dissertation entitled *A Sociolinguistic Study of the Patterns of Nonstandard English Words Usage in Formal Contexts: A Case Study of Students of Higher Institutions in Kaduna State* has been carried out by me in the Department of English and Literary Studies. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this dissertation has been previously presented for another degree or diploma at this or any other institution.

Martha Nguemo TERNA-ABAH

SIGNATURE

DATE

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this study entitled A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE PATTERNS OF NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS USAGE IN FORMAL CONTEXTS: A CASE STUDY OF STUDENTS OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS IN KADUNA STATE by Martha Nguemo TERNA-ABAH meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in English Language of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and it is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Professor Adebayo A. Joshua
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr S.A. Abaya
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Professor S.G. Ibileye
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr A.A. Liman
Head of Department

Date

Professor Adebayo A. Joshua
Dean Post Graduate School

Date

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to God Almighty with whom all things are possible; the reason for this great height

and

To the memory of him, who ensured that I got the best of education. He, who made my world revolve around academics right from an early age. My once loving mentor, my dear late father - MR. SEBASTIAN ZEVEER SHENGE. Even though you are not alive to witness this feat, it is a proof that your sacrifice was not in vain. But for death, how proud you would have been of me!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my profound gratitude to my erudite supervisor, Professor Adebayo .A. Joshua whose expertise, useful advice, invaluable words of encouragement and unceasing effort at supervising my work actually made its realization possible.

I owe a debt of gratitude to my second supervisor Dr S.A. Abaya for his meticulousness, valuable suggestions and for working so tirelessly to ensure that this research was completed. I also wish to thank my third supervisor Professor S.G. Ibileye for all his valuable contributions that made this work a success.

I will forever be grateful to the one woman who has sacrificed a lot for me. That model of ideal motherhood- my dear mother, Mrs. Josephine Hanive Shenge. I thank you for allowing God use you to shape my life after father's demise.

My deep appreciation also goes to my brothers, sisters, nephews, nieces and in-laws. They include: Mrs. Eugenia Adaa, Prof. K.C Shenge, Rev. Susan Orochihi, Doosy, Angie, Kumsy, Jimmy, Danny, Afasco, Sewuese, Muha, Boy, Ahemen, Ordidi, Terdoo, Baby Msaan, Terfa, Iwuese, Tuma, Iyua, Sesugh, Michelle, Richman, Oyen, Sonenter, Mr Pius Adaa, Mr Dan Orochihi, Mercy Shenge, Seun Fayemi, Joy Daniel, Doosuur, Hembafan and the Abahs. It is indeed a blessing having you all as family. Thank you all for your support.

I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to all my former lecturers in the department of English and Literary Studies especially Prof. Gani-Ikilama, Prof. Joshua, Dr Ofoukwu, Prof. Ibileye, Prof. Surakat, Mr Ekpeme, Dr. Sadiq, Dr Frank-Akale, Prof.

Aliyu Muhammed and Prof. J. S. Aliyu. You all contributed in molding me academically from that young and inexperienced undergraduate to what I am today.

I am sincerely grateful to Dr Ahmad Abdullahi and Abdulkadir Bala for providing me with some of the literature I used for this research. My deepest gratitude goes to all my colleagues at ABU/SBRS, Funtua especially those in the English language Unit for all the support I enjoyed from them.

I must not forget to say a big thank you to my wonderful friends Ngusaar, Demvihin, Erdoo, Fwanshishak, Ajuji, Aisha Jallo, Jerry Idu, Liman and Nankyer. Indeed, you have stood the test of time as true friends.

I am highly indebted Pastor Zack Omale for his encouragement, prayers and labour of love. Sir, you are simply exceptional. To members of Harvest Area and Pastor Peter Aruwaji, I say thank you all.

Not left out are my adorable children, Wueseter (Brainy Boy) and Dooveren (Princess Baby). Although there were times when you were rather a serious distraction, I still thank you for teaching me how to combine motherhood, work and studies. You remain priceless!

Lastly, to my amazing husband Engr. T.I. Abah, what else can I say? Your encouragement and support really made the difference. I am most grateful.

ABSTRACT

This study dwells on the Sociolinguistic Patterns of Nonstandard English Words usage in Formal Contexts using students of institutions of higher learning in Kaduna State as its case study. The study begins by examining the centrality of the English language in the Nigerian society particularly in the educational sector. It then goes on to look at the variability of the English language and the role of social context in determining the most appropriate variety to be used hence the use of standard and nonstandard English in formal and informal contexts respectively. On the contrary, the target group of this study uses nonstandard English words in their spoken and written communication in formal contexts. The study, which is limited to the lexical variants, thus identifies these variant lexical items from students' scripts and recorded discourses and thereafter examines their patterns of occurrence and the factors motivating their usage. The study adopts an eclectic approach comprising Fishman's Domain and Topics, Labov's Quantitative Paradigm and Giles' Accommodation theory. Using the Domain and Topics model, the study establishes the fact that the context/domain under consideration is formal based on the general subject areas under discussion, role relationships between the participants and setting of interaction. The study thereafter examines the social factors responsible for the use of identified nonstandard/non-English lexical items using the Labovian framework and Accommodation theory. Based on the study's findings, social factors of language of the social media/Short Message Service's shorthand, bilingualism used as a source of pity/obtaining undue favours, religion, familiarity/relaxed atmosphere and nature of students' course/question asked motivated our subjects' use of the identified nonstandard English lexical items. The study then looks at the general patterns that the identified lexical items take as well as the differences or similarities of these identified nonstandard English lexical items across the selected institutions. Finally, the study discusses its contributions to knowledge and makes suggestions for further research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Certification.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgement.....	v
Abstract.....	vii
Table of Contents	viii

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.0	Introduction.....	1
1.1	The Centrality of English to the Field of Education In Nigeria.....	2
1.2	The Variability of the English language.....	3
1.3	Social Context as a Determinant of What Variety of English to Use.....	4
1.4	Statement of the Research Problem.....	6
1.5	Aim and Objectives.....	7
1.6	Research Questions.....	8
1.7	Justification for the Study.....	9
1.8	Scope and Delimitation.....	10

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0	Introduction.....	12
2.1	The Field of Sociolinguistics.....	12
2.2	The Study of Language Variation.....	14

2.2.0	Social Variables and Language Variation.....	15
2.2.1	Age and Language Variation.....	15
2.2.2	Social Class and Language Variation.....	17
2.2.3	Gender and Language Variation.....	18
2.2.4	Educational Status and Language Variation.....	20
2.2.5	Culture and Language Variation.....	20
2.2.6	Ethnicity and Language Variation.....	21
2.2.7	Religion and Language Variation.....	23
2.3	Varieties of the English Language in Nigeria.....	24
2.3.0.	The Standard English (Process of Standardization).....	25
2.3.1	The Standard/Formal English as a Variety of English.....	27
2.3.1.1	Standard British English.....	36
2.3.2	Nonstandard English/Informal English.....	37
2.3.2.0	Varieties of Nonstandard English Commonly Used by the Target Population along with SBE in Formal Contexts.....	39
2.3.2.1	Standard Nigerian English(SNE).....	39
2.3.2.2	The Written Language of the Global System for Mobile Communication's Short Message Service (GSM/SMS).....	43
2.3.2.3	English Slang.....	44
2.3.2.4	Pidgin.....	47
2.3.2.4.1	General Pidgin.....	47
2.3.2.4.2	English Pidgin/Nigerian Pidgin.....	52
2.4	Code Mixing.....	55
2.5	Definition of Context.....	58
2.6.	Theoretical Framework.....	63
2.6.1	Domain and Topics.....	63

2.6.2	The Quantitative Paradigm or Labovian Framework.....	65
2.6.3	The Accommodation Theory.....	67
2.6.4	The Justification for Eclecticism.....	69

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0	Introduction	73
3.1	The Research Design.....	73
3.2	The Target Population	74
3.3.	Sample and Sampling Procedure	74
3.4	Research Instruments	75
3.4.1	Observation.....	75
3.4.2	Recording.....	76
3.4.3.	Students’ scripts.....	77
3.5	Problems Encountered and How they were Overcome.....	77

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.0	Introduction	79
4.1.	Data Presentation and Analysis Based on Students’ Examination Scripts.....	79
4.2	Data Presentation and Analysis Based on Recorded Spoken Discourses in Formal Contexts.....	141
4.3	Discussion of Findings	159

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0	Introduction.....	175
5.1	General Summary	176
5.2	Conclusion	178
5.3	Implications of the Study.....	179

5.4	Contributions to Knowledge.....	181
5.5	Suggestions for Further Research.....	182
	REFERENCES.....	183
	APPENDICES.....	191
	CHAPTER ONE	

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

One of the indispensable legacies of the British colonial administration in Nigeria that has continued to thrive several years after independence is the English language. Even when some Nigerians criticize some of the heritages of the colonial administration such as the amalgamation, hardly do they complain about the English language and the place it has come to occupy in Nigeria today. Corroborating these views, Bamgbose (1971:36), states that, “of all the heritage left behind in Nigeria by the colonial administration, probably none is more important than the English language.” This same view is re-echoed by, Schmied (1991:119) who believes that the English language has proved “far more durable than other parts of colonial inheritance.”

The centrality of English language to the life of the average Nigerian cannot be overemphasized. The English language is the language of general interaction which facilitates communication among Nigerians regardless of their linguistic, cultural and social barriers or differences. Ogu (1992:79) while re-echoing the views expressed above, states that, “the status of English language in Nigeria is that of a stable and important second language.”

Another area where the impact of the English language is greatly felt in Nigeria is in the mass media. News and other programmes on the Nigerian Television Authority (NTA) and on other independent television networks such as African Independent Television (AIT), Channels Television among others are broadcast in the English language. Similarly, any newspaper or magazine which aims at national coverage must necessarily publish in English. Banjo (1996:69) confirming this says that ‘no African country is better served with English newspaper than Nigeria.’

The use of the English language is not restricted to the media alone but it is also the language of the legislature, judiciary, interview for employment, the government as well as business and commerce.

1.1 THE CENTRALITY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TO THE FIELD OF EDUCATION IN NIGERIA

One sector in which the English language has become crucial in Nigeria is in the field of education. According to Bamgbose(p38), “the entrenchment of the English language is perhaps most noticeable in the field of education...the Nigerian child’s access to the cultural and scientific knowledge of his world is largely through the English language” The relevance of the English Language in the educational system in Nigeria is in two dimensions. One, it is studied as a separate discipline in the country’s schools as one of the core subjects prescribed for all students in the secondary school curriculum and secondly, English Language is pedagogically important, as it is the language of instruction in virtually the entire school system from upper primary to the level of higher education. In fact, it is the major medium of expression in the Nigerian educational system. To buttress this point further, the National Policy on Education (NPE) 2004, section 4e and f emphasizes among other things that:

[e] *The medium of instruction in the primary school shall be the language of the environment for the first three years. During this period, English shall be taught as a subject.*

[f] *From the fourth year, English shall progressively be used as a medium of instruction and the language of the immediate environment and French shall be taught as subjects.*

Moreover, admission into tertiary institutions in Nigeria irrespective of the course of study requires candidates to have a credit pass in the English language in the West

African Examination Council Senior Secondary Certificate Examination (WAECSSCE) or the National Examination Council (NECO). No wonder, Bamgbose (p38) maintains that, “the entrenchment of English language is perhaps most noticeable in the field of education” and that “the Nigerian child’s access to the cultural and scientific knowledge of the world is largely through the English language”.

1.2 THE VARIABILITY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The English Language like any other living language is remarkably varied. According to Wardhaugh (1983:15), ‘no language spoken by more than a very small number of people is homogeneous.’ Every language has considerable internal variations and speakers make constant use of the many different possibilities offered to them.

The English language as a global language has developed many varieties. These varieties range broadly from Standard English to nonstandard English. The Standard English in the words of Jowitt (2008:8) has come to be used as, “a label for either the more or less institutionalized sub variety of a great number of Englishes around the world... a reflection of what has been called International or World Standard English.” It is used for varieties like the Standard British English (which is the focus of this study), Standard American English, Standard Chinese English, Standard Canadian English, Standard Nigerian English among others. On the other hand, nonstandard English according to Corder and Ruszkiweicz (1979:10) “ is most often defined by its vocabulary, its sounds or its grammatical construction and is appropriate in discussions of informal or humorous situations and activities such as sports.” They go further to equate nonstandard English with informal English which they say “is that marked as colloquial in dictionaries and most of those marked as slang.” From

the foregoing, we can say that nonstandard English includes English varieties such as English slang, English pidgin and all forms of colloquial expressions.

1.3 SOCIAL CONTEXT AS A DETERMINANT OF CHOICE OF ENGLISH VARIETY

The choice of any language variety over another at any given point in time is determined by several factors one of which is social context. Social context as most sociolinguists are unanimous about plays a vital role in determining which variety of language to be used. In this school of thought is Trudgill (1974:103) who posits that: “language varies not only according to the social characteristics of the speaker (such as social class, ethnic group, age and sex) but also according to the social context in which a user finds himself.” Many factors can come into play in determining which variety of language to be used in a given context. For instance, as Trudgil puts it, certain subject matters under discussion are likely to produce a more formal variety than others. The physical setting and occasion of the language activity like academic lectures and ceremonial occasions are more likely to select relatively formal language than public-house arguments or family breakfasts. He further states that, the person spoken to, and in particular, the role relationships and relative statuses of the participants in a discourse would also influence the variety of language to be used. Like speech between individuals of unequal rank (due to status in an organization, social class, age, or some other factors) is likely to be less relaxed and more formal than that between equals. Thus in most, if not all linguistic communities, differences in social context (broadly defined to include the hearer, the subject matter and the medium as well as the situation) lead to the use of different styles. These styles can be characterized through differences in vocabulary, including address forms and pronouns and in grammar and pronunciation (Trudgil, 103-114).

While expressing similar views as those of Trudgil above, Catford (1965:84) posits that “language use is determined by situation and context.” He sees language in its varieties as a subset of formal and/or features that correlate with particular socio-situational features. Therefore, any set of linguistic features must correspond adequately with some particular situation.

In the same vein, Lyons (1977: 123-124) highlights six points that are vital to the understanding of the relationship between language and context thus:

- I. Each participant must know his role and status.
- II. The participants must have knowledge of time and space of the conversation.
- III. The participants must be able to categorize the situations in terms of degree of formality.
- IV. The participants must know what medium is appropriate to the situation.
- V. Participants must know how to make their utterances appropriate to the subject matter as a determinant in the selection of one dialect or language rather than another.
- VI. Finally, the participants must know how to make their utterances appropriate to the ‘province’ or ‘domain’ to which the situation belongs.

From the foregoing, it can be said that both standard and nonstandard varieties of English have their time and place depending on the social context. On the contrary however, the use of nonstandard or informal English in formal contexts that call for Standard British English is becoming prevalent among some students of institutions of higher learning. It is not uncommon to hear words associated with nonstandard varieties of English and in some cases, those of Nigeria’s indigenous languages such as “yaro boy”, “okada”, “ko” “oga” “shit”, “fuck up”, “sha”, “u” “aiyaa” ‘guy’, ‘malo

guy' 'damn,' 'yeah', 'guys' among others while interacting with students at a very formal level. This is not limited to the spoken communication alone but also prevalent in written communication where nonstandard English words like the shorthand associated with the Global System Mobile Communication's Short Message Service (GSM/SMS), the English slang, English Pidgin and non English words from some of Nigeria's indigenous languages as well as other forms of colloquial lexical items feature prominently. Consequent upon these, the study seeks to establish why there is such a prevalence of the use of nonstandard English in formal contexts among students of higher learning.

1.4 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

One's mastery of a language and particularly the English language is measured in part by how one selects language suited to a given context. Most linguists are unanimous about the central role context plays in determining the choice and use of a variety of language. In the words of Alo (2004:77), "nonstandard English is appropriate for communication among people who are intimate such as friends, husbands and wife." Corder and Ruszkiewicz (1979:548) believe that one's vocabulary should be suited to the audience one is addressing. It therefore follows that the choice of Standard English (formal) or nonstandard (informal) should be determined by the context to ensure that the variety chosen is appropriate for that context. Contrary to this assertion however, the use of nonstandard English words among students of institutions of higher learning in formal contexts that call for Standard British English is now prevalent. For example, the researcher once asked one of her students who had just finished writing a test about how the test was and his response was 'Ma, I really fucked up.' The researcher asked him a second time thinking his initial response was a mistake but surprisingly, he still responded:"Ma, I fucked up big time". At another

instance, the researcher was at the supervisor's office when a postgraduate student of the English and Literary Studies Department came to see him to find out if he had effected corrections on her thesis. He told her that he had not and immediately she said "shit". Out of shock and disappointment particularly because that was coming from an MA English language student, he quickly cautioned her against the use of such an expression especially in that given context which was very formal. During one of the students' orientation programmes, a student while asking a question directed at the vice chancellor referred to the Vice Chancellor and other distinguished guests as 'guys'. The prevalence of nonstandard English words usage in formal contexts among students of institutions of higher learning cuts across both the spoken and written communication. The curiosity to find out why there is such prevalence birthed the topic for this research.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

While seeking to find out the patterns of occurrence of these nonstandard English words and the factors responsible for their usage in formal contexts, this research shall provide answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the patterns of occurrence of the nonstandard English forms used by the students of the selected institutions?
2. What are the motivations for the use of these nonstandard English items in formal contexts among the target population?
3. Are there differences or similarities in the identified nonstandard English items used by students from the two universities and two polytechnics selected?
4. What role do staff members play students' choices and uses of nonstandard English words in formal contexts by students?

1.6 AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The main aim of this research is to examine the patterns of nonstandard English words usage in formal contexts as well as establish the sociolinguistic factors responsible for such usages among students of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nuhu Bamali Polytechnic, Zaria, Kaduna State University, Kaduna and Kaduna Polytechnic, Kaduna.

The specific objectives of this research are:

1. To examine the patterns of occurrence of nonstandard English words used in formal contexts by the target population
2. To establish the factors responsible for the use of identified nonstandard words usage in formal contexts among the target group.
3. To find out if there are similarities or differences in the identified nonstandard English items used by university students and those from polytechnics that form the case study of this research.
4. To ascertain the role of staff members in students' use of nonstandard English in formal contexts.

1.7 JUSTIFICATION FOR THE STUDY

The significance of this study is in its attempt to identify the nonstandard English lexical items used in formal contexts, examine their patterns of occurrence and advance reasons for their usages. The knowledge of these nonstandard items, their patterns and factors motivating their usage in formal context, which is against the norm, will be of great importance to the students, teachers and other stakeholders hence deliberate steps will be taken to curtail this practice.

Moreover, this study is a departure from previous works on language variety such as those of Adekunle (1978), Madaki (1981a), Joshua (1983), Olaoye (1990), Kassim (1994) Shenge (2008) among others. These works focused more on language choice in multilingual communities and in some cases only the sociolinguistic factors responsible for language variation and not the patterns of nonstandard lexical forms that this particular research dwells on.

1.8 SCOPE / DELIMITATION OF THE RESEARCH

This research is limited to the sociolinguistic study of the patterns of nonstandard English words used in formal contexts among students of universities and polytechnics in Kaduna state comprising, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nuhu Bamali Polytechnic, Zaria, Kaduna State University, Kaduna and Kaduna Polytechnic, Kaduna. The study limits itself to students between their second and final year because, it is assumed that those in their first year may not be familiar with the language of a formal school environment. In addition, this study is limited to the nonstandard English lexical items used in formal context because of the enormity of attempting to examine other levels of variations such as phonological, syntactic, connected speech processes, social indicators, social markers and stereotypes.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The review of literature in this chapter focuses on the key concepts in the title of this study such as the field of sociolinguistics, the Study of language variation, the standard and nonstandard English involving : Standard English (process of standardization) and definition, Standard British English, Standard Nigerian English, slang, pidgin, written language of Global System for Mobile Communication's Short Message Service (GSM/SMS), code-mixing, context and the theoretical models adopted for the study.

2.1 THE FIELD OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS

According to Malmkjaek (2010:494-496), an attempt to offer a definitive delimitation of the scope of sociolinguistics as a discipline may prove inadequate as the array of topics sitting comfortably underneath this umbrella term is as wide ranging as it is disparate. For some variationists, sociophonetics (associated principally with the works of William Labov 1966, 1970, 1972, 1981, 1990 and 2006) lies at the heart of sociolinguistics as a discipline and the statistical correlation of structured variation in production patterns with global social variables such as socio-economic class and gender are considered the core areas of research in the field. Others take a broader view and in addition to interactional sociolinguistics (associated principally with the work of John Gumperz 1971, 1972) which examines meaning-making processes in contextualized language use and ways in which speakers signal and interpret meaning in social interaction, fields such as sociology of language, discourse analysis, ethnography of communication, pragmatics and linguistic anthropology, amongst others, are also placed centrally within sociolinguistics.

Whether narrowly or broadly viewed, Malmkjeak maintains that the field borrows from and in turn offers insights for sociology, social theory, anthropology, education, social psychology and more. What unites practitioners of the various topics in sociolinguistics is an interest in what speakers actually do. Variation in language use, which is inherent and ubiquitous, is centrally important in sociolinguistics and is not dismissed as free, unconstrained and of little consequence to theory. Analysis of this variation, and of the linguistic and social constraints on it, allow us to understand better how language changes. Consideration of why, as well as how speakers vary in their language use also allows a better comprehension of the nature and functions of language which lie beyond the need to impart knowledge and information. The ways in which the individual speaker varies is also of central importance to sociolinguistics

While expressing similar views as those expressed by Malmkjeak, Trudgill (1974) observes that Sociolinguistics is problematic in terms of its definition because it means different things to different people. He notes that while everybody would agree that ‘sociolinguistics has something to do with language and society, it is clearly not concerned with everything that could be considered language and society.’ The problem lies in drawing the line between language and society. Nevertheless, most sociolinguists maintain that as far as sociolinguistics is concerned, there is definitely interrelatedness between language and society with the society influencing the choices that speakers make when they use language. In this school of thought are Atkinson, Britain, Clahsen, Radford and Spencer (2007:14) who define sociolinguistics as,

the study of the relationship between language use and the structure of society. It takes into account such factors as the social backgrounds of both the speaker and the addressee (i.e. their age, sex, social class, ethnic background, degree of integration into their neighbourhood, etc.), the relationship

between speaker and addressee (good friends, employer–employee, teacher–pupil, grandmother–grandchild, etc.) and the context and manner of the interaction (in bed, in the supermarket, in a TV studio, in church, loudly, whispering, over the phone, by fax, etc.), maintaining that they are crucial to an understanding of both the structure and function of the language used in a situation.

In the same vein, Yule (2010: 254) opines that “the term sociolinguistics is used generally for the study of the relationship between language and society.”

Corroborating this further, Crystal (2008: 466) equally maintains that sociolinguistics is,

a branch of linguistics which studies all aspects of the relationship between language and society. Sociolinguists study such matters as the linguistic identity of social groups, social attitudes to language, standard and non-standard forms of language, the patterns and needs of national language use, social varieties and levels of language, the social basis of multilingualism and so on.

Stockwell (2007:265) like Atkinson, Britain, Clahsen, Radford, Spencer, Yule and Crystal re-echoes that sociolinguistics is “the branch of linguistics which studies the relation between language and society.” He goes further to state that, sociolinguistics may be usefully defined as “the study of variation in language, or more precisely of variation within speech communities.” Ndukwe (1997) cited in Agbedo (2000:169) while expressing similar views as those of Yule, Stockwell and Crystal states that sociolinguistics is the “branch of linguistics that endeavours to study the significant aspects of the relationship between language and society.”

One fact that runs through all the definitions examined above is that, there exists a relationship between language and society whereby the use of language is conditioned by certain social factors that influence the choices that speakers make.

According to Kerstin and Trauth (2006: 1089) who also share the same views with those highlighted above although expressed slightly differently sociolinguistics is, “the scientific discipline developed from the cooperation of linguistics and sociology that investigates the social meaning of the language system and of language use, and the common set of conditions of linguistic and social structure.” Likewise, Trudgil (1974:32) also posits that sociolinguistics is “that part of linguistics which is concerned with language as a social and cultural phenomenon.” According to him, “language is not only determined by social factors but also by certain customs and beliefs or attitude of speakers.” Some of these cultural phenomena even determine what type of language variety is acceptable for instance when speaking with an older person or someone of a particular gender thus the Yorubas for instance would insert the “e” prefix when addressing an older person while the Hausas for instance use ”ki” and “ka” when addressing a female and male respectively. In like manner, Gumperz (1971:223) observes that “sociolinguistics is an attempt to find correlations between social and linguistic structures and to observe the changes that occur”, a view also held by Hudson (1980:1) who views sociolinguistics as “the study of language in relation to society.” Wardhaugh (1986:12) like Gumperz and Hudson believes that sociolinguistics is, “concerned with investigating the relationship between language and society with the goal of a better understanding of the structure of language and of how language functions in communication.”

For Akindele and Adegbite (1999:475) sociolinguistics can be defined as:

the relationship which exists between a language or languages and the culture or tradition as well as the politics of a particular community. It is a discipline which assigns functions to various languages which exist in a community...it examines the interaction between the use

of language and the social organization behaviour..... Sociolinguistics provides answers to such questions as who speaks what language to whom and when and to what end....It also seeks to provide an answer to the question of what accounts for the differential changes in the social organization of language use and behaviour towards language.

The different submissions by various sociolinguists on the definition of sociolinguistics examined above point out that the society has an influence over the choices that users make of language hence understanding the interrelatedness of language and society is very central to understanding how language functions and what informs the choices that speakers make of language which sociolinguistics believe are usually determined by certain social variables such as one's regional background, social status or ethnic origin, gender, age, educational attainment among others. Sociolinguistic methods as employed in this study seek to determine the variants of English language used in formal contexts, their patterns of occurrence and the social factors responsible for the choices that speakers of the selected speech communities make with regards to formal contexts.

2.2 THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE VARIATION

One major pre-occupation of sociolinguistics, which is of relevance to this research, is the study of language variation and change. This particular area is associated principally with the pioneering work of William Labov in 1966 and subsequently, 1970, 1972, 1981, 1990 and 2006. Labov was able to prove through these studies that language is inherently variable and that a great amount of variability dismissed before by theoretical linguists like Chomsky (1957) as "free variation" adheres to definite patterns determined by the linguistic environment (linguistic variable) on one hand and the social environment (social variable) on the other. In other words, language is not antiseptic and homogeneous rather it is susceptible to all sorts of social viruses

and therefore, inherently variable (Agbedo 2000:174). The linguistic variable according to Wardhaugh 1986:137 is

an item in the structure of a language, an item that has alternate realizations, as one speaker realizes it one way and another different way or the same speaker realizes it differently on different occasions.

The seven main types of linguistic variables so identified include, phonological, syntactic, lexical, connected speech processes, social indicators, social markers and stereotypes. The social variable on the other hand refers to behavioural factors that may be isolated to correlate with linguistic variation. These factors include region, sex, age, social class, ethnicity among others and are seen as accounting for language variation in individuals or speech communities. We shall discuss how some of these social variables are they relate to this research influence language variation and change.

2.2.0 SOCIAL VARIABLES AND LANGUAGE VARIATION

2.2.1 Age and language variation

One of the social variables that has influenced variation in language use is age. Language use varies greatly among the children, youths, middle aged and the old in any given speech community. According to Cheshire and Milroy (1993, 20-21),

the frequency of nonstandard forms is highest among adolescents and old people because, for adolescents, there is the influence of peer group pressure and the desire to distinguish a generational identity while the old are out of workplace, exhibit a more relaxed attitude and thus greater linguistic creativity.

They go further to submit that, age exclusive features such as in-group slang words characterized by coining may be dropped or abandoned as people grew older. According to Helfrich (1979:85), some age exclusive language features may be due to maturational factors reflecting in other words, biological age such as the one-word

utterance typical of children aged about one year or the “trembling voice” associated with the elderly speakers.

This difference in language use does not affect only adolescents and the elderly but also the middle aged. According to Eckert (1997:157) , “only the middle-aged are seen as engaging in mature use as “doing” language than learning it or losing it.” The research of Giles, Howard, Noels, Kim, Ota, Hiroshi et al (2000:319-20) in eleven countries can be seen as confirming the vitality of middle age. In a series of experiments carried out by Giles et al, they found middle aged people to have greater ethno linguistic vitality than younger or older people (the mean age seen as the onset of middle age was around thirty one, with fifty-two the mean for the onset of old age). Vitality was measured by a version of the subjective ethno linguistic vitality questionnaire which included items assessing judges’ perceptions of young middle-aged and older adults in terms of their strength areas such as government, education, business institutions and their social prestige and influence. The high profile of a middle-aged probably explains why researchers have implicitly seen their language as a standard against which the language of both older and younger speakers can be measured. Thus, children’s language has been conceptualized in development terms with adult language seen as the target. Conversely, the language of the elderly has been analyzed as a degeneration and decline from the middle-aged adult norm. Chambers and Trudgill (1998:79) and Downes (1998:225) advancing reasons for this development state that “for older, retired people, the pressure to conform to societal norms may weaken unlike the middle-aged whose lives tend to become more public and they have to adapt to the norm and values of the mainstream society.” These may be experienced because of pressures of work, personal independence or geographical and/or social mobility, all of which lead to greater variability and social relationships.

2.2.2 Social class and language variation

Until the 1960's, most studies of variability were concerned primarily with regional variation or dialectology. Only during the latter half of the twentieth century would the concern for status-based difference in language become a primary rather than secondary focus when sociolinguists turned their attention to the language of the cities where an increasing proportion of the world's population lives in modern times. The rise in urbanization is connected with an increase in social stratification reflected in linguistic variation. (Romaine 2001)

Labov(1966) was the first to introduce systematic methodology for investigating social dialects and the first large-scale sociolinguistic survey of an urban community. Unlike previous dialectological studies which generally chose one person as representative of a particular area, this survey was based on tape recorded interviews with one hundred and three people who had been chosen by random sample as being representative of the various social classes, age, ethnic group and so on to be found in New York City.

Previous investigations had concluded that the speech of New Yorkers appeared to vary in a random and unpredictable manner like in the case of pronouncing the post-vocalic /r/ following a vowel such as "car" while others did not. This fluctuation was termed "free variation" because there seemed not to be any explanation for it. Labov's study and subsequent ones modeled after it however showed that, when such free variation in the speech of and between individuals was viewed against the background of the community as a whole, it was not free but rather conditioned by social factors. Thus, while idiolects considered in isolation may seem random, the speech community as a whole behaved regularly. In his investigation, Labov (1966:58)

discovered that, the lower one's social status as measured in terms of factors such as occupation, education and income, the more of the post vocalic /r/'s one uses.

Trudgill (1974) also carried out a similar investigation in Norwich study of nonstandard forms used by different class groups. The variable “-ing” referring to the alternation between the alveolar /n/ and a velar nasal /ŋ/ with –ing endings such as in “reading” and “singing”. The results of the investigation showed that the lower a person's social status, the more likely he/she is to use a higher percentage of alveolar rather than velar nasal endings. These findings are a confirmation that one's social status can affect one's use of language and by extension bring about variation.

2.2.3 Gender and language variation

Another social variable that has influenced language variation among users is gender. Eckert and Mc Connet-Ginet (1997) quoted in Wodak and Benke (1997:127) while summing up the varied positions with regards to the role of gender in language variation posit that,

women's language reflects their conservatism, prestige consciousness, upward mobility, insecurity, deference, nurture, emotional expressivity, connectedness, sensitivity to others, solidarity while men's language evinces their toughness, lack of affection, competitiveness, independence, competence, hierarchy, control etc.

Sociolinguistic studies have long observed that women use more forms of standard language than men do. To support this assertion, Wodak and Benke (1997:133) state that in many speech communities, female speakers will use a higher proportion of prestige forms than male speakers will. Women tend to use fewer stigmatized forms than men do and in formal speech, they are more sensitive to prestige language than men are.

Labov (1990:213-15)'s theory of the "gender paradox" states that,

while women adopt prestige forms of language proceeding from upper level of public consciousness at a higher rate than men, they also use higher frequency of innovative vernacular form occurring below the level of public awareness than men do.

He goes further to formulate two basic principles to capture the gender paradox theory thus:

- i. In linguistic change from above, women adopt prestige forms at a higher rate than men do.
- ii. In linguistic change from below, women use higher frequencies of innovative forms than men do.

These two principles show contrasting tendencies in the way men and women advance linguistic change. This view is re-echoed by Trudgill(1974a) who , in his work on his native city, Norwich showed that, whatever their social class, men in Norwich tended to choose pronunciations which were closer to the local vernacular and less close to Standard English. This he attributed to the fact that men tended to be breadwinners of their families and were more likely to go to work and get more involved with the rest of the society where they pick up more vernacular forms than women who tended to stay more in the confinement of their homes and did not mix much as a result, used more standard forms of language. Whatever the reasons for the difference between the language of men and women, it is an indication that gender is linked with language variation.

Apart from the investigations above, in a smaller-scale study, Jenny Cheshire (1982) observed the linguistic behaviour of three groups of teenagers in adventure playgrounds in Reading, spending considerable time with them so that they came to take her for granted. Her data revealed that adolescent males were more likely to use nonstandard grammatical forms than adolescent females.

2.2.4 Educational status and language variation

One's level of educational attainment has a lot of influence on how such a person would use language. Investigations into this particular area viewed under social status were pioneered by Labov's study of the New York City speech community (Labov, 1966 and 2006:420 in *The Stratification of New York* first and second Edition,). Several sociolinguists have seen educational status as influencing language variation among speakers of the same language with their speech varying in terms of its closeness to the standard form or its distance from the standard form for the educated speakers and uneducated or fairly speakers respectively. The level of one's education plays a major role in shaping one's language use. Indeed, people speak according to their level of education such that according to Heidi, Richards and John (1985:271), "the speech and writing of educated users of a language would reflect the standard variety." This view is also shared by Alo (2004:77) who maintains that educated speakers are often associated with standard varieties especially in speech situations that call for its use. Saeedi, Rasekh and Pavaresh (2009: 78) while giving reasons for this practice state that, "those who are educated are exposed to the standard dialect through mass media, colleagues, friends or institutions where standard, prestigious dialect is mostly used"

2.2.5 Culture and language variation

How we view the world is shaped by the beliefs, values and experiences of prior generations of our respective families. Each generation has refined its sense of what is most important for children to know, believe, value, and do to ensure survival of the cultural and social community. This unique family culture is passed unto the new through the stories that are told to children and through the family and community's child rearing practices (Parlakian Rebecca and Sylvia Sanchez 2001:127). According

to Trudgil (1974:32) “language is not only determined by social factors but also by certain customs and beliefs or attitude of speakers.” In the Nigerian context for instance, English language variation is characterized by what Sridhar (1982: 297, 299) refers to as “culture bound speech patterns” whereby the vocabulary of sentences is English but the syntax is from the some indigenous languages. This is noticeable in the area of transfer of proverbs and also certain variations that connote respect for biological age such as the semantic extension of words like “daddy”, “mummy”, “uncle” and “aunt” as mark of respect to refer to older interlocutors who may not be members of one’s immediate or extended family. In some cultures, certain words are considered taboo words and speakers are restrained in their choice of language by such cultural practices. It is an aberration to say exactly how many children one has in some cultures and this reflects in answers to questions about one’s number of children. The usual response is always that one has many children.

2.2.6 Ethnicity and language variation

Ethnicity as a social variable has played a serious role in how people view and use language. The term ethnicity has been different in so many ways depending on the perspective one is viewing it from. Giles (1979:253) defines an ethnic group to mean ‘those who perceive themselves to belong to the same ethnic category’. The term ethnicity is also defined by social practice rather than personal attributes. As Fought (2002: 445) puts it, ethnicity is ‘not about what one *is* but about what one does and that is the primary basis for establishing ethnicity.’

According to Wolfram (2007:78-83), there are several different kinds of formative bases for the relationship between ethnicity and language variation. For ethnic groups associated with a different heritage language historically, there is the potential of

language transfer from ethnic varieties. By transfer, we mean the incorporation of language features into a non-native language based on the occurrence of similar features in the native language. Loan translations of words from a heritage language are also a common way in which the effects of an ancestral language can persist in an ethnic variety.

He goes further to state that, ethno linguistic distinctiveness may extend from significant typological language differences to minute details of prosody or restricted lexical differences. In the case of different languages, speakers may make symbolic choices in their language use or manage code switching to signal ethnic identity while in the case of intra-language variation the manipulation of particular phonological morphosyntactic, or discourse variables may be used to signal ethnic affiliation. For instance, one of the reasons that African American English is so strongly defined along ethnic lines throughout the United States is no doubt the bi-racial ideology that has defined American society.

Independent language innovation may also contribute to the configuration of ethnic varieties. Lexical items are the most obvious examples, including terms for social categories and relationships endemic to the subculture, such as terms for insiders versus outsiders and different social divisions within the ethnic community, but grammaticalization, the encoding of a unique meaning onto a form, also can occur.

According to Wolfram and Schilling-Estes(2000), ethnic varieties are no different from other varieties of a language, whether they are defined primarily on the basis of a regional or a social affiliation. Although, Lippi-Green (1997) says, an ethnic variety

may be subjected to the application of the principle of linguistic subordination in which the speech associated with a socially subordinate ethnic group is interpreted as a linguistically inferior version of the variety spoken by the socially dominant group. Particular structures may be branded as “ungrammatical” or “bad grammar”, and the variety as a whole may be described as ‘corrupt’ or ‘broken’. This is because, ethnic varieties are rarely if ever associated with the standard variety or with prescriptive language norms, since they are invariably associated with a marked, non-mainstream social group. Accordingly, the varieties associated with these groups are considered non-standard or non-normative.

Though a vernacular variety may be viewed as linguistically inferior, it may still serve positively to mark ethnic identity and group solidarity, showing how evaluative attributes related to social dominance differ from those related to social cohesion. As one Lumbee Native American Indian in the American south put it, ‘We took English and corrupted it to make it our own [. . .] That’s how we recognize who we are, not only by looking at someone. We know just who we are by our language’ (Hutcheson 2000). Language may function as one of the most robust indicators of ethnic status, notwithstanding the application of the principle of linguistic subordination. (Trudgill 1972).

2.2.7 Religion and language variation

Another social variable that brings about language variation is religion. Although very little research has been carried out by renowned sociolinguists in this area, it is an area that has injected a lot of religion specific lexical items particularly in the speech of Nigerians. Ajani (2005:19) lists some of these religion induced items drawn from Wole Soyinka’s collected plays such as “ogun”, the god of iron and of war in Yoruba

traditional religion. Other examples of these include “sango” the god of thunder. The word prophet which has a broader semantic scope than the usual meaning in British or American meaning is also religiously used among the Yoruba “Aladura” religious group to refer to a child born with long and thick hair believed to be divinely consecrated to be a prophet. (Ajani 2005)

Expressions like “bless you”, “it is well”, “I am strong” to mean I am sick, brother/sister to refer to members of the same church are a common place among Pentecostal Christians in the Nigeria. Among Muslim speakers of English language in Nigeria, there are variations in the use of English which is manifest in their code mixing of Arabic words that have to do with God and Islam with Standard English expressions. Words like “Alhamdulillah, assalamu alaikum, insha Allah whose English meanings are “praise be to God”, “peace be upon you”, “by the grace of God” respectively are often used along with standard English expressions in formal contexts.

2.3. VARIETIES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN NIGERIA

A variety of a language according to Hudson (1980:22) ‘is a set of linguistic items with similar social distribution.’ The term according to him can be used to refer to different manifestations of the language. From the above, it can be deduced that varieties come about when speakers begin to use the same language in different ways as a result of certain factors which may condition such different choices. Corroborating this viewpoint, Jowitt (1991:37) also states that a variety of a language is, “one of many general and complete language systems each used by a substantial number of people and each possessing characteristics that distinguish it from other systems without requiring it to be classified as a different language.”

This implies that varieties of the same language have to be similar in nature hence mutually intelligible among the users if not, such varieties may be considered distinct languages and not varieties of the same languages. In most cases, the vocabulary items are shared but the usage and in some cases the meaning may differ as can be seen in the case of English slang- a variety of the English language. In addition to the above assertion, such varieties have to be used by a reasonable number of speakers if not they may just be seen as idiolects. Ferguson (1971:30) further states that a variety of a language is:

any body of human speech pattern which is sufficiently homogeneous to be analyzed by available techniques of synchronic description and which has a sufficiently large repertory of elements and their arrangement or processes with broad enough semantic scope to function in all normal contexts of communication.

Based on the discussion above, we can say that there are broadly two main varieties of the English language with each of them having other sub varieties. These two broad varieties are the Standard English and the nonstandard English.

2.3.0 STANDARD ENGLISH (PROCESS OF STANDARDIZATION)

For any language to be considered standard, it must have gone through the process of standardization. The standardization process results in a situation where in most cases, a feature is either made standard or remains nonstandard. Trudgill (1992:71) defines standardization as ‘consisting of the process of language determination, codification and stabilization.’ Language determination according to him refers to decisions which have to be taken concerning the selection of a particular variety for the purposes in the society or nation in question. Codification on the other hand as Trudgil submits, is ‘the process whereby a language variety acquires a publicly recognized and fixed

form.’ The results of codification are usually enshrined in dictionaries and grammar books. In the same vein, Hudson (1980:22) opines that for a language to be considered standard, it must have passed through the following processes:

i. Selection

This is the first step in the process of standardizing a language. Many communities have more than one language or variety in use. Before a language or variety is standardized, such a language or variety has to be selected from the other existing ones. The choice of such a language or variety must be generally endorsed by members of that speech community as the language or variety to be developed.

ii. Codification

According to Crystal (2008:109), codification is term used in language planning (corpus planning) referring to,

the compilation of a systematic statement of the rules and conventions governing the use of a language variety, typically the standard language of a community. When a language has been codified, its products include spelling and pronunciation guides, grammars, dictionaries, style manuals, and guides to correct usage.

These views are also expressed by Holmes (2001) who equally posits that codification means “to develop a writing system, set of official rules for grammar, orthography, pronunciation, syntax and vocabulary as well as publishing grammar books, dictionaries and similar guidelines.” Whether codification is successful depends largely on its acceptance by the population as well as its form of implementation by government such as promoting its prestige, spread, teaching the norm in schools, language courses and so on.

iii. Elaboration of Function

This stage involves assigning more functions to a selected variety to enable it meet the communicative needs of such a country or speech community both within and in its interactions with other countries. It must be possible to use the selected variety in all the functions associated with central government and with writing: for example, in parliament and law courts, in bureaucratic, educational and scientific documents of all kinds and of course, in various forms of literature (Hudson 1980:22).

iv. Acceptance

The target variety having undergone the processes highlighted above has to be accepted by the relevant population as the variety of the community - usually in fact as the national language. Once this happens and in most cases, the standard language serves as a strong unifying force for the state says Hudson (p23).

It is in light of the above that the standard (British) English which has met the above criteria is discussed below as the standard variety of the English language.

2.3.1 STANDARD/FORMAL ENGLISH AS A VARIETY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The notion Standard English in sociolinguistics as Crystal (2008:476) puts it, is a much debated term for the variety of English used as a communicative norm throughout the English-speaking world. The notion has become increasingly difficult to handle because of the emergence of differing national standards of usage (in vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and spelling) in areas where large numbers of people speak English as a first or second language. Crystal had expressed similar views in 1994 when he said that the notion Standard English is a widely used term

that has resisted definition but is used as if most educated people nonetheless know precisely what it refers to. According to him, the cautious opening of the entry on Standard English (SE) in the Oxford Companion to the English Language edited by Tom McArthur, suggests one may be entering a minefield (Crystal 1994:110).

Equally, Atkinson, Britain, Clahsen, Radford and Spencer (2009:15) maintain that the views of lay people about language are often quite simplistic. One illustration of this concerns the relationship between the so-called standard languages and the non-standard dialects associated with those languages. Standard French and Standard English, for example, are varieties of French and English respectively that have written grammar books, pronunciation and spelling conventions, are promoted by the media and other public institutions such as the education system and are considered by a majority of people to be the ‘correct’ way to speak these two languages.

As problematic as the definition of Standard English might be, many linguists have put forward various definitions of it which are assessed below. Adebite and Akindele (1999:155) who are of the view that the correct term for Standard English should be world English or international English define Standard English as, “abstraction not referring to any particular national standard of English like British English, American English... but instead referring to a variety of English acceptable to the English audience worldwide.”

This assertion portrays the fact that despite the various regional standard varieties of the English language which are being widely used in such communities like the case of the Standard Nigerian English, cannot be considered as Standard English because they are not acceptable or mutually intelligible outside Nigeria. For instance, a

question like ‘How is your body?’ may be understood in the Nigerian context but may appear ambiguous to a non Nigerian like an American or Briton.

The Standard English is also seen as a yardstick for measuring the correctness and appropriateness or otherwise of other varieties of the English language. Jowitt (2007:3) puts this more succinctly in his summary of dictionary meaning of Standard English that Standard English is, “a variety in which other varieties are evaluated; there is an expectation that other varieties will enter into conformity with this variety and that the lack of uniformity displayed among the varieties will be removed.”

The views of Jowitt are also expressed by Schneider (2011:15) who posits that: we are taught that there is a “proper English” or “Standard English” which is correct, “good,” and more or less fixed, somewhat like mathematics. A grammar book informs us on how to build its sentences, and we look up the words of the language in a dictionary. These books, and our teachers, tell us what is “right” in language matters, and what we should strive for, and everything else, including, we suspect, some of our own performance, is somehow “wrong,” deviant.

The Standard English is equally viewed as a variety being taught in schools and that which forms the basis of printed English. This is captured in the words of Yule (1985:180) who defines Standard English as, “the variety which forms the basis for printed English in newspapers and books, the variety normally taught to those who want to learn English as a second language.” This assertion is in line with what Banjo (p37) rightly observes that ‘no African country is better served with English newspapers than Nigeria.’ In addition, most of the recommended books for Nigerian schools are printed in the Standard British English. It is also a variety commonly used

in the mass media in Nigeria and generally taught in our schools as a subject in addition to it being a medium of instruction.

Alo (2004:77) on the other hand believes that Standard English is “associated with educated speakers” and that through education; it is possible for all members of a speech community to speak the Standard English regardless of their social standing. He stresses that, Standard English is “appropriate for formal contexts such as lectures, public address, business reports, formal discourse or when we meet people for the first time and are uncertain as to how to respond to them.” The views expressed by Alo are shared by Mayerhoff (2006:293) who sees Standard English as:

a set of norms that are shared across many localities and which have acquired their own special meaning. In general, they are the norms that are associated with education, and they may function as gate keeping norms establishing who will and who will not be able to exercise authority of power....

Some definitions of the Standard English portray it as having the greatest prestige when compared with other varieties even though the Standard English is only prestigious by a twist of historical fate largely. This is so because, it was the variety associated with the social group with the highest degree of power, wealth and prestige if not the Standard British English has no innate superiority in linguistic terms. Those who believe in the prestigious status of the Standard English are Heidi, Richards and John (1985:271) who maintain that for a language to be considered a standard variety, it must be ‘one which has the highest status in a community or nation and which is usually based on the speech and writing of educated natives of the language’. The Standard English in the Nigerian context suits this assertion held by Heidi et al as it is viewed with high prestige and is also the variety commonly used by those who are educated. This is not to say that all educated Nigerians for instance use the Standard

English as they should even in formal contexts especially now that the use of Standard English in formal contexts seems to be on the decline. The fact remains however that, many educated Nigerians use the Standard English in contexts that call for its usage.

The Standard English is also seen as being devoid of grammatical errors and can be widely understood by many hence it is preferred in formal contexts. However, it is worth mentioning here that, it has no fixed accent thus, it can be spoken in a wide range of accents. Although the Received Pronunciation is preferred, it is actually spoken by just a few.

Crystal (1994:110, 459) defines the Standard English of an English speaking country as,

a minority variety (identified chiefly by its vocabulary, grammar and orthography) which carries most prestige and is most widely understood.... A prestige variety used as an institutionalized norm in a community; forms not conforming to this norm are said to be non standard or pejoratively substandard.

Crystal goes further to postulate the following five essential characteristics of Standard English based on extracts from definitions available in literatures on English:

- i. Standard English is a variety of English – a distinctive combination of linguistic features with a particular role to play. Some people call it a ‘dialect’ of English and so it is, but of a rather special kind, for it has no local base. There is nothing in the grammar and vocabulary of a piece of Standard English to tell us which part of a country it comes from.

- ii. The linguistic features of Standard English are chiefly matters of grammar, vocabulary, and orthography (spelling and punctuation). It is important to note that Standard English is not a matter of pronunciation: Standard English is spoken in a wide variety of accents (including, of course, any prestige accent a country may have, such as the British RP.)
- iii. Standard English is the variety which carries most prestige within a country. Prestige here is a social concept, whereby some people have high standing in the eyes of others, whether this derives from social class, material success, political strength, popular acclaim, or educational background, the English these people choose to use will by this very fact, become the standard within their community. Crystal also quotes the US linguist- James Sledge as saying that the Standard English is “the English used by the powerful.”
- iv. The prestige attached to Standard English is recognized by adult members of the community and this motivates them to recommend Standard English as a desirable educational target. It is the variety which is used as the norm of community by the community’s leading institutions such as its government, law courts, and media. It is therefore the variety which is likely to be the most widely disseminated among the public. It will accordingly be widely understood, though not to the same extent by everyone, and with a varying comprehension of some of its features. It may or may not be the most liked.
- v. Although Standard English is widely understood, it is not widely produced. Only a minority of people within a country actually use it when they talk. Most people speak a variety of regional English, or an

admixture of standard and regional Englishes. Similarly, when they write, which is itself a minority activity- the consistent use of Standard English is required only in certain tasks such as formal or official letters. More than anywhere else, Standard English is to be found in print.

In the same vein, Trudgill cited in Bex and Watts (1999:117-128) also attempts a characterization of Standard English just as Crystal did. According to him (Trudgill), language varieties do not readily lend themselves to definitions thus, a clearer idea of what Standard English is can be obtained by saying what it is not as well as by saying what it is. Thus, Trudgill goes on to state the following as being what Standard English is not:

i. Standard English is not a Language

Standard English is often referred to as ‘the standard language’. It is clear however that, Standard English is not a ‘language’ in any meaningful sense of this term. Standard English whatever it is, is less than a language since it is only one variety of English among many. Standard English may be the most important variety of English in all sorts of ways; it is the variety of English normally used in writing especially printing; it is the variety associated with the education system in all English speaking countries of the world and is therefore the variety spoken by those who are often referred to as ‘educated people’ and it is the variety taught to non native learners.

ii. Standard English is not an Accent

There is one thing about Standard English on which most linguists or at least British linguists do appear to be agreed and that is that, Standard English has nothing to do

with pronunciation. From a British perspective, we have to acknowledge that there is in Britain a high status and widely described accent known as the Received Pronunciation which is sociolinguistically unusual when seen from a global perspective in that, it is not associated with any geographical area, being instead a purely social accent associated with speakers in all parts of the country or at least in England, from upper-class and upper-middle-class backgrounds. It is widely agreed, though that while all RP speakers also speak Standard English, the reverse is not the case. Perhaps nine to twelve percent of the population of Britain (Trudgil and Cheshire 1989) speaks Standard English with some form of regional accent. It is true that in most cases, Standard English speakers do not have 'broad' local accents i.e. accents with large numbers of regional features which are phonologically and phonetically very distinct from RP, but it is very clear that in principle, we can say that, while RP is in a sense standardized, it is a standardized accent of English and not of Standard English itself. This point becomes very clear from an international perspective. Standard English speakers can be found in all English speaking countries and it goes without saying that they speak this variety with different non RP accents.

iii. **Standard English is not a Style**

According to Trudgill, there is however and unfortunately too, considerable confusion in the minds of many concerning the relationship between Standard English and the vocabulary associated with formal varieties of the English language. Styles are characterized as varieties of language viewed from the point of view of formality (Trudgill 1992). They are varieties of language which can be ranged on a continuum from formal to very informal. Formal styles are employed in social situations which are formal and informal styles are employed in social situations which are informal. Speakers of Standard English have a full range of styles open to them just as speakers of other varieties do and can swear and use slang just as anybody else.

iv. Standard English is not a Register

The term register as Trudgill sees it is used in the sense of a variety of a language determined by topic, subject matter or activity such as the register of Mathematics, Medicine, Law or the register of pigeon fancying among others. In his words, one can certainly acquire and use technical register without using Standard English just as one can employ non technical registers while speaking or writing in Standard English.

After stating what Standard English is not, Trudgill goes on to say what it is. In his words and as agreed upon by at least most British sociolinguists, Standard English is a dialect. It is simply one variety of the English language among many. It is a sub-variety of English. Sub-varieties of languages are usually referred to as dialects and languages are often described as consisting of dialects. Standard English is however of course, an unusual dialect in a number of ways. It is for example by the most important dialect in the English speaking world from a social, intellectual and cultural point of view and it does not have an associated accent.

Secondly, unlike other dialects, Standard English is purely a social dialect. Because of its unusual history and its extreme sociological importance, it is no longer a geographical dialect even if we can tell that its origins were originally in the Southeast England. It is true that in the English speaking world as a whole, it comes in a different number of forms, so we can talk if we wish to for some particular purpose, of Scottish Standard English, American Standard English or English Standard English. The most salient sociolinguistic characteristic of Standard English is that, it is a social dialect.

Historically, Trudgill points out that, Standard English was selected (though of course unlike other languages, not by any overt or conscious decision) as the variety to

become the standard variety precisely because it was the variety associated with the social group with the highest degree of power, wealth and prestige. Subsequent developments have reinforced its social character.

2.3.1.1 STANDARD BRITISH ENGLISH

According to Jowitt (2007:2), the Standard British English as a variety ‘emerged in England quite rapidly in the 14th and 15th centuries out of the cluster of English dialects of the time.’ Fundamentally, it was the dialect of the East Midlands, an area which included London, the seat of government and also the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Of crucial importance to its development was the establishment of the printing press in England and in Westminster close to (and now part of) London by William Claxton. He further states that, “the standardization of the dialect was further accelerated by industrialization, urbanization and the coming of mass formal education. However, it can be said to have reached its climax with the completion in 1928 of the publication of the Oxford English Dictionary on Historical principles, a process that had taken more than sixty years.

The Standard British English is a widely accepted and institutionalized standard variety of the English language. Historically, it descended from the West Saxon dialect of old English specifically the dialect of London. This variety was selected (though of course, unlike many other languages not by any overt or conscious decision) as the variety to become the standard variety probably because it was associated with the social group with the highest degree of power, wealth and prestige (Bex and Watts 1999: 117). Schneider (2011:16) describes the Standard British English as “certain speech form shared by certain speakers for use in certain situations

– probably educated ones from anywhere in the British Isles performing in formal or public contexts.”

The most important fact about the Standard British English is the fact that it has been employed as the dialect of education to which pupils especially in earlier stages have had differential access depending on their social class background. Schneider(2011:16) went on to say that the Standard English is the variety of language considered by its speakers to be ‘the most appropriate in formal and educational contexts.’ This variety is also used in this research as a yardstick for drawing comparisons with identified nonstandard lexical items.

2.3.2 NONSTANDARD/ INFORMAL ENGLISH.

Atkinson, Britain, Clahsen, Radford and Spencer (2009:15) posit that nonstandard varieties (sometimes called ‘dialects’) are often considered to be “lazy, ungrammatical forms, which betray a lack of both educational training and discipline in learning.” Although this view according to them is sometimes strongly opposed by linguists who maintain that the study of language use has shown not only that nonstandard varieties exhibit grammatical regularity and consistent pronunciation patterns in the same way that standard varieties do, but also that a vast majority of people will use nonstandard features at least some of the time in their speech.

According to Parker and Riley (1994), nonstandard English is “any dialect of English other than Standard English”. They go further to state that, it is a term used disapprovingly to describe ‘bad’ or “incorrect” English. To them, a nonstandard dialect “does draw negative attention to itself”. That is, educated people might judge the speaker of such a dialect as socially inferior, lacking education and so on. ‘A

nonstandard dialect has socially marked forms' (one that causes the listener to form a negative judgment of the speaker).

In the words of Corder and Ruszkiweicz (1979:10), a language can be called nonstandard 'if its spelling is inconsistent, its punctuation idiosyncratic and its usage not widely accepted.' Nonstandard English according to them is,

most often defined by its vocabulary, its sounds or its grammatical construction and its appropriateness in discussions of informal or humorous situations and activities such as sports...nonstandard English is the same with informal English ...it is marked as colloquial in dictionaries and most of those marked as slang

Alo (2004:16) in the same vein opines that, the nonstandard English is 'that which may be used by people who are intimate (e.g. friends, husband and wife) and allows such devices as direct references, interjections, abbreviations and so on.'

From the various definitions of the nonstandard English, we see that nonstandard English or informal English is not meant for official use in formal contexts but rather, it is the expected choice of variety for informal discourses outside official or academic related matters. Nonstandard English is thus that which students are expected to use while interacting with their fellow students, friends and other acquaintances. Consequently, nonstandard English or non-English words used in formal contexts particularly in formal writings are therefore either circled or underlined and marks deducted by the examiner as penalty for expression or mechanical accuracy errors. These forms include both conventional and unconventional shorthand such as abbreviations associated with SMS, substitution of English words with numbers and contracted forms of English words like 'don't' 'I'd' 'e.g.'. Other forms of nonstandard English include: English Slang, non-English words

especially those from Pidgin, Arabic, Hausa and in some cases Yoruba which our subjects code mix with the Standard English language in formal contexts without putting such words in inverted commas to show that even though their usage is not allowed, such nonstandard words are used deliberately for certain reasons.

2.3.2.0 VARIETIES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE COMMONLY USED BY THE TARGET POPULATION IN FORMAL CONTEXTS ALONGSIDE THE STANDARD BRITISH ENGLISH

2.3.2.1 Standard Nigerian English (SNE)

One among the varieties of English spoken in Nigeria today is the “Standard Nigerian English” (Bamgbose, 1982). This variety although characterized by features that reflect the socio ethno-cultural linguistic background of Nigerians is considered closer to the Standard British English than other varieties like Nigerian pidgin or broken English. It is a variety common among educated Nigerians. Adekunle (1985: 36, 38) using the theory of language change and linguistic variation, puts forth cultural needs, geographical and linguistic factors as responsible for changes in English language in Nigeria. According to him,

the English has as a result of many years of active use in the Nigerian speech community....become part of Nigeria’s contemporary environment and behaviour. It is an artifact whose foreign derived components have in the process of its evolution combined with native Nigerian elements to make it local

The Standard Nigerian English is considered the variety used by university-educated Nigerians and is the variety often used in formal contexts. In the words of Walsh, N.G.(1967) quoted by Ogu (1992:88), “the varieties of English spoken by educated

Nigerians no matter what their language have enough features in common to mark off a general type which may be called Nigerian English”

According to Bamgbose 1971, 1982, Jibril 1986, Ufomata 1996, Jowitt 2000, Standard Nigerian English differs systematically from British English in areas of stress and usage of sentence stress. According to them, sentence stress is not used for emphasis or contrast and given information is not usually deaccented. In the area of rhythm, it is been suggested that Standard Nigerian English has syllable- timed rather than stress-timed rhythm. It also most often than not reflect the prosodic structure of the speaker’s native language and that stressed syllables are associated with a high tone and unstressed syllables with a low tone. (Wells 1982)

According to Ajani (2000:5), the Standard Nigerian English is sometimes characterized by direct lexical transfers from the local languages and mostly from areas such as indigenous food, music , clothing, traditional religious beliefs, local institutions among others as well as different creative strategies such as the lexification of acronyms, neologisms and semantic extension. Drawing excerpts from free speech from Wole Soyinka’s collected plays, Ajani exemplifies these features using the following sentences.

1. Towards the end of this speech, the sound of “gangan” drums is heard, coming from the side opposite the hut. A boy enters carrying a drum on each shoulder (CP2152)
2. A man in an elaborate “agbada” outfit with a long train and a cap standing right downstage, with a sheaf of notes in his hand.(CP2:167)
3. Silva: Now, now, let’s stop all this silliness. Here, let’s have another go. It’s all a matter of tempo chummy. Not like high life or “juju” music. Now, shall we try again? This time, follow the score. (CP2189)

Bola: what do you have on the menu today?

Waiter: We have “dodo”, “akara”, “amala”, “eba” and “tuwo”.

Bola: What about “soup”, what kind of “soup” do you have today?

Waiter: We have “egusi” soup, “ewedu” and “ogbonno”. Which one do you prefer?

We also have bush meat...

From the examples above, we see instances of direct transfer from Yoruba, Hausa and Igbo exemplified in the words “akara”, “amala”, “eba” and “tuwo, “egusi” , “ewedu” and “ogbonno”. The use of “soup” in the Nigeria sense has a broader semantic range than its British usage does where it is mainly eaten as an appetizer at the beginning of a meal, or even taken just by itself. In the Nigerian context however, soup is generally used as a side dish to eat the main meal. It is not often eaten alone (Ajani 2007). Other cases of semantic extension abound in SNE especially in the domain of relationship vocabulary. Thus, the words father, mother, brother, sister, uncle, aunt and cousin could take on additional meanings in the Nigerian contexts where they are used as terms of respect for an older female or male person who may have no connection at all with one’s immediate or extended family. These are used as honorific terms in those contexts (Wigwe 1990). Another example of semantic extension is in the use of the expression “well done” as a form of salutation to mean good morning, afternoon or evening whereas in its British sense, it is used only as a form of commendation especially for one who is busy doing some work.

In the area of morpho-syntax, the Standard Nigeria English is characterized by what Sridhar (1982: 297, 299) refers to as “culture bound speech patterns” whereby the vocabulary of sentences is English but the syntax is from the indigenous language noticeable in the transfer of proverbs. Also, among the Yorubas especially and in most Africa, it is not socially and culturally appropriate to confront people directly

and the age factor, that is respect for age also requires certain discourse strategies to avoid face threatening acts as well as to save face. Words like bride price, senior wife which are cultural based may account for Nigerian English.

Not everyone however, believes in the existence of a distinct variety of English language in Nigeria called Standard Nigerian English. Vincent (1974) for instance sees this variety simply as a “bad English” likewise Salami (1968) who contends that what has been identified as Standard Nigerian English in reality is “errors of usage”. These two views according to Ajani (2007) seem to air the concern of English language teachers in Nigerian institutions of learning who find it quite derogatory and rather insulting to refer to such a variety of language. These would rather see any departure from the British variety (which was imported to Nigeria) as either deviant or incorrect. On the contrary, Adekunle (1974) maintains that,

there arises from the Standard Nigerian English the normal process of language development involving a narrowing and extension of meaning or a creation of new idioms and not mother tongue interference.

He buttresses this point by using the example of “travel” used in the sense “to be away” as in “My father travelled (My father is away). It is not a transfer of a first language expression into English but a modification of the verb to travel.

Despite the differing opinions about the existence or non existence of this variety as discussed above, one thing that is not open to debate as observed among the target population for this study is the fact that, some of their usages although not hundred percent British Standard English are closer to it than they are to Nigerian pidgin, English slang or broken English thereby suggesting existence of a variety closer to the Standard British English, a variety associated with educated Nigerians and used in

formal contexts hence, the Standard Nigerian English. This variety has also been used along with the Standard British English as a yardstick for determining the “nonstandardness” of lexical items used by the target group of this study.

2.3.2.2 THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE OF THE GLOBAL SYSTEM FOR MOBILE COMMUNICATION’S SHORT MESSAGE SERVICE (GSM/SMS)

One of the features of nonstandard English words usage in formal contexts particularly in the written communication of the target population is the shorthand associated with the GSM/SMS. GSM was introduced in Nigeria during the Obasanjo led administration in 2001 with the licensing of MTN and Econet (now Airtel). Other networks like Globacom and Etisalat in addition to the two mentioned earlier are in operation currently in Nigeria with over sixty- five million subscribers as announced on Africa Independent Television (AIT) during one of the MTN shows in August, 2012. With the arrival of GSM, Nigerians and particularly students of higher learning now have access to not just telephoning but also to sending of messages on the Short Message Service (SMS) which is considered a cheaper option.

According to Mgbemena (2007:2), SMS also known as text messaging is, “a feature available in most modern mobile digital phones that allow users to send and also receive graphic messages from 150 to 160 characters from other mobile phones.” Similarly, Chilwa (2007:2) posits that “the SMS gives the subscriber the advantage of choosing specific number of words that would communicate comprehensively but briefly with minimum cost.” Based on the fact that most handsets allow a maximum of 160 characters including space, symbols and punctuation marks on a page, subscribers become constrained by space and in some cases time. In the light of this

problem, subscribers become compelled to create new and in fact unique linguistic forms characterized by abbreviations, acronyms and other forms of shorthand to enable them maximize the limited available space and say all that has to be said.

Onadeko (2000: 81-82) states that,

text messages have become a dynamic written communication strategy occurring naturally in practical communication contexts and as discourses are constructed in short texts in either formal or informal modes not always conforming to lexical or grammatical rules, but do certainly communicate and are recognized by their writers and receivers as coherent.

While experienced writers are still able to draw a line between when to use the SMS shorthand and the contexts that do not call for it, many students particularly those that form the subjects of this study who receive the most messages have not been able to switch easily or for whatever reasons are not willing to.

2.3.2.3 ENGLISH SLANG

The use of English slang among students of higher learning across the globe has become a common phenomenon. According to Eble (1988:1-2), “the creative use of language by college students to grumble to each other about their lot in life and about those in authority over them must date back in Western Europe to the earliest days of the universities”. Public interest in college slang during the latter part of the nineteenth century is shown by the many short and often anecdotal articles on the topic published in newspapers and magazines. Some of these include the works by Eble (1979), (1980), (1983), (1986), (1988), (1989), (1990), (1991), (1992), (1993), whose works dwell on slang used by students of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

The use of English slang is not restricted to the United States of America and other parts of the developed world alone. In Nigeria also, there is hardly any institution of higher learning where students especially at informal contexts do not use slang. This is evident from the web site <http://www.ngex.com/entertainment/on-campus/campus-slang> which is exclusively for Nigerian campus slang where students from different Nigerian Universities send in slang vocabularies and their meanings as used on such campuses.

Despite the prevalence of particularly English slang among students of institutions of higher learning, most linguists are unanimous in their views about the nonstandard and informal nature of English slang hence its appropriateness in only the informal contexts. This is captured succinctly in the words of Grossman and Tucker (1991:1) who believe slang is, “a nonstandard vocabulary belonging to a particular culture or subculture and consisting of raw and unrefined expressions many of which are considered taboo, vulgar and derogatory.”

This is corroborated by Flexner (1975: IV) who also shares the view that slang is informal variety of the English language thus, “slang is the body of words and expressions frequently used by or intelligible to a rather large portion of the general... public but not accepted as good, formal usage by the majority.”

Ockerstrom (2002:5) sees slang as “unconventional, hard-hitting, metaphorical language that is colloquial, sometimes vulgar and always innovative” while Asher and Simpson (1994:3964) quote dictionaries as defining slang with at least two senses: first, “slang is the special, restricted speech of sub-groups or subcultures in the society” and second, “it is a highly informal conventional vocabulary of more general use”.

According to Eble (1983:1), a survey of writings about English slang confirms not only the marginal status accorded to it but also the opposing values associated with this status which often ‘puts slang continually at odds with good grammar and social respectability.’ Equally, Bolton (1982:354) posits that, “slang makes a poor choice for the writer who wants to address an audience beyond the time and place in which he writes.” Quirk et al (1972) put slang in a footnote where it is described as an “attitudinal variety outside the common core of English.”

Giving that English slang is considered informal and nonstandard as shown by the different definitions discussed above, it is therefore not supposed to be used in formal contexts. Unfortunately however, our data proves otherwise as students of the selected institutions engage in the use of English slang which they code mix with Standard English expressions in their write-ups during examinations without putting such slang words in inverted commas. The use of slang words is not restricted to the written communication of students alone but is also used in their spoken communication in formal contexts.

2.3.2.4 PIDGIN

From the data obtained in both the spoken and written communication of our subjects, it was equally discovered that some of the identified lexical items considered as nonstandard but code mixed with Standard English expressions in formal contexts took the form of Pidgin hence the relevance of our understanding of what Pidgin is. Here we shall be looking at general Pidgin and English or Nigerian Pidgin.

2.3.2.4.1 General Pidgin

Pidgins all over the world arise from contact situations where the groups in contact have no common means of communication. Those who share this view include Jowitt (2000:12) who opines that pidgin the world over results from, “the hybridization of two or more distinct languages which begin as a second language that is used for limited purposes especially for commercial transaction and communication between two races.”

The same view is re-echoed by the Linguistic Encyclopedia (1991:81) which states that ‘a precondition for the development of pidgin is the contact between members from two or more cultures who do not speak the same language.’ The contact which is often as a result of trade or colonization has to be on over a period of time. In the same vein, Hudson (1980) also believes that, “pidgin is used by people who otherwise would have no common language whatsoever, and learned by one person from another within the communities concerned.”

This is not however to say that every communication system that develops among people who do not share a common language is pidgin as can be seen in the case of sign language used among the deaf and dumb. For such a communication system to be seen as pidgin, the people involved must have their own distinct languages which are not however intelligible to either party found in such a situation where there is the need to communicate but no common language to do so.

According to Crystal (2008:336), a pidgin is,

a system of communication which has grown up among people who do not share a common language, but who

want to talk to each other, for trading or other reasons. Pidgins have been variously called 'makeshift', 'marginal', or 'mixed' languages. They have a limited vocabulary, a reduced grammatical structure, and a much narrower range of functions, compared to the languages which gave rise to them. They are the native language of no-one, but they are nonetheless a main means of communication for millions of people.

Crystal's postulation is evident in the case of slaves from Africa who were brought over to North America to work on plantation farms. Because they were separated from people whom they shared the same language with and thrown together with people of different linguistic backgrounds, they were thus initially unable to communicate with each other. In order for them to be able to communicate effectively with their peers on the plantations and with their bosses, they were compelled to form a language hence pidgin developed. Corroborating this view, Cook (1993:69), believes that pidgin is "a contact language used by two groups with one being socially dominant but neither speaking it as a first language."

Pidgin is said to be sharply restricted in social role, used for limited communication between speakers of two or more languages who have repeated or extended contacts with each other, for instance, through trade, enslavement, or migration. A pidgin usually combines elements of the native languages of its users and is typically simpler than those native languages insofar as it has fewer words, less morphology and a more restricted range of phonological and syntactic options (Rickford, 1998:163). This position is equally held by Meyerhoff (2006: 15-16) who sees pidgin generally as "a language variety that is not very linguistically complete or elaborate and is used in fairly restricted social domains and for limited social or interpersonal functions" Barber (1993:239) on the other hand posits that "pidgin is an auxiliary language used

in the first place for the purpose of trade between groups that have no common language.” Crystal (1987:334) like Barber states that pidgin is “a system of communication which has grown up among people who do not share a common language but who want to talk to each other for trading or other reasons.”

Contrary to the assertions above, the use of pidgin especially in Nigeria today goes beyond just the purpose of trade alone. Pidgin now is used by people from all walks of life who employ its use for different purposes other than trade. One thing to note however is the fact, that pidgin is often seen as a grammatically simplified form of a language native to none of the parties involved.

While some of the definitions examined so far consider pidgin as a language, Yule (1985:233) sees it as a variety of language. He defines pidgin as “a variety of a language (e.g. English) which developed for some practical purposes such as trading among groups of people who had a lot of contact but who did not know each other’s language and as such it would have no native speakers.”

The views of Yule expressed above are similar to those of Holmes (2004:5) who opines that pidgin is,

a reduced language that results from extended contact between groups of people with no language in common; it evolves when they need some means of verbal communication, perhaps for trade, but no group learns the native language of any other group for social reasons that may include lack of trust or close contact.

He further states that those with less power (speakers of substrate languages) are more accommodating and use words from the language of those with more power (the superstrate), although the meaning, form and use of these words may be influenced by

the substrate languages. When dealing with the other groups, the superstrate speakers adopt many of these changes to make themselves more readily understood and no longer try to speak as they do within their own group. They cooperate with the other groups to create a make-shift language to serve their needs, simplifying by dropping unnecessary complications such as inflections (e.g., two knives becomes two knife) and reducing the number of different words they use, but compensating by extending their meanings or using circumlocutions. By definition the resulting pidgin is restricted to a very limited domain such as trade, and it is no one's native language

According to Kerstein and Traulth (2006:905-906), the term "pidgin" is probably a corruption of the English word business, as pronounced by the indigenous Chinese, and designates,

a mixed language that arises in situations where speakers of different languages are unable to understand each other's native language and, therefore, need to develop a common means of communication. In such situations, the structure and vocabulary of the individual native languages are reduced over time, in order to bring about general, mutual understanding. Gradually, a functional mixed language develops from the rudimentary contact language and is learned along with one's native language.

They go further to state that linguistically, pidgins are characterized by a "limited vocabulary, a greater use of paraphrase and metaphor, a simplified phonological system, and a reduced morphology and syntax."

Stockwell and Trask (2007:221) are also of the view that 'pidgin is an auxiliary language created by people with no language in common.' This they say happens when people with no language in common find themselves thrown together and obliged to deal with one another. Sometimes the language of just one group will be

learned by the others and used as a lingua franca but often, something quite different happens: words from one or more of the languages of the people involved will be taken and stitched together into a kind of crude way of communicating. This is a pidgin. In addition, Stockwell and Trask maintain that,

a pidgin is nobody's mother tongue, and it is not a real language at all: it has no elaborate grammar, it is very limited in what it can convey, and different people speak it differently. Still, for simple purposes, it does work, and often everybody in the area learns to handle it.

The view that pidgin is a variety of language as put forward by Stockwell and Trask (2007:221) has been widely opposed by scholars such as Elugbe and Omamor (1987 and 1991), Gani-Ikilama (1989 and 1999), Muhlhausler(1986) among others who equate Pidgin with fully fledged languages. According to Muhlhausler, the problem with such definitions accorded to pidgin, those who stress the makeshift character of Pidgin ignore the fact that 'pidgins are developed to a considerable degree of stability and complexity.' There is also the possibility of confusing simplification (greater grammatical regularity) with impoverishment (lack of referential and non referential power). He further claims that pidgins are not mixed up languages in the sense most often intended. This is most pronounced in the post- pidgin phase. That is, when a pidgin comes into renewed contact with its original relexified language. It is in the light of the above argument that Muhlhausler (1986) proposes a new definition of pidgin thus,

pidgins are examples of partially targeted or non targeted second language learning, developing from simpler to more complex systems as communicative requirements become more demanding. Pidgin languages by definition have no native speakers; they are social rather than individual solutions and hence are characterized by norms of acceptability.

Whether pidgin is a language or a variety of the English language in the Nigerian context as reflected in the divided opinion discussed above, one fact that is not debatable is that pidgin has other varieties. The variety of pidgin spoken in Nigeria particularly among students of institutions of higher learning and those selected for this study is the West African pidgin also known as Nigerian pidgin.

2.3.2.4.2 English Pidgin/Nigerian Pidgin

Nigerian pidgin otherwise known as pidgin English is said to be a variety of West African English spoken all through Anglophone West Africa. In the words of Bamgbose et al (1995:291), Nigerian pidgin is “geographically spread all over Nigeria and spoken by Nigerians of different ethnic origins, and it is indigenous to Nigeria because it originated and is expanding here in Nigeria.”

Historically, Mafemi (1971:98) observes that the emergence of Nigerian pidgin ‘lies in the early contacts between Europeans and Africans on the coast...’ particularly the English who became Nigerians’ trading partners after the Portuguese had left from the beginning of the 17th century onwards. This is captured in the words of Bamgbose et al (1995) thus, “the continued stay of the English, whose number and interests also continued to expand, encouraged the growth of Nigerian pidgin.”

The development and spread of Nigerian pidgin beyond its traditional coastal territory can be said to have been facilitated by Nigerians themselves. The fact that Nigerians despite their multilingual background had no indigenous language of common identity forced them to follow the new language-pidgin which consequently expanded and stabilized since it had to cope with the expanding experiences of its Nigerian users. This made Nigerian pidgin to functionally penetrate further in the hinterland in remote, rural, far-away northern villages (Gani-Ikilama, 1999)

In addition, urbanization has also helped the growth and spread of Nigerian pidgin. Mafeni (1971:98) posits that 'Nigerian Pidgin is essentially a product of the process of urbanization.' The setting together of people from different linguistic backgrounds in urban centers makes the use of Nigerian Pidgin necessary.

The use of Nigerian pidgin cuts across different strata of the Nigerian society as it is used by the educated and the illiterate, the rich and the poor and so on. This is captured in the words of Elugbe and Omamor (1991) that Nigerian pidgin is used today among factory workers, in schools, military and police barracks, illiterate homes of mixed marriages and among office workers. It is also used by Nigerian novelists, playwrights, advertising agents, the media, trade unionists and politicians as a means of mass communication. Thus, it is no longer a surprise that Nigerian pidgin is spoken in Standard English speaking homes where it was once considered forbidden. Many artisans, gardeners, gatemen and other domestic staff of highly educated homes/families can only communicate with their masters and employers in Nigerian pidgin. Elugbe and Omamor further reiterate that, Nigerian Pidgin is spoken almost anywhere and in all places where it is spoken; it is spoken by illiterates and by university graduates, the lowly as well as those highly placed in the society. These same views are confirmed by Akinluyi (1971:36) who observes that, 'pidgin is used in Nigeria by people in various walks of life ranging from the illiterate market women to the university professor; it is used by people of different ages and linguistic backgrounds.'

Like Elugbe, Omamor and Akinluyi, Adekunle (1972:198) states that, Nigerian pidgin is 'the language most frequently used as the means of inter ethnic communication at

the shopping centers, market places, motor parks and even in most informal discussions in the offices and in linguistically heterogeneous cities.’ Also, Ronald (1985:55) posits that Nigerian pidgin is not just a bad variety of the English language but ‘language...with its own legitimacy, i.e., its own history, structure, array of functions and the possibility of winning recognition as a proper language’

The Nigerian pidgin is English based pidgin. This implies that the English language is the dominant language which supplies it with most of its vocabulary with the various indigenous languages contributing minimally. In other words, the English language is the superstrate language, major lexifier or super stratum while the indigenous languages serve as the substratum.

Some of the examples of pidgin words commonly used among students are ‘okada’, ‘express man’, ‘allowee’, ‘oga’, ‘wahala’, ‘bulala’ , ‘drop’ ‘keke napep’ among others.

2.4 CODE MIXING

Our study shows that one among the ways in which the subjects of this research use nonstandard English is by code mixing both nonstandard words with Standard English expressions in both their written and spoken communication. Although details are discussed in chapter four, some of the examples of this can be seen in some of the extracted sentences from our subjects’ spoken and written communication thus:

Example one: *Wallahi*, I am saying the truth.

Example two: The *okada* man *dropped* me at the gate.

Example three: Most of the killings during the post election violence were carried out by *yaro* boys.

According to Mayerhoff (2006:227), code mixing generally refers to “alternation between varieties or codes within a clause or phrase. Often, it elicits more strongly negative evaluation than alternation or code switching across clauses.” While Mayerhoff sees it as occurring between varieties or codes, Akindele and Adegbite (1999:38) posit that code mixing refers to ‘a situation whereby, two languages are used in a single sentence within major and minor constituent boundaries. The mixing of items is almost at the word level.’ Poplack (1985:115) who adopts the label ‘mixed speech’ to refer to code mixing also shares the same views with Akindele and Adegbite that code- mixing occurs between languages. He posits that, code- mixing is “associated with conversation that involves the use of two codes or languages and it is at the level of the lexical or phrasal items.” He adds that “nouns are popularly involved in code mixing not only because they are relatively free of syntactic restrictions” but also due to the robustness of nouns in lexical items.

In the same vein, Crystal (2008:109) while expressing similar views as those expressed by Akindele and Adegbite and Poplack maintains that, “code-mixing involves the transfer of linguistic elements from one language into another: a sentence begins in one language, then makes use of words or grammatical features belonging to another.”

Fasold (1984: 180-209) on the review of language choice in his investigation of what makes people in a society choose one language rather than another in a given instance identifies three kinds of choices thus: code switching, code-mixing and variation within the same language. Fasold describes code mixing as a ‘situation where ‘pieces’ of one language are used while a speaker is basically using another language. The

language ‘pieces’ taken from another language are often words or phrases as shown in the examples at the beginning of this discussion. According to Fasold, one who speaks more than one language will definitely have to choose one. The problem with Fasold’s stand is that, it is not always all about choice but appropriateness with regards to context - whether the context is formal or informal. It has also been discovered that language users particularly the subjects of this study do not only mix ‘pieces’ of language as Fasold puts it but also mix words from other varieties of language like the case of English Slang mixed with Standard English expressions.

There is also need to draw a distinction between code mixing and borrowing which although some linguists believe are the same, some still maintain that they differ. One of those in this school of thought is Romain (1992:133) who while differentiating between code mixing and borrowing states that, “ as far as the question of borrowing and code mixing are (sic) concerned, it goes beyond the particular utterance concerned and the degree to which a particular utterance is integrated.”

In the same vein, Appel and Muiyeken (1993:121) believe that code mixing and borrowing are not the same and that in order to differentiate between the two, the Saussurean *langue* and *parole* should be the yardstick. Thus they maintain that, ‘borrowing involves an integration of two languages at the level of *langue*... code mixing, integration at the level of *parole*.’ They further state that,

in practice, it may not be simple to distinguish between them. The classical view is that code mixing and borrowing can easily be kept apart: with code mixing, the non-native items are kept not adapted morphologically and phonologically, with borrowing they are... (Appel and Muiyeken 1993: 133)

Code mixing which is our main concern and not borrowing is a sociolinguistic phenomenon prevalent in any bilingual and multilingual setting. Appel and Muijken (p122) observe that, since bilinguals usually acquire two languages in different ways, it is most likely that they also share two different cultural experiences. Thus, the acquisition modes affect the usage as well as the choice of lexical items. According to them,

if a bilingual speaker always uses language A in informal and language B in formal settings, it will be difficult to translate (or in this context, come up with a word/phrase)...referring to experiences in informal settings from A into B. it might take some extra time to find 'the right words' for these words generally do not come up in the situations in which B is spoken

Different reasons have been identified by linguists as to why bilinguals or multilinguals code mix ranging from covering up deficiency or incompetence, as a mechanism to exclude certain person(s) from having a complete understanding of the subject of discussion, to demonstrate a personality of mixed identity, for the sake of humour like in the case of comedians among many other reasons (Myers 1998:149). Although as mentioned earlier, the subjects of this study code mix in their speech behaviour however, the reasons for this behaviour which range from religious inclinations to seeking favours are discussed in the findings of the analyzed data in chapter four.

2.5. DEFINITION OF CONTEXT

The term context has been defined in a number of ways by different linguists such as referring to ' a specific part of an utterance or text near or adjacent to a unit which is the focus of attention', 'that which gives words meaning i.e. putting a word in context in order to clarify the intended meaning', 'a particular characteristic of the

formulation of rules in Generative linguistics where the forms can be classified in terms of whether they occur only within a specific context or are independent of the context.(formal context)’ (Crystal 1980, 1987, Allerton 1979, Fromkin 2000) and a host of many others. The different definitions of context that are discussed in this section are those that have direct relevance to this study. That is, those definitions that consider context as a determinant of the choice of formal or informal varieties of language.

According to Nunan (1993:8-9), context refers to “the situation giving rise to the discourse and within which the discourse is embedded.” He goes further to distinguish between linguistic and non-linguistic contexts. The linguistic context in Nunan’s view is “the language that surrounds or accompanies the piece of discourse under analyses” whereas the non – linguistic context or experiential context within which the discourse takes place includes,

the type of communicative event (for example joke, story, lecture, greeting, conversation) the topic, the purpose of the event, the setting including location, time of day, season of the year and the physical aspects of the situation (for example size of room, arrangement of furniture), the participants and the relationship between them and the background knowledge and assumption underlying the communicative event.

Corroborating the above viewpoint, Alo (2004:75) opines that the term context encompasses a wide notion embracing linguistic and non-linguistic factors of language use. The linguistic context is primarily ‘seen in terms of what immediately precedes and what follows an expression in a text.’ The social context which is non-linguistic ‘refers to the person or participants involved in a large activity and their

social characteristics including social class, level of education, age, sex and relationships.’

To crystal (1989:48), context is “the place in which a communicative event occurs” while Lyons (1979:572) defines context as “a theoretical construct in the postulation of which the linguist abstracts from the actual situation and establishes as contextual all the factors which systematically determine the form and the appropriateness of the meaning.”

Context no doubt has been viewed as a determinant of not only the meaning of utterances but also their appropriateness in specific given contexts as already discussed in the introductory paragraph in chapter one. According to Levinson (1983:5), context can be understood to cover “the identities of participants, the temporal and spatial parameters of the speech event, and all the beliefs, knowledge and intentions of the participants in that speech event and no doubt much besides.”

He goes on to posit that, “context can also mean the selection of just those features that are culturally and linguistically relevant to the production and interpretation of utterances.” These features according to Lyons (1974:574) include the following:

1. Knowledge of the role and status (where role covers both role in the speech event, as speaker or addressee, and social role and status covers notions of relative social standing)
2. Knowledge of spatial temporal location
3. Knowledge of formality level.

4. Knowledge of the medium(roughly the code or style appropriate to a channel, like the distinction between written and spoken varieties of a language)
5. Knowledge of appropriate subject matter.
6. Knowledge of appropriate province (or domain determining the register) of a language)

Thornborrow and Wareing (1998:88) opine that, ‘context refers to factors which could influence how an individual interprets a chunk of language” but for Crystal (1989:48) however, context is ‘the place in which a communicative event occurs’ while Adebija (1999) opines that context refers to the relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of an utterance or discourse’. Expressing similar views as those of Adebija, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) state that ‘context includes all relevant factors in the environments, social conventions and the shared experiences of the participants.’ Thus, one’s audience as well as other societal norms should be considered in every given situation as this will determine how language should be selected.

In the words of Crystal (1980:79), “context is a term referring to the features of the non- linguistic world in relation to which linguistic items are systematically used.” According to him, the term situation is also used in this sense, as a compound term “situational context.” In this broadest sense, situational context includes “the total non-linguistic background to a text or utterance, including immediate situation in which it is used and the awareness by speaker and hearer of what has been said earlier and of any relevant beliefs or presuppositions.” Others restrict the term to what is immediately observable in the co-occurring situation. Another sense of the term put forward by Crystal is the general term “context of utterance” which he says is

sometimes used to refer to all factors which systematically determine the form and meaning of utterances.

Saeed (2006:190) however sees knowledge as context. To him knowledge cannot be separated from context. In other words, “a speaker must make estimations of what the hearer knows before uttering a referential statement.” For instance, if someone rushes towards you and says: The baby swallowed the needle: their choice of word reveals that they think you can identify both the baby and the needle involved. The three different sources for the knowledge a speaker has to estimate according to Saeed are:

1. That computable from the physical context
2. That available from what has already been said: and
3. That available from background or common knowledge.

Under the first heading, we look at who is speaking to whom, the time and location of verbal exchange. Under the second heading, the talk itself or discourse is considered the context. In isolation, sentence fragments like: “John did” or “Me too” cannot be interpreted. But in the right conventional context, they are meaningful: For instance;

- a. Who moved these chairs?
- b. John did.
- c. I’m starving.
- d. Me too.

Definitely, participants would have no difficulty interpreting “John did” as “John moved these chairs”: or “me too” as “I’m starving too”.

The third type of knowledge can be called background, common sense, encyclopedic, socio-cultural and real world knowledge. What is meant here is that, as members of any human community; speakers of the same language, citizens of the same state, city or neighbourhood, members of the same political association etc, it is assumed that we

possess some knowledge which others will draw upon in the process of any form of verbal exchange.

Example:

a. I'm hungry

b. I'll lend you some money

This exchange indicates that money can be used to buy food (Saeed, 2006:90-92).

From the foregoing, it can be deduced that shared knowledge is very important and that it is also the context or background that determines what choice should be made of language in every given situation in order to avoid communication breakdown. Students of course understand the meaning of for instance the slang expressions commonly used among them hence they can use such expressions in their communication with one another especially at informal contexts because of the shared knowledge they have. This however, may not be so with their lecturers or older persons who are unfamiliar with such expressions. Using such expressions while addressing one who is not familiar with them will not only be strange and inappropriate particularly in a formal context but may also lead to ambiguity or communication breakdown because there is no shared knowledge. This view is shared by Alo (2004:74) who states that, "a very important aspect of context is provided by social conditions." In order to transmit and decode meaning, we do more than arrange the form of language (sounds and words) in a particular order. One has to construct meaning in a manner that is socially acceptable.

2.6. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.6.0 AN ECLECTIC APPROACH

This study adopts an eclectic approach in the analysis of its data. The study adopts a synthesis of Fishman (1972)'s "Domain and Topics", Labov (2006)'s "Quantitative Paradigm" and Giles (2001)'s "Accommodation Theory". Before going on to discuss the justification for adopting an admixture of the aforementioned models, these approaches shall be briefly discussed below.

2.6.1. DOMAIN AND TOPICS

This model which is also known as 'domain analysis' was postulated by Fishman and is representative of the theories from the Sociology of Language. Fishman (1972:587) defines domain as, "a socio- cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships between communicators and locales of communication in accordance with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a speech community."

In expressing his views about this model, Fishman attempts to correlate physical setting and social context with language choice by asking the question "who speaks what language, to whom, when and why by using the following parameters; topic, interlocutor and spatial-temporal setting or domains." By domain, Fishman means "institutional contexts" in which one language variety is more likely to be appropriate than another. This is referred to as congruent and incongruent social situation use of language.

According to Crystal (2008:155), domain in Sociolinguistics refers to,

a group of institutionalized social situations typically constrained by a common set of behavioural rules, e.g. the domain of the family is the house, of religion is the church, etc. The notion is seen as of particular

importance in the analysis of multilingual settings involving several participants, where it is used to relate variations in the individuals' choice and topic of language to broader sociocultural norms and expectations of interaction.

Explaining the assertion by Crystal further, Saville- Troike (1982) opines that certain factors determine domain. These factors may include the general subject area under discussion (e.g. education, work, family, friendship etc), the role relationship between the participants (e.g. teacher- student, employer- employee, father- son etc) and setting of the interaction (e.g. school, office, home, market etc). Fishman (1972:588) sees role- relationships as implicitly recognized and accepted sets of mutual rights and obligations between members of the same socio- cultural system. He argues that,

speakers are constrained in their choice and use of language by the role relationships which exist between them and their interlocutors. Some role- relationships may experience some degree of role change or fluidity while others do not. For example, a lawyer and his client may also interact as relations, as friends, as members of the same church etc, while a king and his subjects (in the same speech community) may not experience such a role range. In the case of the former, the interaction is 'personal' while in the latter, it is 'transactional'

“Social situation” associated with “Domain Analysis” is another important factor for language choice and use. Fishman remarks that “social situation” is responsible for some interactions being “personal” sometimes and “transactional” at other times. By “social situation” he means “that the time and place of any social interaction must be suited for the kind of role –relationships that exist between interlocutors.” In others words, role relationships can change depending on whether or not a social situation is congruent i.e. right behaviour at the right time and the right place.

2.6.2 THE QUANTITATIVE PARADIGM OR LABOVIAN FRAMEWORK

The first wave of variation studies launched by William Labov in 1966 laid a foundation for the study of variation by establishing broad correlations between linguistic variables and the primary social categories of socio economic class, sex and age in his study of the social stratification of English in New York City (Labov: 2006). This approach is considered a statistical approach to the study of variation in language. Labov collected statistical data on the frequency of competing forms used by different speakers and then looked for correlations with non-linguistic factors hence the quantitative approach which has since then proved outstandingly successful. What Labov and his successors found is this: If we merely observe a speaker, or a group of speakers, all we can notice is that speakers sometimes use this form and sometimes that one, in a seemingly haphazard manner. However, if we tabulate the frequency of each competing form, we often find first that, one individual differs notably from another and second, that the frequency of a particular form correlates strongly with some non-linguistic variables. Most often, the non-linguistic variables are obvious ones like sex, age, social class and degree of formality, but sometimes we find more unexpected correlations. What these studies have shown is that, variation is not haphazard at all. Instead, variation is highly structured: statistically speaking, each individual behaves in a highly consistent way, with some individuals behaving differently from others, depending on some of the variables just mentioned and moreover, the behaviour of each individual changes in a predictable way when the context of speaking becomes more or less formal. The quantitative approach has revolutionized the study of language by demonstrating that linguistic behaviour is even more highly structured than we had previously suspected; it has contributed

enormously to the study of language change, and it has provided a resolution of the Saussurean paradox (Stockwell and Trask 2007:240-241).

This approach as already mentioned assumes that language is inherently variable and that a great amount of this variability adheres to definite patterns determined by the linguistic environment on the one hand and the social environment on the other. The linguistic variable has been defined by Wardhaugh (1986:135) as “a linguistic item which has identifiable variant”. Hudson (1980:157) observes that linguistic variables “are those where the meaning remains constant but the forms vary.” While Lehman (1976:280) opines that it is “any feature of a language that is represented in differing forms in the speech of one person or a social group....” Social variable on the other hand refers to “the behavioural factor(s) that may be isolated to correlate with linguistic variation. Such factors include region, social class, age, sex, ethnicity, etc” Agbedo (2000:177) maintains that it is “the interaction of the various social factors that account for language variation in individuals and in a speech community.” Although the Labovian framework (quantitative paradigm) holds that a community of speakers shares the same underlying grammar, what distinguishes them is their differential production of diagnostic linguistic variables, which is amenable to quantitative analysis and also sensitive to various kinds of social structures. Individuals may then be grouped into various social categories by virtue of the frequency of occurrence of a particular variable feature in their speech as constrained by different social contexts. This was effectively demonstrated in the study of the distribution of the variable (r) in the New York City speech community by Labov (1966, 2006).

Worthy of note also are the stages of the quantitative paradigm outlined by Hudson (1980: 144) thus:

1. Selection of speakers, circumstances and linguistic variables.
2. Collection of texts.
3. Identification of linguistic variables and variants.
4. Processing of figures:
5. Interpretation of results.

2.6.3 ACCOMMODATION THEORY

The Accommodation theory according to Giles (2001:193) is concerned with an individual's choice and use of language. That is, language behaviour according to the interlocutor, the topic of the discourse and the setting in which language takes place. Crystal (2008: 32) while defining the Accommodation theory posits that it is a theory in Sociolinguistics which,

aims to explain why people modify their style of speaking (accommodate) to become more like or less like that of their addressee(s). For example, among the reasons why people converge towards the speech pattern of their listener are the desires to identify more closely with the listener, to win social approval, or simply to increase the communicative efficiency of the interaction

Similarly Yule (2010:258-259) also maintains that “as we look more closely at variation in speech style, we can see that it is not only a function of speakers’ social class and attention to speech, but it is also influenced by their perception of their listeners. This type of variation is sometimes described in terms of “audience design,” but is more generally known as ‘speech accommodation.’ Yule therefore defines speech accommodation as,

our ability to modify our speech style toward or away from the perceived style of the person(s) we're talking to. We can adopt a speech style that attempts to reduce social distance, described as convergence, and use forms that are similar to those used by the person we're talking to. In contrast, when a speech style is used to emphasize social distance between speakers, the process is called divergence. We can make our speech style diverge from another's by using forms that are distinctly different.

Studies have shown that, at least one member of an interactive dyad tends to adopt the speech patterns of the person to whom he is talking. Giles (1975) in Giles and Powesland (1975: 154-155) terms such accommodative changes in social interaction as "convergent" behaviour in the case of accent changes. As he hypothesizes convergence, whether symmetrical or asymmetrical in a dyad, may be only one aspect of a wider phenomenon of speech change. According to him, "in certain social interactions, there may exist dissociative motivational tendencies on the part of one or both of the members of the dyad such that speech is modified so as to become less similar- divergence rather than convergence." A sender may attempt to dissociate from any identification with the receiver or more broadly from the group which the individual represents. And if both interlocutors are similarly motivated, then they may be 'symmetrical' in their effort towards progressive divergence. Speech divergence and convergence may then be seen as representing a strategy of conformity or identification. In other words, speakers will change their speech to suit that of their interlocutor when they converge to conform to the norms of the language of that community or diverge in order to distance themselves from their interlocutor (Giles, 2001: 193-194).

Based on this model, an individual can induce another to evaluate him more favourably by reducing the dissimilarities between them. This is the principle upon

which the process of speech accommodation operates and as such will be an individual's desire for social approval. Giles' notion of a speaker seeking approval by applying a general set of rules to accommodate others in most social situations is similar to what Fielding (1972) cited in Giles and Powesland (1975) term conversational rule for response matching in that, if a speaker desires a reward or favourable interaction, he finds it advantageous to accommodate his speech style towards that of his interlocutor. Accommodation through speech can be regarded as an attempt of a speaker to modify or to disguise his persona in order to make it acceptable to the person being addressed. According to Fielding, the receiver may not necessarily be conscious of the speaker's rationale.

2.6.4 THE JUSTIFICATION FOR ECCLECTICISM

It is difficult for a research of this nature which involves many distinct but interrelated aspects of language to be analyzed to adopt a single approach. These aspects include our subjects' use of language with particular reference to their choice of nonstandard and non-English lexical items, the patterns of occurrence of such lexical items, determining the kind of context under consideration hence the suitable variety of the English language for such contexts and the social variables motivating the use of unsuitable identified lexical items used in those formal domains. In view of the foregoing, Fishman's "Domain and Topics" model was used to establish whether the contexts being considered were formal or not using the factors of "role relationship between participants"(with a special consideration to the demands of the questions asked, the examiner-student and staff-student relationship), "the general subject area under discussion" (whether what was being discussed was official or personal in both the written and verbal discourses) and "setting of the interaction". Using these factors, we were able to establish that the contexts we dealt with were formal and thus

ought to have favoured the “transactional” choice of language. That is, the Standard British English. On the contrary, there was a generous use of nonstandard and non-English lexical items used by our subjects in such formal contexts. In an attempt to find out the reasons for the “incongruent” language behaviour, Labov’s Quantitative Paradigm which holds that certain social factors account for variation in the realization of certain linguistic variables was adopted to explain the social factors responsible for the use of nonstandard and non-English lexical items among our subjects. Another justification for the inclusion of this approach is the relevance of its five stages highlighted by Hudson (1980:144) which this study adopts wholly thus:

Stage one: Selection of speakers, circumstances and linguistic variables. For this study, the selection of our subjects from the four institutions of higher learning was done through the random sampling technique. For the spoken discourse, eight formal domains involving eight students and eight staff were selected. Secondly, one thousand scripts were also randomly selected across the four institutions. The linguistic variable unlike Labov’s was the lexical type where nonstandard/non-English words were extracted from students’ answers to examination questions and from recorded discourses in formal contexts between some of them and some selected staff.

Stage two: Collection of texts: The collection of what this approach calls ‘texts’ is equated with the nonstandard/non-English lexical items which this study centres on. The collection of these lexical items was done in two folds: one, selected examination scripts were carefully examined and nonstandard/non-English words extracted from sentences to see their patterns of occurrences and reasons for their usages. Two, recorded discourses between students and staff in formal contexts were studied and nonstandard/ non-English lexical items extracted for analysis.

Stage three: Identification of linguistic variables and variants: The application of this stage to our study was in identifying these nonstandard/non-English lexical items and analyzing them side-by-side their Standard English versions.

Stage four: Processing of figures: The processing of figures which this study equates with the analysis of identified lexical variants was done based on the data obtained using the theoretical models adopted for this study which include Fishman's domain analysis, Giles's Accommodation theory and the Labovian model. Data was also analyzed using identified nonstandard/non-English items, their patterns occurrence and their Standard English versions.

Stage five: Interpretation of results: Here, the findings of the study were based on the interpretation and analysis of data collected using tables with an extensive discussion of the contents in each table as well as the findings.

In the same vein, the choice of the "Accommodation theory" in analyzing particularly the spoken discourses between staff and students in formal contexts was to establish why our subjects tended to accommodate their speech styles towards those of the staff they were speaking with, for instance, code-mixing of Hausa words with standard English expressions when they realized that their interlocutors were natives of Hausa or understood Hausa. This as the theory maintains must have been done and particularly as it was established in the course of our analysis (see 4.2.2, 4.2.4) because such students desired favourable interaction or rewards from the staff in question.

In summary, the adoption of the eclectic approach for our analysis was to determine whether the contexts under consideration were formal or not hence the appropriate choice of language using factors such as role relationship between participants,

general subject under discussion and the setting of interaction. These factors are all related to “Domain and Topics.” Consequently, the factors responsible for the wrong choice of language reflected in the use of nonstandard and non-English words used by our subjects despite the established formal contexts are captured in the “Labovian framework/Quantitative Paradigm and “Accommodation theory” hence the justification for the adoption of these three theories for our analysis.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the methodology for this research, focusing mainly on the research design, the population of the study, sample and sampling system, the research instruments, the procedure for data analysis and a discussion of the problems encountered in the cause of data collection and how they were overcome

3.1 THE RESEARCH DESIGN: THE QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DESIGN

While quantitative methods involve counting and often fairly sophisticated tests to determine the significance of data, qualitative methods involve close observation of a linguistic community. A quantitative study of any given community might involve a count of how many individualized variety X or Y with the numbers broken down according to such variables as sex, age, socio economic status, or ethnicity. A qualitative study of the same community might closely examine the behaviour of a few individuals to determine the uses they might make of one variety or another. Qualitative sociolinguistics also involves both the researcher's personal familiarity with the community and her use of introspection and intuition (Barbara Johnstone 2000:164). Based on these therefore, four speech communities involving the Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Federal Polytechnic, Kaduna and Nuhu Bamali Polytechnic, Zaria were selected and the individualized varieties extracted from students' written and spoken discourses and broken down into the social variables that motivated their usage based on the patterns of occurrences of the these varieties as well as the researcher's familiarity, use of introspection and intuition through non participatory observation.

3.2 THE TARGET POPULATION

The subjects of this research were mainly the students and in few instances staff of four selected institutions of higher learning namely; Ahmadu Bello university, Zaria, Federal Polytechnic, Kaduna, Nuhu Bamali Polytechnic, Zaria and Kaduna State University, Kaduna. The focus was on students between their second and final year to ensure that those selected were familiar with the language of a formal school environment.

3.3. SAMPLE AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The random sampling method was adopted for this study. This was done in two folds: the first fold had to do with obtaining students' examination scripts to see how they use language in formal contexts. To get one thousand scripts representative of the entire students' population of the four institutions, the following steps were taken:

STEP ONE: The faculties and departments were divided into arts and social sciences on one hand and sciences on the other to ensure a fair selection.

STEP TWO: In those separate groups, all the departments were arranged in an alphabetical order and then numbered.

STEP THREE: The faculties and departments with the odd numbers were then picked from number one. The next odd number was picked after skipping three numbers that is number two, three and four were skipped and five picked. In the case of Kaduna State University which has only four faculties and a just a department in the faculty of Medicine, two departments were selected from the Faculty of Arts which has the highest number of students then one department from the remaining three faculties.

In all, twenty departments were selected that is five per institution and one thousand students' scripts representing two hundred and fifty per institution were sampled through this technique for the written communication while discourses between lecturers and students were recorded at eight different formal settings representing two per institution

Getting the subjects for the recorded discourse was done spontaneously mostly in the offices of the Deans of Faculties and Heads of departments or examination officers of the randomly selected departments. Recording of discourses sometimes was done while going through scripts or during the process of obtaining approval from either Faculty Deans or the Departmental Heads to have access to their students' scripts.

3.4. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Three sources of primary data collection were used for the research. They are: non-participatory observation method, data from students' examination scripts of the 2010/2011 academic session and tape recording (discrete/ surreptitious) of especially verbal communication between staff and students in formal contexts.

3.4.1. OBSERVATION

Non-participatory observation was used to examine how the target population uses language in formal contexts particularly the spoken communication. While doing this, notes were taken to aid the memory of the researcher for instance with regards to the degree of familiarity between interlocutors, the setting of the discourse, the age range of the students among other social factors and how these factors all together influenced the choices that the students made of language.

3.4.2. RECORDING

Giving the nature of this research which is the synchronic use of language, surreptitious or discrete recording was done to record students' speech in formal contexts in order to identify those nonstandard forms being used. The main reason for adopting this method was so that 'natural speech' or what Labov (1981) calls 'vernacular' could be obtained. Akindele and Adegbite (1992:15) while supporting this view state that, "Sociolinguistics makes use of those appropriate techniques for a particular study...the recording of natural speeches is most valid when surreptitiously done....Recording of data has been done via tape recorder...."

To effectively do this, the researcher used a handset in some instances to record conversations between staff and students in eight formal domains thus: one recording was done during a classroom lecture, the other recording was that of an official transaction between a dean of faculty in his office with a student, another between a head of department and a student in the head of department's office. Equally, one other recording was between the hall administrator and a student, one between a lecturer and a student on project supervision, another between a lecturer/registration officer and a student with regards to registration of an elective and one between a lecturer and a class representative. A handset was sometimes used instead of a tape recorder because it was easier to conceal a handset which the researcher while recording pretended she was either texting or retrieving telephone numbers from her phone book thus making the participants unaware that their conversations were being recorded.

3.4.3. STUDENTS' SCRIPTS

Data was also obtained from students' examination scripts where features of informal expressions were identified and analyzed. Examination scripts were chosen because examination contexts are formal hence call for formal use of language especially bearing in mind the nature of questions that were asked which bordered on essay writing, report writing, speech writing, newspaper article and formal letter writing.

It is important to note that all our subjects except those from Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria offer a compulsory English language course where they must answer questions on long essays unlike the students of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria's general English course where students answer multiple choice questions and fill-in-the-blanks. This therefore made it easier for the researcher to sample the scripts of the selected departments and also understand the speech pattern of the students with regards to the question asked.

3.5 PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED AND HOW THEY WERE OVERCOME

One among the major problems encountered by the researcher was in the area of data collection for this study particularly with regards to having access to the scripts of some of the randomly selected departments. This problem was peculiar to Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria where some of the Deans and Heads of Departments vehemently refused to allow the researcher have access to the scripts despite a proper official covering letter from the researcher's department. To overcome this problem, the researcher had to rely on those scripts she could have access to although still ensuring that the faculties and departments were fairly represented.

Similarly, due to the fact that lectures at institutions and particularly the ones under consideration are not always interactive in nature; it was needless recording classroom discourses except for those in the department of Theatre and Performing Arts where students participated actively during lectures. One of such discourses was recorded in a classroom situation at the Drama Village of one of the institutions.

Also, obtaining other forms of students' written communication like formal letters written to for instance lecturers, Heads of Departments, Registry among others to corroborate the examination scripts at least to see how students use language in a more relaxed atmosphere was practically impossible. This is because, the researcher's efforts at having access to such official documents was viewed with great suspicion as such documents were considered classified. This explains why the researcher had to rely on students' examination scripts alone.

More so, identified non-English items were presented to native speakers of those languages for validity.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.0. INTRODUCTION

The interpretation and analysis of data has been divided into two segments. The first segment centers on analysis of data obtained from examination scripts of students of institutions that form the case study for this research. In all, twenty departments involving one thousand students were sampled whereby for each of the four institutions, five departments and two hundred and fifty scripts were randomly selected and data obtained from them for analysis. The second segment focuses on analysis of surreptitiously recorded discourses between staff and students in formal settings.

4.1 DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS BASED ON STUDENTS' EXAMINATION SCRIPTS

These institutions have been code-named institution one, two, three and four for confidentiality which was an agreement entered into between the researcher and the authorities concerned.

4.1.0 INSTITUTION ONE

The data for this institution was obtained from the scripts of the 2010/2011 first semester examination on Use of English and Communication II (GST 201) which is a compulsory general course for all students of the university. The following questions were asked during the said examination:

Question one. Of late, there has been an increase in the rate at which people are kidnapped. Write an open letter to the Inspector General of Police on the measures that could be adopted to eradicate the menace.

Question two. A newspaper house requested for contribution on the topic: “Democracy in Nigeria: Dividends and Woes”. Write your contribution.

4.1.1. DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING

SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS’ ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE IN THEIR ORIGINAL FORMS

The sentences are presented in their original forms with most of them being grammatically wrong. This explains why asterisks have been used to show that these sentences are grammatically incorrect.

1. * If we have *enof* S.S.S in our country this problem will be reduced.
2. *...even in the military regime, you *don't* have any right ...
3. *As *I'm sugest* sir, there are ways that police role....
- 4.* *...Alhamdulillah*, we have little cases of kidnap now.
5. *Sir, on this letter, I want to give at least 2 measures that could be adopted to eradicate the *menance of the culprits....
- 6.* The attitude of the people to be rich or *grid* during the democracy period to enrich their *purket.
7. *...there will not be problems in Nigeria if they should conduct *electn*....
8. *Incentive should be given to any police that *cot* any kidnapper.
9. *Like in Kaduna we have *operation yaki* which is helping a lot.

10.* The place of kidnapping at that point of operation until after sometime before *they'll* recall.

11.* A man of about 32yrs old was in his house when two brave men came to him saying....

12.*He then said that he *doesn't* know anybody like that.

13.*The man with the white shirt touched the 32yrs old man and that was the end of the man, he was never found.

**TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS
EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE HIGHLIGHTING THEIR
PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS
(TABLE 1)**

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1.formal letter 2.Article	The role relationship between interlocutors based on the questions are: 1.Inspector General of Police/ student 2.Newspaper columnist/ audience (readers)	50	Enuf don't I'm Sujest Alhamdulillah 2 grid electn cot operation yaki they'll 32yrs doesn't	SMS shorthand English contraction English contraction SMS shorthand Arabic/code mix Substitution of word with number SMS shorthand SMS shorthand SMS shorthand Hausa/code mix English contraction SMS shorthand English contraction	Enough do not I am suggest praise be to Allah two greed election caught Joint Task Force on security in Kaduna state they will thirty-two years does not

One among the views held by the ‘Domain Analysis’ model is that, certain factors determine domain. These factors may include the “general subject area under discussion” (e.g. education, work, family, friendship etc), the “role relationship between the participants” (e.g. teacher- student, employer- employee, father- son etc) and “setting of the interaction” (e.g. school, office, home, market etc)(Saville- Troike 1982). Fishman (1972) argues that, speakers are constrained in their choice and use of language by the role relationships which exist between them and their interlocutors. He further remarks that social situation (the time and place of any social interaction must be suited to the kind of role –relationships that exist between interlocutors.) is responsible for some interactions being ‘personal’ sometimes and ‘transactional’ at other times. Maintaining this or not will lead to congruent (right behaviour at the right time and the right place) or incongruent social situation.

Using Fishman’s “Domain analysis”, the domain or context under consideration here is a very formal one because, apart from the examination context being formal, the role relationship between the participants based on the demand of the questions is that of the Inspector General of Police and the student on one hand and secondly, the student as a newspaper columnist and the general audience of readers. The subject of discussion as the two questions stipulate is also very formal that is, the issue of kidnapping and the dividends or otherwise of democracy. In view of this, the choice of language based on Fishman’s postulation ought to have been “transactional”. Therefore, the choice of the identified nonstandard and non-English words in students’ answers to the questions asked is inappropriate for the formal domain/context. Interestingly however, Labovian framework holds that, the identified nonstandard/non-English-words which Labov calls “linguistic variables” are determined by social variables. A close look at some of the identified nonstandard

English lexical items shows that they are variant spellings of Standard English words motivated by GSM/SMS. We see the variant spellings of English words like “enough”, suggest, two, greed, caught and thirty-two years being realized as “enuf”, “sujest”, “2” ”grid,” “cot” and “32yrs” respectively. These variant linguistic items which are of the lexical type are associated with the shorthand of SMS thus as this framework maintains, the use of these lexical items highlighted above has been motivated by GSM/SMS. Similarly, there is also the use of Hausa and Arabic words code mixed with English expressions. These two words are “yaki” (Hausa) (used in line 9) and “Alhamdulillah” (Arabic) (used in line 4) whose Standard English versions are “war” and “praise be to Allah” respectively. Based on the researcher’s general observation and not the scripts, the code-mix of the Arabic phrase “Alhamdulillah” with Standard English expressions in formal contexts is common among Muslim speakers thus, the social factor that has influenced the use of this word is religion. “Yaki” which is a coinage from the Hausa language in used with the English word “operation” as “Operation Yaki” designating a Joint Task Force on security in Kaduna state. This phrase is used literally to mean that the security outfit has declared war on criminals in the state. Although it has become a common parlance in Kaduna state, its prevalence of use in this context without inverted commas is inappropriate. Interestingly this only proves how much influence the society has on the choice of language our subjects make.

4.1.2. DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMISTRY

SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS IN THEIR ORIGINAL FORMS

1. *... if there will be security check point after *5km to 10km*...
2. *I am at least *170%* sure that the increase in the kidnapped is due to poverty and lack of job opportunity....
3. *... you discover people are being kidnapped may be on their way to the market, school, working places *e.t.c.*
4. *In conclusion, measures should be taken to eradicate the menace such as tight security everywhere *i.e* every nook and angle corner....
5. *Last 2 weeks in a neighbouring area, a rich and wealthy trader was attacked in his house.
6. *Provision of implements to the police such as nuclear weapons, missiles *etc.*
7. *I'm hereby written on the control measures that could be taking in eradicating the rate of kidnapping in Kaduna state.
8. *Pls sir, I plead for my plea to be accepted and used in the society for a better tomorrow.
9. *... since they are living without job, most of them *deside 2 trade but no money for trading and you don't *espect your parents who *sale all they have to send you to school....
- 10.* The inspector can also stop this through this *vegillantee groups, *operation yaki*, soldiers, police men *etc.*
11. *...they *masakad* the victim....
12. *if they saw a man, if they *don't* trust him *insted* of killing him...
13. *Some even use *okada* to kidnap people.
14. *Taking *drop* in Kaduna now is very dangerous.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 2)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam	The role relationship between interlocutors based on the questions are: 1. Inspector General of Police/ student 2. Newspaper columnist/ audience (readers)	50	15km 10km 170% i.e. 2 2 I'm pls don't insted Operation Yaki masakad okada 'drop'	substitution of word with numbers/SMS shorthand substitution of word with numbers/SMS shorthand substitution of word with numbers/ symbol English shorthand substitution of word with number SMS shorthand English contraction SMS shorthand English contraction SMS shorthand Hausa/code mixed with English SMS shorthand Nigerian Pidgin Nigerian English/Pidgin	fifteen kilometers ten kilometers one hundred and seventy percent that is two to I am please do not instead Joint Task Force on security in Kaduna state massacred commercial motorcyclist alight/taxi

The pattern of occurrence of the nonstandard/non-English words identified in the department of Biochemistry are in form of GSM/SMS shorthand, substitution of words with numbers or symbols, contracted forms of English words, one Hausa word mixed with an English word and Nigerian Pidgin. This is a reflection of what Alo (2004:77) says are nonstandard forms which ‘allow such devices as direct references, interjections, abbreviations and so on and are expected to be used by people who are intimates for instance, friends, husband and wife.’ Apart from the shorthand associated with SMS, one other feature that characterized the data above is the use of abbreviations which like Alo submits are inappropriate for the formal context under consideration. As the Domain analysis maintains, the use of these words make the ‘social situation’ incongruent because the choice of words hence English variety ought to have been ‘transactional’ based on the role relationship, topic under discussion and domain. A close look at some of these words shows that the social factor of GSM/SMS manifesting in its shorthand in “km”, “2”, “masakad” and “pls” could have most likely motivated students’ choices of the identified lexical variants.

4.1.3. THE DEPARTMENT OF HAUSA

SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS’ ANSWERS IN THEIR ORIGINAL FORMS

1. *We don’t know who they are and where are they in this town all the day the kidnapped are going harder & harder we believe that *Allah Subhanahuwa Ta’alah....*
2. *The federal *inec office of Nigeria should also conduct a free and fear election, they *shouldn’t* collect anything from anybody as a brief to win the election
3. *NTA, announced the kidnapping of 4 people in one of the states....
4. *Nigeria must especially here in Kaduna state, the *operation yaki* and even the *banga* boys are working hard for the people of the state.

5. *Paying *there salary *i.e* workers
6. *Sufficient *moto* car and sufficient petrol
7. *... so why *can't* we give him education, job and enough amount of salary that he will depend on.
8. *... because, if we do *dat* many improvement will come
9. *... he met two people waiting for him to *drop*....
10. * *pls_sir*, action has to be taken.
11. * Demo means people while cracy means rules *i.e* peoples rules
12. *They *don't* bother about what situation their peoples are....
13. *Sir, I want you 2 permit me to write an open letter to you.
14. *There is need for adequate police officers and infrastructures such as torch light, rain coats *etc*.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 3)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester examination	The role relationship between interlocutors based on the questions are: 1. Inspector General of Police/ student 2. Newspaper columnist/ audience (readers)	50	Allah Subhanahu wa Ta'alah shouldn't 4 Operation yaki ie banga boys mato cant dat drop pls don't 2 Etc	Arabic/code mix English contraction SMS shorthand Hausa/ code mix English shorthand Hausa/ code mix Hausa/borrowing English contraction SMS shorthand Nigerian Pidgin SMS shorthand English contraction SMS shorthand Anglicized French abbreviation	glory be to Allah should not four JTF security outfit in Kaduna state that is vigilante group vehicle cannot that alight/taxi please do not to and so on

The patterns of occurrence of the identified nonstandard and non English items for this department are largely in form of code mixing of Hausa/Arabic words with English expressions, the use of variant English words' spellings influenced by

GSM/SMS shorthand and the use of contracted forms of English words. The variant English spellings which include “4”, “dat”, “pls” and “2” are variations of Standard English spellings of “for/four”, “that”, “please” and “to/two” respectively. Another pattern of occurrence is in form of code-mixing of Hausa words with English expressions which include: “yaki”, “banga” and “mato” used instead of the Standard English words/expression ‘Joint Task Force on Security code named “Operation Yaki”, “vehicle” and “vigilante group”. Similarly, another pattern of occurrence of these items takes the form of code mixing of the Arabic phrase “Allah Subhanahu wa Ta’alah” whose English version is “glory be to Allah” and “vigilante” respectively. One of the items-“drop” though an English word, in the context within which it was used, is a vocabulary associated with Nigerian Pidgin and Nigerian English meaning to alight or taxi. Based on Fishman’s ‘domain analysis’, the choice of language in this given context ought to have been ‘transactional’ because of the ‘the role relationship and general subject under discussion which make the domain formal. If this is the case, what then is responsible for the seemingly ‘personal’ use of language by our subjects? Using Labovian framework to explain this, Labov (2006) holds that, for every use of a linguistic variable, there are social factors determining it. Based on this assertion, the discussion above and close observation, GSM/SMS, religion and to some extent bilingualism are the motivators for the use of items such as ‘4’, ‘dat’, ‘pls’ ‘2’ ‘Allah Subhanahu wa Ta’alah’, ‘banga’, ‘mato’ respectively. Probably lack of knowledge of the Standard English equivalent of words like ‘Operation Yaki’ and ‘drop’ may have accounted for their usage despite the fact that they are inappropriate for the ‘domain’, ‘role relationship between participants’ and ‘general subject area under discussion’ as the ‘Domain model postulates.

4.1.4 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN MEDICINE

SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS IN THEIR ORIGINAL FORMS

1. *The 2011 presidential election and the present threat of *boko haram* is a clear exposition of how far disharmony among religion has extended.
2. *Sir, the method in which you impose of using the *Operation Yaki* as a stand by for all negative acts *comitted by the people....
3. *My fellow Nigerians, disharmony doesn't bring progress, sustainable development rather underdevelopment, feud, looting, poverty, violence, crisis *etc.*
4. *Secondly, let there be *house-to-house, bed-to-bed* scrutiny.... Even beds and pillows should be checked by security forces
- 5 *... *Boko haram* which lead or cause the suicide bomb attack
6. *It's a state that has *learn to live beyond every religious intolerance....
7. *It's known that the tongue and teeth do have some little crashes but they still learn to live together.
8. *But in the past few years, we realized that the some intruders who are so- called *Buzu* came from other nations like Niger, Chad *etc.*
9. *The major religions in the *contry are Islam, Christianity and traditional religion with Christians and Muslims the majority and both religion have many sects ranging from Catholic, Pentecostal, Protestants and so on among Christians and having *Izala, Darika, Shi'ism* among Muslims.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 4)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam.	The role relationship between interlocutors based on the questions are: 1. Inspector General of Police/ student 2. Newspaper columnist/ audience (readers)	50	Boko haram	Hausa/Arabic code mix	An Islamic sect that believes western education is forbidden
			Operation yaki	Hausa/code mix	Joint Task Force security outfit in Kaduna state
			Doesn't bed-to-bed	English contraction Slang	Does not House-to- house
			Buzu	Hausa	Tuareg from Niger and neighbouring countries
			It's	English contraction	It is
			Izala	Arabic/ code mix	Islamic sect
			Darika	Arabic/ code mix	Islamic sect
			Shi'ism	Arabic/ code mix	Islamic sect

First and foremost, the patterns of occurrence of the identified linguistic variables are in form of code mixing of largely Arabic/Hausa words with English language on one hand and on the other slang words code mixed with English expressions. Greenfield (1972) using the domain analysis in his studies, revealed that certain domains favour

the use of one code rather than another. Saville-Troike (1983) also proposes that factors like general subject matter, role relationship between participants and the setting should determine domain. In view of the above, considering the fact that the data being analyzed was obtained from answers to examination questions on formal letter to the Inspector General of police and newspaper article (where the presumed role relationship between the supposed participants is that of the Inspector General of Police force and student on one hand and the newspaper audience and writer/columnist on the other hand), the preferred variety in this 'social situation' ought to have been the Standard British English variety but because of the social variable of religion, Arabic words motivated by religion particularly Islam were used by the subjects. Age is another social factor responsible for the use of the identified items particularly the use of the slang phrase 'bed-to-bed' search (used in line 4) instead of the English version 'house- to-house search. Descriptive terms which may not have been readily available to some of our subjects could have been the reasons for their use of expressions like 'Operation Yaki' and 'Boko Haram' otherwise they would have just put such expressions in inverted commas. From the foregoing, we can say in line with Labovian framework that, the variations of lexical items used by students of the department of Medicine have been determined by the social factors of religion and slang which is most of the times motivated by age. From the data obtained, it can also be seen that, unlike other departments where there are a lot of GSM/SMS motivated nonstandard English words, none of such featured in this department. Thus, it can be inferred that students' course of study too may affect the choices they make of language.

4.1.5. DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND DRAMA

SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS IN THEIR ORIGINAL FORMS

1. *One day on my way to school, there was a bus behind me full of passengers driving towards Kakuri, suddenly, the bus *stop and somebody *drop* from the bus.
- 2.*The person who *drop* from the first bus *entad* another bus again....
3. **Pls* sir, I want you to put on more effort on that....
- 4.**pls* sir, we know you are trying your possible best on these crimes....
5. *...they celebrated doing some rascal things such as love making, drinking *etc.*
6. *If the people being kidnapped *can't* afford what the kidnappers want, they kill them.
7. *But his family and friends *don't* want him to marry her....
8. *They go out with *fek*
- 9.*Let's take a look at Niger Delta, you *can't* go there without being robbed.
- 10.*People are being kidnapped everyday like chickens in a cage, it worries me most
bc *...we *rely* felt your impact
11. *Please *sa*...
12. *This has become a threat to most students *bording a taxi or *okada* to their various destinations.
13. *Sir, the *okada* riders and taxi *riders should register their motorcycles and taxi with the VIO.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM THE SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 5)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Formal letter 2. Newspaper Article	The role relationship between interlocutors based on the questions are: 1. Inspector General of Police/ student 2. Newspaper columnist/ audience (readers)	50	Drop entad pls etc can't don't fek bc rely sa okada	Nigerian English/Pidgin SMS shorthand SMS shorthand Anglicized French abbreviation English contraction English contraction SMS shorthand SMS shorthand SMS shorthand SMS shorthand Nigerian Pidgin	alight/ taxi entered please and so on/ among others cannot do not fake because really sir commercial motorcyclist

While the use of non-English words is absent in the department of English and Drama unlike other departments examined so far, there is a generous use of shorthand associated with Short Message Service (SMS). These SMS motivated shorthand are

'entad', 'pls', 'fek', 'bc', 'rely', 'sa' which are variant spellings of the Standard English words 'entered', 'please', 'fake', 'because', 'really' and 'sir'. There is also the use of contracted forms of English words which include 'can't' and 'don't' used instead of 'cannot' and 'do not'. Similarly, there is also the use of Nigerian Pidgin/Nigerian English words code mixed with English expressions for example 'okada' and 'drop'. 'Drop' although originally an English word is used in this context to mean "alight" or "disembark". (see line 2 under 4.1.5). All the identified words going by the domain are not suitable for use because, apart from some being abbreviations, their spellings are unconventional, their usage not widely accepted and therefore, they are meant for informal communication with people who are intimate and not for the kind of role relationship between the participants in the context under consideration (Corder and Ruszkiweicz 1979:10, Alo 2004:77). Although these identified lexical items can be said to be motivated by SMS and Nigeria English/Pidgin prevalence as social factors, their usage has made the social situation incongruent as the Domain analysis posits.

4.2 INSTITUTION TWO

The scripts sampled for this institution were those of Higher National Diploma (HND) I students. Students at this level offer a compulsory English Language course- GNS 301 whose questions vary based on the different Schools (faculties) within the institution.

SCHOOL OF APPLIED SCIENCES

The course title for the General English offered by students of this school is known as 'Higher Technical English'-GNS 301. Students during the first semester examination of the 2010/2011 academic session were asked the following questions:

QUESTION 1: The outcome of the immediate past presidential polls led to civil unrest in some parts of your country and a six man committee was set up by the state

government to uncover the causes of the unrest, determine the extent of damages to life and property, identify the culprits and suggest steps to take against a recurrence of the incident in future. In your capacity as the secretary of the committee, write out your report using the schematic format.

QUESTION 2: You are the chief statistician in the budgetary department of the Ministry for Economic Planning. You have detected an error in the estimates for recurrent expenditure for two ministries. Write a letter to the commissioner for economic planning drawing his attention to the error that you have detected and put the record straight.

4.2.1 DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *They were saying *sai* Buhari, *sai*_Buhari and started burning tyre on the way
2. *Some boys are between *10-15 yrs* but what they are doing is only God that will judge
3. *The budgetary *dept* wish to draw your *attentn*
4. *...if *u* check, the budget is *30m* and not *28m*
5. *I *ope* that with this little point of correction, you will put the record straight.
6. **I'm* interested in telling you the error in the estimate for recurrent for two ministries.
7. *All the *almajiris* in Zaria were part of those killing people, burning houses *etc.*
8. *In our school, 2 Christian lecturers and many students *ie* is *arne* according to them were killed.
9. *It all start when *pres* Goodluck won the election.
- 10.* My friend was rescued by operation *yaki* if not they want to kill her.

11. *They *don't* give a *damn* as they are killing innocent souls.
12. *Most of the killings during the post election violence were carried out by *yaro* boys.
13. *Let's* just divide *d* country to prevent more killings

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 6)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1.formal report 2.formal letter	Based on the question asked, the role relationship between interlocutors are: 1. state governor/ secretary of a panel 2. state Commissioner/ Chief Statistician of the state	50	sai Buhari	Hausa/ code mix	only/except Buhari
			10-15yrs	Substitution of words with numbers/ SMS shorthand	ten to fifteen years
			dept	SMS shorthand	department
			u	SMS shorthand	you
			30m	Substitution of word with number/ SMS shorthand	thirty million
			20m	Substitution of word with number/ SMS shorthand	twenty million
			ope	SMS shorthand	hope
			I'm	English contraction	I am
			almajiri	Hausa/ code mix	an Islamic migrant
			etc	Anglicized French abbreviation	and so on/among others
			2	Substitution of word with number	two
			i.e	English shorthand	that is
			arne	Hausa code mix	unbeliever
pres	SMS shorthand	president			
operation	Hausa code mix	JTF security			

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern occurrence of	Standard English version
			yaki		outfit in Kaduna
			don't	English contraction	do not
			damn	Slang	do not care
			yaro boys	Hausa code mix	boy also 'almajiris' Islamic migrants
			let's	English contraction	let us
			d	SMS shorthand	the

The nonstandard/non-English words identified in this department as shown in the table above take the form of Hausa words, slang, contracted forms of Standard English words and GSM/SMS shorthand which were code mixed with the Standard English in the course of our subjects answering the questions indicated above. Using Fishman's 'domain analysis', we can say that the domain of this interaction is formal hence calls for use of language that is 'transactional'. On the contrary, there are variations in spellings such as: '10-15yrs,' 'dept', 'u,' '30m' , '20m,' 'ope,' 'I'm', , 'etc,' '2,' ' i.e, 'pres,' 'operation yaki', 'don't', ' damn', 'd', 'let's' which are a departure from the Standard English spellings: 'only/except' , 'ten to fifteen years', 'department', 'you', 'thirty million', 'twenty million', 'hope', 'I am', 'and so on'/'among others', 'two', 'that is', 'president', 'let us' 'the' and 'do not' respectively. These variant spellings are associated with SMS shorthand hence as postulated by the Labovian framework; SMS is the motivation for students' use of the lexical variations associated with it. The use of Hausa induced words such as 'sai

Buhari’, ’arne,’ ’almajiri’ and’ ,’yaro’ is motivated by the users’ proficiency in the Hausa language. Slang words like ‘damn’ and ‘guy’ are common with youths and particularly students. From the foregoing therefore, we can say that although, the domain under consideration is formal, students were motivated by GSM/SMS, bilingualism and age to use the identified nonstandard lexical items in this department.

4.2.2 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS’ ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *They enter our school *coz* we are writing exam that time.
2. *The problem is because of rigging if not Buhari will have won but inec announced Goodluck who *didn’t* win.
3. *I came out and didn’t see any *okada*
4. *With due respect sir, *pls* I want to draw you attention to the error in the budget...
5. *Most of the *guys* jumped the fence but the ladies were unable to jump.
6. *Sir I want to draw your attention to the error in the budget *i.e.* the recurrent budget...
7. *The *electn* is peaceful but after the result problem started.
- 8.*They burn over 50 houses before *operation yaki* came.
9. *I *can’t* understand why you kill a human being like yourself because of election.
10. *Even in Bauchi, *corpors* were killed
11. *The committee is made up of 5 members namely....
12. **Kd* like other parts of north was on fire even inside your house *you’re* not safe
13. *There should be no rigging of election & anybody that is guilty should be punished

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 7)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Formal report 2. Formal letter	Based on the question asked, the role relationship between interlocutors are: 1. State governor/ secretary of a panel 2. State Commissioner/ Chief Statistician of the state	50	Coz	SMS shorthand	Because
			didnt	English contraction	did not
			okada	Nigerian Pidgin	commercial motor cyclist
			pls	SMS shorthand	please
			guys	English slang	boys/men
			ie	English abbreviation	that is
			electn	SMS shorthand	election
			can't	English contraction	cannot
			corpers	Nigerian English	Youth Corps members
			5	Substitution of word with number	five
			Kd	SMS shorthand	Kaduna
			you're	English contraction	you are
			&	SMS shorthand	and

The domain of the written communication was a formal one by virtue of it being an examination and based on the questions asked. As the Domain Analysis postulates the 'social situation' demands that the language be 'transactional' just as Alo (2004:77) opines that 'Standard English is appropriate for formal contexts such as lectures,

public address, business reports, formal discourse' From the data obtained, the following nonstandard English lexical items featured in students' answers to questions bordering on the formal letter and report writing: "coz", "didn't", "okada", "pls", "guys", "ie", "electn", "can't", "corpers", "5", "Kd", "You're" and "&" instead of "because", "did not", "commercial motorcyclist", "please", "boys/men", "that is", "election", "cannot", "youth corps member", "five", "Kaduna", "you are", and "and" respectively. The pattern of occurrence shows that these variant lexical items are largely SMS shorthand, slang words, Nigerian Pidgin words and Hausa words which were code mixed with Standard English expressions. The use of these words in the domain under consideration is inappropriate but as Labov posits, there are reasons behind these choices of language our subjects in this department make which are similar to those in the other analysis, that is, GSM and slang.

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

The compulsory English language course for this school is Business Communication-GNS301. During the first semester examination of the 2010/2011 academic session, the following questions were asked

QUESTION ONE: You are the Executive Director of a business centre. Using the fully blocked format, write a letter to a foreign supply company to supply you with some computer systems to replenish your business centre.

QUESTION TWO: A reputable firm has advertised for the post of PRO. Write your letter of application for the advertised post.

4.2.3. DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *We need about *150 pcs* of thermo cool laptop computer....
2. *I hereby order for the supply of *20* computers in my business centre.
3. *Enclosed herewith is *d* draft of *105* million naira.
4. *Hp laptop *50pcs*, Hp desktop computer with Pentium d.u.d rewritable *10 pcs*, Hp notebook computer with Pentium m.d.u.d rewritable *15pcs*
6. *Thanks
7. *Sir, *I'm* short of computer system in my business centre.
8. *... there are some systems in the business centre that were attacked by virus so they are not working now and the business has now *expand *pls*.
9. *I *ope* my request will be granted.
10. *If you can supply *btw* now and next month....
11. *I *don't* want *u* to disappoint me please.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 8)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on Formal letters	Based on the question asked, the role relationship between the interlocutors are: 1. company Director/ supplier/ business man 2. Human Resource Manager/ applicant	50	150pcs	Substitution of words with numbers/SMS shorthand	one hundred and fifty pieces
			20	Substitution of words with numbers	twenty
			105pcs	Substitution of words with numbers/ SMS shorthand	one hundred and five pieces
			15pcs	Substitution of words with numbers/ SMS shorthand	fifteen pieces
			I'm	English contraction	I am
			pls	SMS shorthand	please
			ope	SMS shorthand	hope
			btw	SMS shorthand	between
			don't	English contraction	do not
u	SMS shorthand	you			

The two questions asked during this examination were both on the formal letter. The domain is thus formal. The role relationship of the participants is that of a Human Resource Manager and applicant in the first question and a supplier/consumer in the second question which also makes the domain a formal one just as the topic under discussion is also formal. These are in addition to the formal context of examinations. This particular 'social situation' bearing the above in mind ought to have favoured a

more formal code than the one used by the subjects in answering the two questions. The identified nonstandard English lexical items highlighted in the table above therefore make the social situation incongruent. The pattern assumed by these nonstandard words shows that a large number of them are abbreviations associated with SMS which can be seen as the motivation for these usages.

4.2.4 DEPARTMENT OF OFFICE TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *I *ope* I'll get the supply on time *thanks*.
2. *If it is possible I want the supply before the *xmas* season.
3. *With due respect sir, I write 2 place order for the supply of the following...
4. *I need *100 pcs* of Hp laptops, *20 pcs* of Hp desktop
5. *I have enclosed an overdraft of *1m* & catalogue so that you will not make mistake.
6. *Make sure that *u* send the best quality of the items.
7. *I hope I can get the supply between now and *dec*.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 9)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on Formal letters	Based on the question asked, the role relationship between the interlocutors are: 1. company Director/ supplier/ business man 2. Human Resource Manager/ applicant	50	Ope I'll thanks xmas 2 100pcs 20pcs 1m u & dec don't	SMS shorthand English contraction incomplete sentence SMS shorthand SMS shorthand Substitution of words with numbers/ SMS shorthand Substitution of words with numbers/ SMS shorthand SMS shorthand SMS shorthand English contraction	hope I will I thank you Christmas to one hundred pieces twenty pieces one million naira you and December do not

The domain, topic and role relationship in this social situation which is the formal examination context and the formal letter require very formal use of language yet as shown in the table above, there is the use of contracted forms of the English words such as ‘I’ll’, ‘don’t’ which are only appropriate for informal writings. These contractions are variations of the Standard English spellings ‘I will’ and ‘do not’. There is also the use of other Standard English words variants associated with the SMS shorthand such as “ope”, “2”, “pcs” “m” “u”, “&” “xmas” and “dec” which are used instead of “hope”, “to”, “pieces” “million” “and”, “Christmas” and “December”. There is also the substitution of words with numbers like “100” for “one hundred,” “20” for “twenty” and “1” for one. These variants forms are supposed to be used in informal contexts but the as Labovian framework maintains, their use in the formal context under consideration is influenced by SMS. This also proves how the subjects of this study find it difficult to draw boundaries between when to use the Standard English and nonstandard English.

SCHOOL OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE

4.2.5 DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS’ ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *Sir, I write 2 apply for PRO in your organization.
2. *I need 20 pcs of Dell laptops, 10 pcs of Hp 1020 professional printers....
3. *Sir, if u can send it urgently, I’ll be *greatful.
4. *Pls, I want the supply next month if possible.
5. *I’m your customer who placed order last yr for 100 laptops, this year I need only 50...
6. *I graduated from govt sec sch Yola in 2008.

7. *My business centre needs the *ff* computers and printers....

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 10)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on Formal letters	Based on the question asked, the role relationship between the interlocutors are: 1.company Director/ supplier/ business man 2.Human Resource Manager/ applicant	50	2	SMS shorthand	to
			20pcs	Substitution with words/	twenty pieces
			10pcs	SMS shorthand Substitution with words/ SMS shorthand	ten pieces
			u	SMS shorthand	you
			pls	SMS shorthand	please
			I'm	English contraction	I am
			yr	SMS shorthand	year
			50	Substitution of words with numbers	fifty
			govt	SMS shorthand	government
			sec	SMS shorthand	secondary
sch	SMS shorthand	school			
ff	SMS shorthand	following			

As already discussed in other analyses above, the students of the Department of Building irrespective of the fact that the examination context is formal and also based on certain factors such as the role relationship, topic of discussion which favour the formal code have chosen a 'code' that is 'personal' instead of 'transactional' thereby making the 'social situation' incongruent. The high use of shorthand associated with SMS is meant to be used informally with people that are intimate as Alo (2004:77) posits. Be that as it may, the nature of these identified items shows that they are motivated by SMS as a social factor.

4.3 INSTITUTION THREE

The students considered in this institution were those of HND I. The analysis is based on the compulsory English language 2010/2011 first semester examination where the following questions were asked:

QUESTION ONE: Write an essay for or against government's plan to withdraw subsidy on fuel.

QUESTION TWO: There has been growing unemployment in Nigeria with its attending problems. Write an essay on this growing rate of unemployment in Nigeria, its causes and suggest the way forward.

Below is the analysis of nonstandard/ non-English items extracted from students' scripts based on the selected schools and departments of this particular institution.

COLLEGE OF ADMINISTRATION AND BUSINESS STUDIES (CABS)

4.3.1 DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *...when it is been removed, since almost everything is dependent on it *p.m.s* things like generators, transport fares *etc....*

2. *The hardship the common man is going through *isn't* funny.
3. *Even the government reversing the price from *N141 - N97*, the prices of things have rose up *talkless of when it will be *N141*.
4. *Finally, with these few reasons, I'm sure you'll understand why *I'm* against the fuel subsidy removal.
5. *Most leaders are corrupt and are the enemy of their people because they *don't* have the intention to build their society.
6. *Possible solution to the reduction of growing rate of unemployment, good plan of entrepreneurship development because government alone *can't* give job opportunity to every citizen.
7. *The cabal which the country has *i.e* the government
8. *However, with all this my reasons, *am* against the government plan to remove fuel subsidy.
9. *Why *can't* they fish out the corrupt ones among them and make them face the law? Why *can't* Nigerian *govt* repair the refineries?
10. * ...yet the government *doesn't* want to take proper care of our security
11. *If you *don't* have any godfather in a particular organization where recruitment is taking place then you are on your own.
12. *... they *won't* look at you because they have their own candidate.
13. *The federal *gov't* says the removal of subsidy will allow them build infrastructures and job creation but will they do it?

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM THE SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 11)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Argumen- tative essay 2.Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ Student	50	pms	English abbreviation	Premium Motor Spirit
			etc	Anglicized English abbreviation	and so on
			isn't	English contraction	is not
			N141-N97	Substitution of words with numbers	one hundred and forty-one naira to ninety- seven naira
			N141	Substitution of words with numbers	one hundred and forty one naira
			I'm	English contraction	I am
			don't	English contraction	do not
			ie	English abbreviation	that is
			am	omission of pronoun I	I am
			doesn't	English contraction	does not
			won't	English contraction	will not
gov't	SMS shorthand	government			

Like the previous tables, the 'Domain analysis' and the 'Labovian framework' are used in the analysis of this data. The topics are argumentative essay on fuel subsidy removal and an expository essay on the growing rate of unemployment. Giving that

the examination context is a formal one and that the nature of questions asked and the role relationship are also formal, the domain can thus be said to be very formal and requiring the formal code. However, from the data obtained from students' scripts, there is the use of nonstandard English lexical items. These items include: "pms", "etc", "isn't", "N141-N97", "N141", "I'm", "don't", "ie", "am", "doesn't", "wont", "gov't" which are not suitable for the given context thereby making the given social situation incongruent. The general pattern assumed by the identified nonstandard English lexis is in form abbreviations, word contraction, omissions and SMS shorthand.

43.2. DEPARTMENT OF HOSPITALITY, LEISURE AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. * Some they *don't* want to use their skill to provide job by **theirself*.
2. *... *am* sure if *ajakuta* can work *80%*, the rate of unemployment will reduce
3. **It's* not necessary to say *govt* must provide work for everyone.
4. *Fuel subsidy bring about the increment of many things such as transportation, food, clothes, *sheda etc.*
5. *The way forward or solution is that most of the infrastructure that have been abandoned *e.g NNPC, Mines(coal), cotton, groundnut etc...*
6. *...like Malaysia came to Nigeria and bought palm fruits to take to their country and now they are the *no* one leading country exporting palm oil.
7. *The cause of unemployment in Nigeria is mainly greed and corruption, like now the age limit of civil servants now they want to increase it to *70yrs* before they resign.
8. *Another cause of unemployment is that some that go and learn trade with an

entrepreneur after they learn *eg* to make soap or any other cause *don't* have money to execute what they have learnt.

9. *...at this point, the government don't have good policies to approach the situation.

10.* Let me say at least 75% of them are not trustworthy....

11. *For a country like Nigeria, the economy is *ok* before the natural resources are on agriculture like cocoa, cassava *etc*

12. *The *rijim* of *pres* Umaru Musa Yaradua he bring down the price from 75/L to 65/L

13. *Furthermore, our government *doesn't* put the right things in place....

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM THE SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 12)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Argumentative essay 2.Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ student	50	don't	English contraction	do not
			am	Omission of pronoun I	I am
			80%	Substitution of word with numbers/ symbols	eighty percent
			its	English contraction	it is
			govt	SMS shorthand Hausa/code mix	government
			sheda		cloth for sewing traditional outfits
			eg	English abbreviation	for example
			etc	Anglicized French abbreviation	and so on
			no	SMS shorthand	number
			70yrs	Substitution of words with numbers/ SMS shorthand	seventy years
			75%	Substitution of words with numbers/ symbol	seventy-five percent
			ok	SMS shorthand	okay/ alright
			rejim	SMS shorthand	regime
			pres	SMS shorthand	president
			75/L – 65/L	Substitution of words with numbers/ SMS shorthand	seventy-five naira per litre to sixty-five naira per litre
doesn't	English contraction	does not			

The data presented above is a confirmation that the subjects actually use nonstandard English words in formal contexts. The pattern of occurrence of these lexical items takes the form of contracted forms of English words such as ‘doesn’t’, ‘it’s’. Other patterns taken by these words are those of the shorthand associated with the written language of SMS, substitution of English words with numbers, omission of pronoun I and code mixing of Hausa words with English language expressions like in the case of ‘sheda’. The domain is one that requires the use of the standard variety of English whereby even if such words were to feature at all; they ought to have been put in inverted commas or brackets. The questions asked were on argumentative essay and expository essays. The formal nature of questions and the fact that examinations are also very formal contexts require very formal use of language. On the contrary, there was the use of nonstandard features cutting across syntax, semantics and lexical levels. Giving that the focus of this study is on the lexical items, only the lexical variations were selected and their patterns of occurrence identified. The Quantitative Paradigm holds that, social reasons are always responsible for variations in language and the choices speakers make. From the patterns of occurrence of these nonstandard lexical items, it can be said that the major social factor which motivated their use by students of Hospitality Management is SMS.

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

4.3.3. DEPARTMENT OF AUDIO-VISUALS

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *Many people today *don't* really understand the meaning of subsidy.
2. *I am suggesting that the federal government should have a rethink and move the country forward by addressing issues of infrastructure, road network, health, environment, educational activities *etc.*
3. *We *don't* need removal of fuel subsidy because even when they remove the fuel subsidy of kerosene and diesel we *don't* see any of their effort.
4. *Presently, masses are suffering bitterly, people are dying every day and night due to lack of security in Nigeria, instead, tackle this problem. *Thanks.*
5. *...government policies, inadequate funding from corporate bodies like banks, economic factors, social factors, geo- political factors *etc.*
6. *People that make and interpret *know* they have the necessary power to withdraw the subsidy....
7. *We have bad government as a result of promising several things without fulfilling them such as constant electricity, employment rate, good roads *etc.*
8. *...the country cannot get a job to cater for your financial needs.
9. *75% of Nigerians are living under abject poverty *ie* most Nigerians are living in a manageable or even to say poor condition.
10. *...they roam about the street drinking & causing trouble.
11. *The world today is overpopulated; an estimate carried out has shown that more than 5,000 students graduate every year from just one tertiary institution....
12. *...it has reached to the level that everybody in the country is corrupt not leaving any one out *cos* some people want to get paid without working.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 13)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Argumentative essay 2.Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ student	50	don't etc thanks knw u 75% & 5,000 cos	English contraction Anglicized French abbreviation Incomplete sentence SMS shorthand SMS shorthand Substitution of word with numbers/symbols SMS shorthand Substitution of words with numbers SMS shorthand	do not among others I thank you know you seventy- five percent and five thousand because

Like the previous departments analyzed, the role relationship, domain and topic in this situation favour the Standard British English variety. However, out of the fifty scripts sampled, the following non-English items were discovered: “don't,” “etc”, “thanks”, “knw” ,”u”, “75%,” “&”, “5,000” and “cos” used instead of “do not”, “among others”, “I thank you”, “know”, “you”, “seventy-five percent”, “and”, “five thousand”, and “because” . Their patterns of occurrence cut across SMS shorthand, contracted forms of English words and substitution of English words with numbers.

From the patterns, we see that only those who are familiar with the shorthand associated with texting/SMS can use the identified shorthand associated with it. This follows that; texting by the students of this department motivated their use of the shorthand associated with SMS.

4.3.5. DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *Why keep on pumping more money to the projects *cos* they are sharing it with the contractors so corruption is the main root of unemployment.
2. *This is how corruption is being practiced in one country *e.g* when a person is in an organization, he or she will only want his or her own people to be there.
3. *They *don't* board commercial vehicles rather they have private jets, they *don't* buy fuel from filling stations....
4. *...adequate provision should be made for them like lending them money through the micro- finance scheme so *dat* they can start something on their own.
5. *In conclusion, the federal *gov't* should work on the electricity so that poor people will benefit from *gov't*....
6. *I *don't* think it will work because, where we have 28 billion Naira in account and they say *it's* finished or not enough to do what we need and *we've* not even seen that starting....
7. *...the poor that are buying fuel at the rate of sixty- five naira before and *sodily increased it to the amount it's now, will find it difficult couple with *eg* like *okadamen* who even rent machine to buy this fuel at this price.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 14)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Argumentative essay 2.Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ student	50	cos eg don't dat govt 28 it's we've okadamen	SMS shorthand English abbreviation English contraction SMS shorthand SMS shorthand Substitution of words with numbers English contraction English contraction Nigerian Pidgin	because for example do not that government twenty-eight it is we have commercial motorcyclists

The data obtained from this department was collected from students' answers to the questions on essay writing. As already established, the domain, topic and role relationship warranted the use of Standard British English by the students of the department of Mathematics and Statistics but as can be seen in table above, their answers were characterized by the use of not only nonstandard and non-English words but also English numbers which were used to substitute English words. These nonstandard English words appeared in form of SMS shorthand, Nigerian Pidgin, contracted forms of English words, abbreviations and the substitution of English words with numbers. A careful study of these features shows that the social factor that motivated their usage are SMS and the prevalence of Nigerian Pidgin among the students in particular and Nigerians in general.

4.3.5 DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. * I *don't* have any gain in it apart from loses for the following reasons....
2. *...if you are a businessman/business woman *etc*
3. *If you *don't knw* somebody, you will not be employed.
4. *In conclusion, unemployment rate can be reduced by *propa* parental upbringing.
5. *...it happened when *ppl*e were not expecting and were hoping that things will change for good.
6. *The farmer in the village *doesn't* need fuel for his farm or his generators; he *doesn't* need fuel to run his factories because he doesn't have one.
7. *...*it's* not supposed to be but all that is as a result of bad leadership.
8. *I advise the federal *gov't* of Nigeria and urge them to always stand by their words.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 15)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Argumentative essay 2.Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ student	50	don't etc knw pple doesn't govt its propa	English contraction Anglicized French abbreviation SMS shorthand SMS contraction English contraction SMS shorthand English contraction SMS shorthand	do not and so on know people does not government it is proper

The students of the department of Electrical Engineering in spite of the questions asked, the role relationship, topic and the examination context which expectedly called for the use more formal lexical items still engaged in the use of nonstandard lexical items irrespective of the domain. As shown in table 15 above, some of these words based on their patterns can be said to be motivated by SMS. This analysis is based on the Labovian framework and domain analysis.

4.4 INSTITUTION FOUR

FACULTY OF ARTS

4.4.1 DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LITERARY STUDIES

(LITERATURE)

The scripts sampled were those of Contemporary English Usage I (LANG 201) first semester examination. One among the questions asked was that students should write an essay on the current insecurity in Nigeria while the other was on the guidelines to follow in continuous writing.

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *The so-called *boko haram* have just been planting bombs and killing innocent
*souls.
2. *If they can bomb *Idiv* in Kaduna, then nowhere is safe.
3. *The security are given enough funding because out of the last budget, they were
given 900 billion naira for use.
4. *For example, the *boko haram* may announce that they will be in so place to kill
people.
5. *... *ie*, the readers opinion what you feel about it.
6. *This objective also mean *it's* not your own opinion....

7. *... even though you don't really like it or you are not in good terms with it *ie* no false thing about it.
8. *Nigerian government are singing the word insecurity everydayin order to put an end to issue *Boko Haram* sects who call themselves western education is sin or against their Islamic religion.
9. *Such *guidelines include definition, description, classification *etc*
10. An example of *d* contextual definition
- 11.* For example, the killing of *Boko Haram* leader in 2009 compounded the problem.
12. *Some criminal acts such as murder or robbery in the name of *Boko Haram*
13. *The *boko haram* sect existed harmoniously not until 2009....
14. *The sect *boko haram* has been in existence as far back as 2002.
15. **Boko Haram* for instance is hiding under the fact that 'no western education'
16. *It's over a year yet there is no solution to the *Boko Haram* problem.
17. *Some of the members are as young as *15yrs* old.
18. *For some, it is because of the *77* virgins promised them, some for revenge, some for criminal reasons *etc*.
19. *Most of these youths *u* see around are members but people hardly know.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM THE SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 16)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ student	50	Etc	Anglicised English	and so on
			it's	abbreviation English contraction	it is
			Boko haram	Hausa/Arabic code mix	Islamic sect that believes Western Education is forbidden that is
			ie	English abbreviation	that is
			15	Substitution of words with numbers	fifteen
			yr	SMS shorthand	year
			eg	English abbreviation	for example
			don't	English contraction	do not
			d	SMS shorthand	the
			1div	substitution of word with number/	Mechanized one division
			u	Contraction	You
			.	SMS shorthand	

Given the fact that this was an examination and that the question was also on expository writing, the domain and topic can be considered as being very formal and requiring the use of the Standard English variety which is the recognized variety for such academic purposes. Based on the data obtained from randomly selected fifty scripts, nonstandard lexical variations from the standard forms were identified. Their patterns of occurrence took the form of abbreviations, contraction of English words, shorthand associated with SMS and code mixing of non-English words. If this particular ‘social situation’ is supposed to favour the Standard British English, what then are the reasons for the use of these varied lexical forms? Using Labov’s postulation that linguistic variations are determined by the social environment, it can be inferred from the data presented in table 16 above that, students’ access to handsets and particularly the Short Message Service (SMS) where some of these abbreviations are used to economize space actually influenced their use of the SMS associated shorthand that featured in their write-ups. The use of the other contractions and abbreviations which are only fit for informal writing only confirm the students’ inability to draw boundaries between which context calls for formal context and which one does not.

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

4.4.2 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN MEDICINE

The scripts sampled were those of three hundred levels (300 L) Medical students while the examination was a combination of the first and second semester of a course titled Human Physiology- HPHY 300.

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *Some scholars divide the processes into stages *1,2* and *3*....
2. *Parturition is the term used to describe the summation of all activities that are involved to bring about the delivery of the foetus at term or earlier or later than term- *38-40 wks*
3. *This *occur about *15mins* after the foetus is expelled.
4. *in the case of jaundice, the enfant should be exposed to *UV* rays in order to get *vit D*
5. *Parturition occurs in stages which are divided into *3* stages.
6. *After the delivery of the baby, the placenta usually emerges after *15-30mins*.
7. *Pregnancy lasts for *38-42wks*.
8. *At the end of the *3rd* trimester, the number of oxytocin receptors increases....
9. *This is the *3rd* stage of parturition that ends with the expulsion of the placenta.
10. *The stage *III* is the expulsion of the placenta.
11. *Normal gestation period is *9-11* months hence parturition takes place after *9mnths*.
12. *this occurs after *290* days or *40* weeks.
13. *Stage *2*: the expulsion of the baby (giving birth) *1hr*.
14. *This is the removal of the product of pregnancy after about *28wks* of conception.
15. *Defn: Labour can be defined as
16. *After a period of about *15* minutes, the placenta is expelled.
17. *Once the baby is delivered, it takes about *20-30mins* for the placenta to be expelled.
18. *Normal parturition period ranges from *1-4* hours.
19. *This is *10-15* minutes after expulsion of the foetus.

20. *The role of progesterone & oestrogen: during pregnancy there is high concentration of progesterone & oestrogen both of which inhibit prolactin & hence ... the level of progesterone and oestrogen *falls & the inhibiting effect on prolactin is relieved.
21. *... it takes a period between *38-40wks*.
22. *... and final expulsion taking place in varying individual timing at *30-40mins*.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM THE SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 17)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Argumentative essay 2.Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ student	50	1,2,3	Substitution of words with numbers	one, two, three
			38-40wks	Substitution of words with numbers/SMS shorthand	thirty-eight to forty weeks
			15mins	Substitution of words with numbers/SMS shorthand	fifteen minutes
			UV	English abbreviation	Ultra Violet rays
			vit D	English contraction	vitamin D
			3	Substitution of words with number	three
			15-30mins	Substitution of words with numbers/SMS shorthand	fifteen to thirty minutes
			38-42wks	Substitution of words with number/SMS shorthand	thirty-eight to forty-two weeks
			3 rd	Substitution of word with numbers	third
			III	Substitution of words with Roman numeral	three
9-11	Substitution of words with numbers	nine to eleven			
290-40	Substitution of words with	two hundred and ninety			

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
			1hr	numbers Substitution of words with numbers/SMS shorthand	days to forty one hour
			28wks	Substitution of words with numbers/SMS shorthand	twenty-eight weeks
			Defn	SMS shorthand	definition
			15	Substitution of words with number	fifteen
			20-30mins	Substitution of words with numbers/ SMS shorthand	twenty to thirty minutes
			1-4hrs	Substitution of words with numbers/SMS shorthand	one to four hours
			&	SMS shorthand	and

Although the questions asked during this particular exam were not those that required the students to write long essays still, given that the examination context is a formal domain, they were expected to use formal English particularly with regards to the choice and spelling of words. From the fifty scripts sampled, nonstandard English items presented in table 17 were identified. There is an interesting discovery in the pattern of occurrence of the nonstandard English items identified in this department compared to the ones identified in the other departments examined so far. Most of these items are derived from the English numbers used to substitute words. It was observed that, unlike other departments where these items would have been circled

and marks deducted, these identified nonstandard items were neither circled nor underlined to indicate that they were unacceptable in such a context.

FACULTY OF SCIENCE

4.4.3 DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

Fifty scripts of the first semester examination on Rural Geography- GEO 422 were selected for this analysis. One among the questions asked was:

QUESTION: Discuss the problem associated with commercial agriculture in developing countries.

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *Commercial *agric* in Nigeria is threatened by lack on fertilizer which has been hijacked by rich men.
2. **E.g* nobody wants to buy the local rice, they all prefer foreign rice.
3. *... bad roads, lack of storage facilities, bad weather *etc* have also affected commercial agriculture in Nigeria.
4. *Some farmers *i.e* mostly those in the village are not educated and *can't* read simple instruction on how to *eg* use hybrid seeds....
5. *in developed countries, everything is subsidized for *d* farmers but in developing countries, this is not the case.
6. *80% of farmers in developing world are illiterate.
7. *In most cases, *it's* the farmer that will still look for buyers....
8. *Like in *Nig* for example, *govt* is not ready to help farmers.
9. *Commercial agriculture is the production of crops for sale & for widespread distribution.

10. *another problem of commercial agriculture in Nigeria is overproduction sometimes leads 2 waste *cos* there are not buyers for such large quantity of products.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 18)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Argumentative essay 2.Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ Student	50	Agric eg etc can't d 80% its Nig &	English contraction/ SMS shorthand English abbreviation Anglicized French abbreviation English contraction SMS shorthand Substitution of words with numbers/symbol English contraction SMS shorthand SMS shorthand	Agriculture for example and so on cannot the eighty percent it is Nigeria And

The 'domain analysis' has been used to establish that this context is formal with regards to the topic (exam question), role relationship in this particular department involving the lecturer/examiner and then students. Consequently, the appropriate variety of English that ought to have been used is the Standard British English which is the institutionalized variety for academic purposes. This variety is devoid of contracted forms of words, abbreviations and other forms of unconventional shorthand. However, out of the fifty scripts sampled for this department, these nonstandard English words and abbreviations were identified: 'Agric', 'e.g.', 'etc', 'cant', 'd', '80%', 'its', 'Nig' and '&'. From the pattern of these nonstandard items, most of them are those associated with Short Message Service shorthand while the rest are those of conventional English words contractions and abbreviations. Using the Labovian framework to explain the motivations behind these usages (which are variations from the Standard English variety spellings) despite the formal context, it can be said from the pattern of occurrence that, SMS is a major motivation for the use of the identified nonstandard English lexical items in this department.

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

4.4.4 DEPARTMENT OF MASS COMMUNICATION TABLE 19

The following questions were asked during MCOM 203 (Interpretative Writing) first semester examination in the 2011/2012 session.

QUESTION 1: There has been serious water crises in Samaru campus of the Ahmadu Bello University. As the president of the student union government, write a letter to the authorities concerned about the problem.

QUESTION 2: What is news forecast?

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

- 1.* Some scientists say water is *no1* item that man needs to survive
2. *According to the Nigerian constitution, a president or governor can only spend a maximum of *4yrs*
3. *Making prediction does not mean by *mallam* or *aladura* but based on scientific analysis
- 4.*This type of interpretative writing predicts what happens in future without consulting *Babalawos*, soothsayers and traditional *mallam*
- 5.*From now, there are 3 more years to 2015
6. Lack of *maintaince only focus more or fairly on the issues & living that of water.
7. This type of interpretative writing predicts what happens in future without consulting *babalawos*, soothsayers and traditional *mallams*
8. Some students are left at the mercy of water hawkers popularly *known as *mairuwa*....
9. It took them a very long time to see those who hawk water known as *mairuwa*.
10. Students have to make line to get water which *the said can take *1hr* to fill a bucket.
11. When we talk about fashion *i.e* what a person will like to put on and how fashion changes from one generation to another example of the recent way of dressing is the *guys* sagging their trousers... and the modern music now is hip-hop by various artists both Nigerian & international
12. The federal government wants to *modernized the *almajiri* system.
13. Forecast can be defined as the prediction of the future that goes beyond the power of the *clergys, *Aladuras*, *Alfa* or *Baba Alaoo*.

14. If it is *ok* for the audience to understand what it is all about.
15. In feature writing, the *5 W & H*
16. Example, the *boko haram* sect
17. *... e.g of an institution, organization, programme *etc* the notable should be *1st, 5th, 10th, 25th, 50th, etc*
18. *There is a slight drop in the removal from *147-98* naira per litre.
19. If there are any communities in the *3rd* world countries that would fight water crisis....
20. Out of *24* hrs a day, the school's water board provides water for only two hours usually around *2am-4am*
21. Comparison is also used to compare one government to another e.g. *pres* Olusegun Obasanjo and his late successor pres Umar Musa Yaradua.

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 19)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1. Argumentative essay 2.Expository essay	Based on the questions asked, the role relationship are: 1. The Vice Chancellor/ Student Union President 2. Lecturer (examiner)/ student	50	no 1	SMS shorthand	number one
			4yrs	SMS shorthand	four years
			Mallam	Hausa/ code mix	teacher but used to mean spiritualist
			Aladura/	Yoruba/code mix	spiritualist
			Alfa	Yoruba/ code mix	spiritualist
			Babalawos	Yoruba/ code mix	spiritualist
			3	Substitution of English word with number	three
			&	SMS shorthand	and
			mairuwa	Hausa/code mix	water vendor
			1hr	SMS shorthand	one hour
			ie	English abbreviation	that is
			guys	English slang	boys/men
			almajiri	Hausa/code mix	Islamic migrant in search of knowledge
Baba Alao	Yoruba/code mix	spiritualist			

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
			ok	SMS shorthand	okay/alright
			5w&h	SMS shorthand	five W and H questions
			Boko haram	Hausa/Arabic code mix	Islamic sect that believes western education is sin
			1 st 5 th , 10 th , 25 th , 50 th ,	Substitution of words with numbers	first, fifth, tenth, twenty- fifth, fiftieth
			etc	Anglicized French abbreviation	and so on
			147-90	Substitution of words with numbers	one hundred and forty seven to ninety
			24hrs	Substitution of words with Numbers/SMS shorthand	twenty- four
			-	Hyphen used instead of 'to'	to
			pres	SMS shorthand	president
			eg	English abbreviation	for example

Apart from the context of examination (domain) being a very formal one, the questions asked (topic) which are both on formal writing also demand the use of very formal English. In addition, even though the channel of communication is writing, the role relationship between the presumed participants is that of lecturer/examiner and

student. This of course establishes that the domain for this communication is formal. However, out of the fifty scripts sampled, a large number of nonstandard and non-English words were used by the students of Mass Communication. What made these features informal hence unacceptable in the context within which they were used is students' failure to put them in inverted commas or in some cases use English descriptive terms for such non-English words. The pattern of occurrence shows that these items take the forms of English contractions, abbreviations, substitution of English words with numbers and code mixing of non-English words with Standard English language expressions. These nonstandard words also take the form of abbreviations, clipping of English words like 'Feb' and omission of pronouns like 'I' in 'am'. These are all what Labov calls variations of the linguistic items which he said are motivated by social factors. A critical study of these items and their patterns as presented in the table above shows that some of them like 'mairuwa', 'mallam', 'aladura', baba alao 'babalawo are motivated by the bilingual nature of the users. Others like '&', 'no', '1hr', 'ok', 'pres' can be said to be motivated by SMS. The use of abbreviations, omissions and clipped words in formal contexts by students of this department only brings to the fore the problems faced by students in choosing a language variety that suits the context at any given time. However, as the Labovian model explains, there are factors motivating these usages. After a careful analysis of the nature of the identified nonstandard and non-English items in this department, we can say based on Labov's submission that their use is being motivated by bilingualism and SMS.

4.4.5 DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE ARTS

The fifty scripts examined in this department were those of “EDLA 308: Subject Method II”. The two questions below were asked during the second semester examination among others:

QUESTION ONE: Distinguish between language acquisition and language learning.

QUESTION TWO: How would your knowledge help improve your English language teaching in Nigerian schools?

ORIGINAL SENTENCES EXTRACTED FROM STUDENTS’ ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ABOVE

1. *Language acquisition has to do with the 1st language a child learns effortlessly
2. *It is believed that *btw* age 2 and puberty a *lang* is acquired
3. *The 2nd *lang* is usually learnt and effort is put in by d speaker after localization of brain functions after puberty.
4. *language in some children even *starts from below one *yr*
5. *Parents can be advised 2 start speaking with children early....
6. *Many *schs* and parents nowadays only teach English to their children that is why most of them have only 1 language and no second language.
7. *At 10 *mnths* some children have started acquiring language
8. *Language acquisition & language learning differ based on age of speaker *i.e* children mostly acquire language while adults have to learn a language to be able to use it.
9. *Many schools in *Nig* don’t want to teach indigenous languages to pupils

TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS (TABLE 20)

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Number of scripts sampled	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version
Formal: First semester exam on: 1.Expository essay	Lecturer (examiner)/ Student	50	1 st	SMS shorthand	First
			2	SMS shorthand	to
			lang	English contraction	language
			2 nd	SMS shorthand	second
			yr	SMS shorthand	year
			10	Substitution of words with numbers	ten
			mnths	SMS shorthand	months
			ie	English abbreviation	that is
Nig	SMS shorthand	Nigeria			

Greenfield (1972) using the domain analysis in his studies reveals that, certain domains favour the use of one code rather than another. Saville-Troike (1983) also proposes that factors like general subject matter, role relationship between participants and the setting should determine domain. In view of the above and considering the fact that the data being analyzed in this department was obtained from answers to examination questions that bordered on defining and differentiating between concepts, the preferred variety in this 'social situation' ought to have been the Standard British English but because of the social variable of SMS, the use of the identified nonstandard words still manifested in the students' answers.

4.2. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS BASED ON RECORDED SPOKEN DISCOURSE IN FORMAL CONTEXTS

INTRODUCTION

An eclectic approach involving the Fishman's 'Domain Analysis', Labov's Quantitative Paradigm/Labovian Framework' and Giles' 'Accommodation theory' has been adopted for the analysis of the spoken discourses as already discussed in 2.5 of chapter two

There are eight discourses in all numbered one, two, three, four, five, six, seven and eight. The interlocutors are tagged A, B, C, D and so on as the case may be. How these discourses were recorded is already discussed under 3.4.3.

4.2.1 .DISCOURSE ONE

BELOW ARE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCES RECORDED

KEY

Lecturer: A

Student: B-E

1. A: Please endeavour to come along with your costumes when coming by 4pm.

2 B: **A beg* you people should stop making noise

3 A: What of Rabiú? Who did I send to find out if he will be coming for rehearsals or not.

4 C: **Oya, na who o*, talk.

5 D: **Ma, Oga Rabiú* said no *wahala*

6 A: Ok. Please don't forget your costumes I repeat. You that is acting the role of an *Alhaji*, make sure you come with your *agbada*,

7 E: **No yawa ma*. Consider it done

8 A: You can all go now. See you by 4pm

9 F: **You these children una too talk make person hear word*

10E: **She said, we'll meet by 4pm abi till dem use loud speaker?*

11 F: **That one na your problem*

BELOW IS A TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS/PHRASES EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES IN DISCOURSE ONE ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between participants	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version	Comments
Formal: lecture in a supposed classroom setting	Lecturer and students during a lecture	Abeg	English pidgin/ code mix	Please	The class was a drama rehearsal involving both lecturer and students thereby leading to over familiarity. This made the transaction personal instead of transactional.
		oya na who o, talk	English Pidgin/ code switch	Whoever was sent should go ahead and talk.	
		oga	English pidgin/code mix	Mr	
		wahala	English pidgin/code mix	problem	
		agbada	Yoruba/ code mix	traditional outfit	
		yawa	English pidgin/ code mix	problem	
		una	English Pidgin/ code mix	you all	
		abi	English Pidgin/ code mix	or	
dem	English Pidgin/ code mix	they			

ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE ONE

The discourse presented above was surreptitiously recorded during one of the lectures/drama rehearsals at the drama village. The role relationship between the participants was that of lecturer and students. The domain of language use was a presumed classroom/lecture although the venue was actually under a giant tree with students clustered round the lecturer who was seated in the middle giving instructions shortly after the day's rehearsals. According to Fishman (1972) speakers are constrained in their choice and use of language because of the role relationship between them and their interlocutors. On the contrary, we do not see that happening in the discourse above. The code during this particular lecture which ought to have been 'transactional, turned 'personal' with the students feeling too free to express themselves in whatever code they chose to (line 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) thereby making the 'social situation' incongruent. Using Labov's model, the following social factors can be used in explaining the speech behaviour of this target group. First and foremost, giving the fact that the lecturer was seen rehearsing with the students made the students too familiar with her. This obviously influenced their choice of informal language. Another factor is the unconventional venue for this particular lecture which was under a tree instead of a classroom. This unconventional classroom, made the setting informal and the atmosphere too relaxed to be seen as a formal one by the students. Thus like Labov postulated, we can say that the sociolinguistic factors of familiarity and relaxed atmosphere were the motivations for the speech behaviour of the participants in this discourse not minding the domain, topic and role relationship.

4.2.2. DISCOURSE TWO

KEY

Student: A

Lecturer: B

BELOW ARE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCES RECORDED

1A: **Assalamu alaikum*

2.B: **wa alaikumussalam*

3A: Good morning sir?

4B: morning, how are you

5A: **Alhamdulillah* sir.

6B: So what are you doing here? I thought you have gone for your I.T.?

7A: *Yes sir. I have. I just *breezed* in this morning with my younger ones for their
Post UME so I decided to come and greet my *daddy*

8B: That's kind of you. So where are you doing your I.T?

9A: *Sir I'm *patching* up with a Construction Company in Kaduna.

10B: OK. But that's completely different from your course of study.

11A:* It's true sir. Sir (switches over to another discussion entirely) Sir, I don't know
if you will be able to assist my younger ones in securing admission. (beckoning
on his younger ones). Please come in and greet *daddy*.

12B. *Well, I can't give you a hundred percent assurance now but if there is any way
I can *insha Allah*, I'll assist. Let them give me their details.

13A: Thank you very much sir. I will be on my way.

BELOW IS A TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS/PHRASES EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES IN DISCOURSE TWO ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version	Comments
Formal: The H.O.D's office. Subject: admission request for a sibling	Head of Department (lecturer)/ student of the department	Assalamu alaikum Wa alaikumussalam Alhamdulillah breeze in daddy patching up with	Arabic/code switch Arabic/code switch Arabic/code switch English slang Informal English Slang	peace be upon you peace be upon you too praise be to Allah came around father temporally working with	The speech of A was adapted to accommodate that of B because of the favour A wanted to get from B

ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE TWO

The domain of language use here was the office of the Head of Department. The speech situation is formal while the role relationship between the participants is that of student-lecturer/ H.O.D. 'A' wishing to accommodate his speech towards that of B by uses 'assalamu alaikum' knowing that B too is a Muslim. B converges in his speech behaviour in line 2 to show religious solidarity. In lines 4 and 6, as soon as there is slight role change from the lecturer who becomes less 'transactional', the student also converges by referring to him as 'daddy' and also using the phrase 'breeze in', in line 11. We see that speaker A who all the while had been accommodative in his speech pattern did so because he desired a 'reward' or 'favourable interaction' which was for B-to assist him is securing admission for his

younger ones. According to Fielding (1972), a receiver may not necessarily be conscious of the speaker's rationale so also was B unconscious of A's intentions. He possibly at the initial stage thought A came by just to greet him not knowing that the main reason for A's seemingly good posture was all because he needed B's assistance. From the foregoing, it can be inferred using Labov's model that the motivations for the code mix in this discourse were religion and seeking for favours.

4.2.3. DISCOURSE THREE

BELOW ARE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCES RECORDED

1A: Good morning sir

2B: Yes, how may I help you?

3A: Sir, I brought my letter for signing.

4B: Were you the one I instructed to ask the secretary to produce a letter of introduction for?

5A: *Yeah*

6B: *Yeah* or yes sir or are we mates? For that reason I'll not sign.

7A: *Aiyaa*, please I am very sorry sir.

8B: I don't know why students no longer bother about how you speak these days and you want to be a Pharmacist. Well, apology accepted. Let me have the letter.

9A: Here is it sir.

10B: (appends his signature) Take it and leave my office.

BELOW IS A TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS/PHRASES EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES IN DISCOURSE THREE ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS

Context/ Domain	Role relationship between interlocutors	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version	Comments
Formal: Dean of Faculty's office. Subject matter: signing of introductory letter	Dean/student	Yeah Aiyaa	English slang Hausa/code mix	yes sir oh please	The use of the identified items was inappropriate given that the domain was formal

4.2.3. ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE THREE

The domain of speech here is the office of the Dean of faculty. The topic is about signing an official letter for the student in question. The role relationship is that of lecturer/dean and student hence the speech situation is a formal one. The student chooses a formal code suitable for the domain not until in line 5 where the student uses the slang word 'yeah' instead of 'yes sir' which would have been appropriate for the given domain, topic and role relationship. B in line 6 being very 'transactional' dissociates himself from any form of identification with A and the group (probably of slang users) which she represents thereby leading to a 'speech divergence'. Using the Labovian model, we can say that the motivations behind the use of the varied linguistic items ('yeah' 'aiyaa') by A are age (a key factor for slang use) and bilingualism. From observation, the student could not have been beyond twenty two years old.

4.2.4. DISCOURSE FOUR

BELOW ARE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCES RECORDED

KEY

Student: A

Lecturer: B

A: *Sannu* sir.

2B: Yes, what do you want?

3A: *inna so.....*

4B: (cuts in) can't you speak English or does this look like Hausa department?

5A: I'm sorry sir.

6B: What is it you want me to do for you?

7A: Sir, I've come for you to sign my course registration form.

8B: Are you a student of this department?

9A: No sir. I am an elective student.

10B: Sorry, I've stopped signing for elective students because we already have too many students.

11A: Please sir, consider me *don Allah*. I've been coming here for the past one week but your office is always locked.

12B: It's not true. Well, there is nothing I can do. You can always pick another Elective course from any other department (makes for the door)

13A: Sir please, help me.

14B: let me have your forms.(signs and hands them back to the student)

one or both of the members of the dyad such that the speech becomes modified to become less similar. Despite his stance, the student still ends up getting exactly what she wants. From the foregoing, it is right to say that the social factors of trying to get a favour and bilingualism too have influenced the use of the identified nonstandard and non-English words in the above discourse in line with Labov's postulations.

4.2.5. DISCOURSE FIVE

BELOW ARE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCES RECORDED

KEY

Student: A

Lecturer: B

1A: Good afternoon sir.

2B: Afternoon.

3A: Sir, you asked me to see you today.

4B: What for? And you had better be fast because I have a meeting to attend.

5A: Sir, I'm the *guy* that complained to you about my missing result.

6B: I thought I asked you to put in writing. Have you done that?

7A: *Yeah*. Here is the letter.

8B: I just hope you actually sat for the said examination because you should know better the consequences.

9A: *Wallahi* I did sir.

10B: Do you students ever say the truth? Well, check back in two weeks time. Two weeks I say. Don't come here disturbing me again until it is two weeks.

11A: Okay sir. Thank you sir

BELOW IS A TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS/PHRASES EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES IN DISCOURSE FIVE ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS

Context/ Setting	Role relationship between interlocutors	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version	Comments
Formal: Office of the departmental examination officer. subject matter: Missing result	Exam officer/ student	guy yeah Wallahi	English slang/ code mix English slang/ code mix Arabic/code mix	Boy/man Yes(sir) I swear to God	The use of the identified slang words is age specific as it is commonly used among students who are youths while wallahi like influenced by religion

ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE FIVE

The domain for the speech setting above is the departmental examinations office while the role relationship between the participants is that of examination officer and student. The subject matter is a complaint from the student about his missing result. The choice of variety considering these three factors according to Fishman's model out to have been transactional but the student used "personal" codes like "guy", "yeah" and "wallahi" in the course of laying his complain in a very formal setting. These slang and Arabic words can be classified under the social variables of age and religion and are the motivations for the linguistic variation manifested in the use of English slang and the code mix of the Arabic word "wallahi" which is very common among Muslims.

4.2.6. DISCOURSE SIX

BELOW ARE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCES RECORDED

KEY

Student: A

Lecturer: B

1A: **Well done* sir.

2B: Oh, hello. How are you?

3A: I'm fine sir. My supervisor asked me to see you with regards to my work that she would be travelling.

4B: Yes, she informed me but if I must continue from where she stopped, you have to remove this artificial hair. I like people that are natural.

5A: Ok sir.

6B: How far have you gone with her?

7A: I am on chapter two sir.

8B: You will have to call me next week so that I won't forget or don't you want me to think of you?

9A: **Haba* sir, why not?

10B: ** So tell me. Do you want me to think of you academically or romantically or are shy of madam?*

11A: **Abeg o.* sir I don't know what you are talking about.

12B; Come back later.

13A: Ok sir.

BELOW IS A TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS/PHRASES EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES IN DISCOURSE SIX ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS

Context/ Setting	Role relationship between interlocutors	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version	Comments
Formal: Lecturer's office Subject matter: project supervision	Lecturer/ supervisor and student/ supervisee	Well done haba abeg o	Nigerian English Hausa/code mix Nigerian Pidgin	Used to mean good afternoon Exclamation though used to mean please please	The incongruent social situation leading to the use of these words was triggered by one of the interlocutors becoming personal instead of being transactional

ANALYSIS DISCOURSE SIX

Like the previous discourses, the domain here is formal and the role relationship between the participants is that of student and lecturer. The topic is project supervision. These factors put together make the domain here a formal one. However, an otherwise formal discourse is turned into an informal one at the instance of the lecturer who for whatever ever reasons deviates into a discussion that ought to have been private thereby making the 'social situation' incongruent. The student who had all the while been very formal in her choice of words apart from her use of 'well done' in line 1 which was used as a form of salutation suddenly begins to use the phrases 'abeg o' and 'haba' in line 9 and 11 respectively to converge to the speech pattern of B. Thus, the use of Pidgin and Hausa respectively are in response to

probably the unexpected and unprofessional dimension the discourse had taken. We can therefore say that the familiar tone exhibited by the lecturer influenced the use of the identified non English words ‘haba’ and ‘abeg o’.

4.2.7. DISCOURSE SEVEN

BELOW ARE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCES RECORDED

1A: **Assalamu alaikum*

2B: **wa alaikumussalam*

3A: Sir, I came to remind you about our fixed class today.

4B: And when is it?

5A: 2pm sir.

6B: *I’ll endeavour to attend *insha Allah*. How is your father’s health now?

7A: **Alhamdulillah*. He is much better. My mother said he’ll be discharged from hospital tomorrow.

8B: That’s nice. I wish him a quick recovery. Tell your course mates who are yet to submit their assignment that today is the last chance I’m giving them. I’ll not collect from anybody after today.

9A: I’ll inform them sir.

BELOW IS A TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS/PHRASES EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES IN DISCOURSE SEVEN ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS

Context/ Setting	Role relationship between interlocutors	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version	Comments
Formal	Lecturer/ student	Assalamu alaikum	Arabic/code mix	peace be upon you	The identified items were motivated by Islam, a religion practiced by A and B
		Wa alaikumussalam	Arabic/code mix	peace be upon you too	
		insha Allah	Arabic/code mix	by god's grace	
		Alhamdulillah	Arabic/code mix	praise be to Allah	

ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE SEVEN

The domain, topic and role relationship in the discourse above require formal use of language however, A in the above discourse tries to adapt his speech towards that of his interlocutor B –his lecturer whom he is aware is a Muslim. B converges in his speech by responding ‘amu alaikum salaam’. This continues in line 6 where B uses ‘insha Allah’ and B also converges in line 7 by using ‘alhamdulillah’ this thus changes the interaction from being ‘transactional to ‘personal.’ The social factors that motivated the use of Hausa/Arabic words which were code mixed in this interaction with the English language expressions are those of religion and familiarity. Both participants share the same religion (Islam) where the use of such non English words is common. Similarly, they know each other beyond the lecturer-student relationship which explains why B inquired about A’s father’s health.

4.2.8. DISCOURSE EIGHT

KEY

Student: A

Hall Administrator: B

BELOW ARE THE ORIGINAL SENTENCES RECORDED

1A: **Sannu Hajia*.

2B: What can I do for you?

3A: **Hajia*. I've come to see you concerning the squatters my roommate brought to our room.

4B: Which of the rooms?

5A. *3/12. *Wallahi Hajia* if nothing is done *ko*, I'll deal with both that girl and those her useless squatters. For goodness sake, I'm a final year student yet I cannot have peace in my room.

6B: Will you stop shouting like that in my office?

7A: **Yankuri ma*. It's just that I'm so angry.

8B: Go and call her and her squatters to come. I don't know how many times these Students want to be warned over this issue of squatters.

9A: Ok ma. Thank you.

BELOW IS A TABLE SHOWING IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS/PHRASES EXTRACTED FROM SENTENCES IN DISCOURSE EIGHT ABOVE INDICATING THEIR PATTERNS OF OCCURRENCES AND STANDARD ENGLISH VERSIONS

Context/ Setting	Role relationship between interlocutors	Identified non standard English items	Pattern of occurrence	Standard English version	Comments
Formal: Office of the hall administrator	The hall administrator/ student	sannu hajja	Hausa/ code mix	used to mean ‘well done’ ma	A’s use of Hausa words instead of the Standard British English is to accommodate her speech to that of B who happens to be of Hausa origin so as to get undue favours
		wallahi	Arabic/ code mix	I swear to God	
		ko	Hausa/ code mix	really(as used in the context)	
		yankuri	Hausa/code mix	I am sorry ma	

ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE EIGHT

The domain is the Hall Administrator’s office. The role relationship between the participants is that of student and Hall Administrator. The topic is ‘illegal’ squatting. The social situation should naturally make A select the Standard English as the appropriate code but because A realizes that B is Hausa, she decides to accommodate her speech pattern to that of B in line 1 as ‘inducement for B to favour her. B also converges in line 2 in her speech behaviour to that of A somehow unaware of A’s rationale. After establishing this favourable disposition, A in line 3 goes ahead to lay a complaint against her roommate. Even though A is not a native speaker of Hausa, she is proficient in its use which explains why she is able to code mix freely. If she were not bilingual, this would not have been possible. Thus, we can say using Labov’s

model that the factor motivating her use of Hausa words to code mix in the above context apart from seeking for favour is bilingualism.

4.3. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings about to be discussed are based on the data analyzed from one thousand examination scripts (two hundred per institution) randomly selected across the targeted institutions and recorded discourses at eight different formal contexts. Below is the discussion of the findings which provide answers to the research problems.

4.3.1. Confirmation of the use of Nonstandard/Non-English Words in Formal Contexts among Students of Institutions of Higher Learning and Particularly those of the Target Institutions

It has been established from the data obtained from students' examination scripts and recorded discourses that there is indeed a prevalence in the use of nonstandard English and in some cases non English words in formal contexts in both the written and spoken communication of students of institutions of higher learning and particularly the target group. Out of the one thousand scripts sampled, a total number of two hundred and eighty- four (284) nonstandard and non English lexical items were identified. From the recorded discourses in formal contexts, a total number of thirty- seven (37) nonstandard and non English items were discovered.

4.3.2 Encouragement from staff members

Our findings showed that students are in some instances motivated to use nonstandard English in formal contexts by their lecturers and other non-academic staff who sometimes even initiate such uses thereby relaxing the atmosphere. Only in few cases did staff members openly rebuke or correct students for using such nonstandard forms in formal contexts while discussing with them. In such situations, students deviated

from the use of Standard British English meant for such contexts to code mixing freely items from not just nonstandard English such as slang, pidgin but also indigenous languages. Clear cases of this can be seen in the recorded discourses in 4.2.1, 4.2.2 as against 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 where the students were immediately cautioned against the use of such nonstandard items identified.

4.3.3 Sociolinguistic Factors motivating the use of nonstandard and Non-English Words in Formal Contexts.

The sociolinguistic factors responsible for the prevalence of the nonstandard and non English items identified from both written and spoken communication of the students in formal contexts include the following:

4.3.3.1. Global System for Mobile Communication/Short Message Services (GSM/SMS)

Out of the two hundred and eighty-four nonstandard and non English items identified among students' examination scripts, eighty- two were peculiar shorthand associated with the written language of GSM' text messages. Before the advent of GSM/SMS, these nonstandard features were absent in students' writing. The problem is further compounded by the prominence social networks have gained among students of higher learning particularly the target of this study. All the chatting and texting that go on, on these social networks is done using these shorthand identified in students' scripts. Some examples of the GSM/SMS motivated nonstandard English items identified are: 'u' for you, 'yr' for year, 'd' for the, 'dat' for that, 'hrs' for hours, 'dnt' for do not, ' &' for and, 'knw' for know, 'kd' for Kaduna, 'cos' for because, 'dis' for this, '4' for four or for, 'sch' for school, 'mnth' for month, 'ple' for people, '2' for two or to among others.

4.3.3.2. Bilingualism

The ability of students to speak other languages beside the English language was also discovered to be responsible for the use of some of the identified non-English items. Most of the lexical items identified were from the Hausa language which happens to be the language of the immediate environment. In all, thirty- six Hausa words which were not put in inverted commas were identified. Apart from ‘Boko Haram’, ‘almajiri’, ‘mai ruwa’ and ‘Operation Yaki’ which are common words, it takes one who is either a native speaker or is proficient in Hausa to use Hausa words like ‘yankuri’, ‘sai anjima’, ‘banga’, ‘inna so’ among others. This is a proof that bilingualism is a motivating factor in the use of particularly non-English words of Hausa origin.

4.3.3.3. Religion

The role of religion in the use of some of the identified informal words (informal in the context under consideration because they were not English words and are not put in inverted commas) cannot be overemphasized. Arabic words and phrases like ‘assalamu alaikum,’ ‘alhadulillah,’ ‘insha Allah,’ ‘ Izala,’ ‘Darika’, ‘wallahi’ ‘ummah’ among others are motivated by religion and particularly Islam. From observation, many Muslims students prefer to use the Arabic versions of English words that have to do with God and Islam generally. Non-Muslims rarely use these Arabic words. For instance, a non Muslim would prefer to say ‘by God’s grace’, ‘peace be upon you’ than ‘insha Allah and ‘ Assalam Alaikum’ respectively. In the recorded discourses analyzed in 4.2.2 and 4.2.8, we also see that because both participants are Muslims thus, there is the liberal use of the words identified above both by both the lecturer and the student.

4.3.3.4 Familiarity

This particular sociolinguistic motivation was observed in spoken communication where students tended to use more of informal words in formal contexts when their interlocutor was someone they were familiar with. A good example of this can be seen in the discourse analyzed in 4.2.5 where because of the familiarity that exists between the lecturer and student, made the student to use words like ‘haba’, ‘ai’, ‘sai anjima’, ‘okada’ among others without the lecturer frowning at it. In fact, the lecturer encouraged it rather. On the contrary, in the analyzed discourses in 4.2.3 and 4.2.4, the lecturers were quick to stop the students from continuing with their use of informal English in the contexts that were very official possibly because there was no familiarity between them.

4.3.3.5 Relaxed Atmosphere

This sociolinguistic motivation with regards to this study is restricted to the spoken communication. From observation in the course of recording the discourses for this study, students used more of nonstandard and non-English items in formal contexts when their interlocutors made the atmosphere relaxed by becoming unofficial or using informal English as well. This can be seen in the discourse in 4.2.6 where the interlocutor in question became flirtatious with the student thereby compelling the student to use ‘abeg o.’ Similarly, in the discourse recorded at the drama village and analyzed in 4.2.1, the unconventional venue for the class (under a tree) at the drama village and the fact that the lecture was a rehearsal of a play to be presented during which the lecturer too had to rehearse along with the students made the atmosphere quite relaxed allowing students to engage in nonstandard English usage even though the context was supposedly formal. This perhaps explains why students of this

particular department feel very free with their lecturers to the point of using the informal title ‘oga’ in addressing them -lecturers.

4.3.3.6. Nature of Students’ Course and Question Asked

It was discovered in the course of data collection and analysis that, the students’ course of study played a role in the nature of nonstandard English items used. Students from the core sciences like Medicine (see 4.1.14) used less of SMS motivated informal words but tended to use alphabets to substitute words like ‘2-3’ for two to three, ‘3rd’ for third among others. In addition, it was discovered that the nature of question asked also influenced the number and nature of nonstandard items used by students. Questions that had to do with continuous writing like those on letter writing, report writing, article writing and essays attracted more nonstandard English items that had to do with SMS, religion, Hausa, English Pidgin and English slang while questions that had to do with defining concepts, explaining processes among others tended to use more of the conventional forms of contracted English words and abbreviations than SMS, Slang, Pidgin and Hausa motivated nonstandard English words. In spoken discourses, it was also observed that science students were more formal in their spoken communication with their lecturers than Arts and Social Science students.

4.3.3.7. Age/Slang

One of the underlying reasons for the use of the identified slang words in the course of data collection for this study is the fact that most of the students that form the target of this study are youths. According to Cheshire and Milroy (1993, 20-21),

the frequency of nonstandard forms is highest among adolescents ... there is the influence of peer group pressure and the desire to distinguish a generational identity....

They go further to submit that, age exclusive features such as in-group slang words characterized by coining may be dropped or abandoned as people grew older. From observation, the younger students tended to use slang words more. In fact, slang words like ‘damn’ ‘guy’, ‘yeah’ , ‘shit’, ’stuff’ among others were rare among older students but very common with youngsters in the selected institutions of higher learning in Kaduna state.

4.3.3.8. Societal Challenges

Nigeria has in recent years faced a lot of security challenges leading to the introduction of new concepts into the Nigerian vocabulary and by extension the students of these institutions that form our case study. The frequently used words in this category identified from students’ scripts are ‘Boko haram’ and ‘Operation Yaki’. The two phrases which mean ‘western education is forbidden’ and ‘Operation War’ a Joint Task Force on security in Kaduna State although informal were generously used by students in their write-ups that called for very formal use of English language. Ordinarily, these students would not have had cause to use these words but how do they talk about insecurity particularly in Kaduna state without using these two concepts? Although students were expected to put these non-English words in inverted commas, it remains abundantly clear that the use of these words was motivated by the current security challenges faced by Nigeria at the moment.

4.4. PATTERNS OF NONSTANDARD ENGLISH ITEMS USED BY THE TARGET GROUP IN FORMAL CONTEXTS

The general pattern taken by the identified nonstandard English items used by the students of the selected institutions took the form of GSM/SMS shorthand, contracted

forms of English words, English abbreviations, English numbers used to substitute words, Slang, Pidgin words, Hausa/ Arabic words, and Yoruba words. In all, there are a total number of eighty-six SMS related shorthand used, sixteen slang words, forty one Hausa/Arabic words, forty five contracted forms of English words, fourteen abbreviations, two omissions of for instance pronoun “I” in ‘am’ instead of ‘I am’, six Yoruba words, sixteen pidgin words and a few others that could not be categorized. These patterns are discussed below.

4.4.1. Code mixing

The general pattern of occurrence for the nonstandard and non-English words identified was in form of code mixing of Hausa words with Standard English expressions, Arabic words with Standard English expressions, Slang words with Standard English expressions, Nigeria Pidgin with Standard English expressions and in some instances Yoruba words mixed with Standard English expressions. These words were used within the sentences and since the main preoccupation of this study is on the lexical level, such code mixed words were extracted from the original sentences and analyzed.

4.4.2. Shorthand Associated With Short Message Services (SMS)

Another pattern in which the identified lexical items manifested was in form of shorthand associated with SMS which involved pseudo clipping of English words, substitution of English words with English numbers or Roman numerals, use of single letters to represent words among other forms of shortening of words for example “coz”, “u”, “yr”, “hr”, “pres”, “d”, “1m”, used instead of “because”, “you”, “year”, “hour”, “president”, “the”, “one million” respectively. Of all the other patterns identified, that of SMS had greater prominence.

4.4.3. Contraction of English Words

In addition, nonstandard words identified from students' scripts took the form of contracted forms of words; a feature suitable only for informal writings. These contracted forms include for instance 'I'm', 'doesn't', 'can't', 'it's', 'didn't', 'shouldn't' among others.

4.4.4. Substitution of Words with Numbers

Instead of writing English words in the cause of answering questions, some students used numbers to substitute words. For example: '2' used to substitute 'two/to', '150' for 'one hundred and fifty' among others.

4.4.5. Use of English Abbreviations

The use of abbreviations which is characteristic of informal writing as Alo (2004:77) states was also another pattern some of the highlighted nonstandard words took. Commonest among these abbreviations were 'etc', 'eg', 'i.e' among others.

4.5. COMPARISON OF IDENTIFIED NONSTANDARD ENGLISH WORDS AND PATTERNS USED BY STUDENTS OF POLYTECHNICS AND UNIVERSITIES IN KADUNA STATE

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS		POLYTECHNIC STUDENTS	
Identified Nonstandard/ non English words	Patterns of occurrence	Identified nonstandard English words	Patterns of occurrence

Enuf	SMS shorthand	sai Buhari	Hausa/ code mix
don't	English contraction	10-15yrs	Substitution of word with number/SMS shorthand
I'm	English contraction		
sujest	SMS shorthand	dept	SMS shorthand
Alhamdulillah	Arabic/ code mix	30m	SMS shorthand
2	Substitution of word with number	20m	SMS shorthand
grid	SMS shorthand	ope	SMS shorthand
electn	SMS shorthand	i'm	English contraction
cot	SMS shorthand	almajiri	Hausa/code mix
operation yaki	Hausa/ code mix	etc	Anglicized French abbreviation
they'll	English contraction	2	Substitution of word with number
32yrs	SMS shorthand	ie	English abbreviation
doesn't	English contraction	arne	Hausa/ code mix
15km	substitution of word with numbers/SMS shorthand	pres	SMS shorthand
10km	substitution of word with numbers/SMS shorthand	operation yaki	Hausa/ code mix
170%	substitution of word with numbers/ symbol	don't	English contraction
i.e	English shorthand	damn	English slang
2	substitution of word with number	yaro boys	Hausa/ code mix
2	SMS shorthand	coz	SMS shorthand
I'm		didn't	English contraction
			Nigerian Pidgin

pls	English contraction	okada	SMS shorthand
don't	SMS shorthand	pls	English slang
insted	English contraction	guys	English abbreviation
Operation Yaki	SMS shorthand	ie	SMS shorthand
	Hausa/code mixed with	electn	English contraction
masakad	English	can't	Nigerian English
okada	SMS shorthand	corpers	Substitution of word with number
'drop'	Nigerian Pidgin	5	SMS shorthand/slang
Allah	Nigerian English/Pidgin	kd	English contraction
Subhanahu wa	Arabic/code mix	you're	SMS shorthand
Ta'alah		&	Substitution of word with number/ SMS
shouldn't	English contraction	150 pcs	Substitution of word with number
4	Substitution of word with number	20	Substitution of word with number /SMS
yaki	Hausa/ code nix	105 pcs	Substitution of word with number/ SMS
ie	English shorthand	15 pcs	English contraction
banga boys	Hausa/code mix	I'm	SMS shorthand
mato	Hausa/ borrowing		SMS shorthand d
cant	English contraction	pls	SMS shorthand
dat	SMS shorthand	ope	SMS shorthand
drop	Nigerian English/ Pidgin		
pls			

don't	SMS shorthand	bw	English contraction
2	English contraction	don't	SMS shorthand
etc	SMS shorthand	u	SMS shorthand
boko haram	Anglicized French shorthand	ope	English contraction
operation yaki	Hausa/Arabic code mix	i'll	Incomplete sentence
doesn't	Hausa/code mix	thanks	SMS shorthand
bed-to-bed	English contraction	xmas	SMS shorthand
Buzu	English slang(exaggeration)	2	Substitution of word
It's	Hausa/code mix	100pcs	With number/SMS
Izala	English contraction	20pcs	Substitution of word with number/ SMS
Darika	Arabic/code mix		SMS shorthand
Shi'ism	Arabic/code mix	1m	SMS shorthand
drop	Arabic/ code mix	u	SMS shorthand
entad	Nigerian English/Pidgin	&	English contraction
pls	SMS shorthand	dec	SMS shorthand
etc	SMS shorthand	don't	Substitution of word with number/SMS
can't	Anglicized French abbreviation	2	
don't	English contraction		SMS shorthand
fek	English contraction	20pcs	SMS shorthand
bc	SMS shorthand	10pcs	SMS shorthand

rely	SMS shorthand	u	SMS shorthand
sa	SMS shorthand	pls	SMS shorthand
okada	SMS shorthand	I'm	SMS shorthand
etc	Nigerian Pidgin	yr	Substitution of word with number
	Anglicized French abbreviation	50	English abbreviation in small letters
it's	English contraction	pms	Anglicized French abbreviation
Boko haram	Hausa/Arabic code mix	etc	English contraction
ie	English shorthand		Substitution of word with number
15	Substitution of word with number	isn't	Substitution of word with number
yr	SMS shorthand	N141-N97	Substitution of word with number
eg	English abbreviation		English contraction
don't	English contraction	N141	English contraction
d	SMS shorthand	I'm	English contraction
1div	Substitution of word with number/contraction	don't	English abbreviation
u	SMS shorthand	ie	Omission of pronoun I
1,2,3	Substitution of words with numbers	am	English contraction
38-40wks	Substitution of words with numbers/SMS	doesn't	English contraction
15mins	Substitution of words with numbers/SMS shorthand	wont	SMS shorthand
UV		govt	English contraction

Vit D	English abbreviation	don't	omission of pronoun I
3	English contraction	am	Substitution of word with
15-30mins	Substitution of word with number	80%	number/symbol
38-42wks	Substitution of word with number/ SMS shorthand	its	English contraction
3 rd	Substitution of word with number/SMS shorthand	govt	Hausa code mix
III	Substitution of word with number	sheda	English abbreviation
9-11	Substitution of word with Roman numeral	eg	Anglicized French abbreviation
290-40	Substitution of word with number	etc	SMS shorthand
1hr	Substitution of word with number	no	SMS shorthand/SMS
28wks	SMS shorthand	70yrs	SMS shorthand
Defn	Substitution of word with number/SMS shorthand	ok	Substitution of word with number/symbol
15	SMS shorthand	75%	SMS shorthand
20-30mins	Substitution of word with number	rejim	SMS shorthand
1-4hrs	Substitution of word with number/ SMS shorthand	pres	Substitution of word with number/SMS
&	Substitution of word with numbers /SMS shorthand	75/L-65/L	English contraction
		doesn't	English contraction
		don't	Anglicized French abbreviation
		etc	Incomplete and informal

agric	SMS shorthand	thanks	sentence
eg	SMS shorthand	knw	SMS shorthand
etc	English abbreviation	u	SMS shorthand
can't	Anglicized French shorthand	75%	Substitution of word with number/symbol
d	English contraction	&	SMS shorthand
80%	SMS shorthand	5.000	Substitution of word with number
it's	Substitution of word with number/symbol		SMS shorthand
Nig	English contraction	coz	English abbreviation
&	SMS shorthand	eg	English contraction
No 1	SMS shorthand	don't	SMS shorthand
4yrs	SMS shorthand	dat	SMS shorthand
Mallam	Substitution of word with number/SMS shorthand	govt	Substitution of word with number
Aladura	Hausa/ code mix	28	English contraction
Babalawo	Yoruba/code mix	it's	English contraction
3	Yoruba/code mix	we've	Nigerian pidgin
Alfa	Substitution of word with number	okadamen	English contraction
Baba alao	Yoruba/code mix	don't	
&	Yoruba/ code mix	etc	Anglicized French abbreviation
Mairuwa	SMS shorthand	knw	SMS shorthand
1hr	Hausa/code mix		SMS shorthand

ie	Substitution of word with number/SMS shorthand	pple	English contraction
guys	English shorthand	doesn't	SMS shorthand
almajiri	English slang	govt	English contraction
ok	Hausa/code mix	its	SMS shorthand
5w&h	SMS shorthand	propa	
Boko haram	SMS shorthand		
1 st , 5 th , 10 th , 25 th , 50 th	Hausa/Arabic code mix		
etc	Substitution of word with number		
147-90	Anglicized French abbreviation		
24	Substitution of word with number		
-	Substitution of word with number		
pres	Hyphen for 'to'		
1 st	SMS shorthand		
2	Substitution of word with number		
lang	Substitution of word with number		
2 nd	SMS shorthand		
yr	Substitution of word with number		

10	SMS shorthand		
mnths	Substitution of word with number		
ie	SMS shorthand		
Nig	English shorthand		
	SMS shorthand		

The aim of the table above which captures all the items identified in the written communication only is to bring out the similarities and differences in the nature of the nonstandard/non English lexical items identified from students of the four institutions that form the case study for this study. These institutions comprise two universities and two polytechnics. Students of these institutions were all asked questions bordering on article writing, formal letters, essays, reports and definition of concepts. Apart from the fact that all the scripts examined were examination scripts, all the questions asked were those that called for the use of Standard British English.

Based on the analysis, it was discovered that:

1. Students from both universities and polytechnics assessed used nonstandard and non English words in their write-ups
2. Secondly, the use of SMS text messaging shorthand was present in writings of students from both universities and polytechnics.
3. Contracted English words, abbreviations and shorthand fit only for informal writings such as informal letters were also used generously in nearly all the scripts
3. Expression of views was observed to be generally poor with most of the sentences being grammatically wrong. This explains why the researcher used asterisks to

indicate that such sentences were wrong at nearly all levels such as morphosyntactic, semantics among others

On the other hand, it was discovered that whereas there were features of non-English words usage across board, they were more prominent among the scripts of university undergraduates. In addition, as seen from table above, the use of nonstandard English words appeared to be more common with university students than their polytechnic counterparts especially when you consider the fact that the same number of scripts were sampled.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes the entire work, the findings, the conclusion, implications of the study and suggestions for further research.

5.1 GENERAL SUMMARY

The study looked at the patterns of nonstandard English words usage in formal contexts among students of institutions of higher learning using four institutions in Kaduna as case study. The research comprises of five equal chapters.

Chapter one of this work examined the background by first of all looking at the centrality of the English language in Nigeria and particularly in the educational sector where it is not only offered as a course but most importantly as the language of instruction. The chapter then discusses the varieties of the English language used in Nigeria and the role of context in determining which of the English varieties to use in every given context. The chapter further looked at the statement of research problem bringing out the fact that although language choice is meant to suit the context such that when the context is formal, the variety of language chosen is also expectedly formal but that this is fast eroding as students were in the habit of using informal varieties of English such as Slang, Pidgin, SMS shorthand, Hausa, Yoruba and in some cases Arabic words in very formal write-ups. Other areas looked at under this chapter were the research questions, the study's aim and objectives, its justification and scope and delimitation.

In the second chapter, the study reviewed related literature bordering on the field of sociolinguistics, varieties of English language in Nigeria ranging from standard to non standard, definition of context and context as a determinant of language choice. The chapter finally discussed the theoretical framework adopted for the study which is the eclectic approach comprising: Fishman (1972)'s 'Domain Analysis', Labov (2006)'s 'Quantitative Paradigm' or 'Labovian Framework' and the Giles (2001)'s 'Accommodation Theory' under the 'Socio-Psychological Approach. The justification for eclecticism is also discussed in this chapter

Chapter three discusses the quantitative and qualitative design adopted for the study, the sample and sampling procedure, the target population which are the students of Kaduna state university, Federal Polytechnic, Kaduna Nuhu Bamali Polytechnic, Zaria and Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. The chapter also discussed the research instruments comprising recording of discourses at formal contexts between staff and students and non participatory observation and finally, the chapter discusses the problems encountered by the researcher in the course of conducting the research and how such problems were tackled.

Chapter four of this study focused mainly on data presentation and analysis which was done in two segments comprising of data obtained from students' examination scripts and recorded discourses. The chapter also discussed the findings which confirmed the use of nonstandard and non English words in formal contexts by the target population, the various sociolinguistic factors responsible for the prevalence of and the use of such identified nonstandard and non-English items and the patterns of occurrence of these items.

The final chapter which is the concluding chapter summarized the entire work, concluded and then looked at the implications and suggestions for further research.

5.2. CONCLUSION

Our study has been able to show that there is actually a prevalence in the use of nonstandard and non-English words in formal contexts among students of higher learning and particularly those of Kaduna State University, Kaduna, Federal Polytechnic, Kaduna, Nuhu Bamali Polytechnic, Zaria and Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and that there are certain sociolinguistic factors that motivated our subjects to use the identified nonstandard and non-English items. These sociolinguistic factors include GSM/SMS, Bilingualism, Religion, Familiarity, Age, Relaxed atmosphere, nature of question asked and course of study and societal challenges.

In addition, our study has also demonstrated that the identified nonstandard and non-English words follow certain forms or patterns which include GSM/SMS shorthand, English slang, English Pidgin, English abbreviations, English contractions and non-English words which are usually code mixed with English language within the sentence.

Similarly, this research also shows that there is a decline in the quality of students' spoken and written English. Although this study set out to look at nonstandard English words used in formal contexts, it was discovered in the course of extracting the data that, most of the expressions used by students were generally wrong. This explains the researcher's use of asterisk for nearly all the sentences to show that they are grammatically incorrect.

Consequently, it is hoped that this knowledge explicated above and discussed fully in the work, will in turn act as an impetus in stakeholders taking deliberate steps at curbing this menace that is gradually taking over the Standard British English variety viewed as the acceptable variety for official transactions in Nigeria in general and for academic purposes in particular.

5.3 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

One among the challenges teachers have faced in accurately comprehending and grading students' work even before the prevalence of nonstandard English usage in formal contexts like examination by students has been that of ambiguity. With the introduction informal English into academic papers, the problem of ambiguity has been further compounded. Teachers are confronted with expressions and spellings which are entirely new to them and worst still, highly varied. This of course has made otherwise easy teaching tasks for teachers difficult.

Secondly, students' performance generally in both internal and external examinations has been abysmal. This consistent dwindling performance of students for instance in WAEC and NECO necessitated the recently organized Retreat and Stakeholders Forum held on 19th June, 2013 with both chairmen of WAEC and NECO in attendance. The aim of the forum was to brainstorm and come up with measures that could enhance students' academic performance (Vanguard newspaper: June19, 2013). So many factors have been cited as being responsible for this decline. Adding to this catalogue of factors responsible for students' poor performance is poor expression and spelling caused by the use of nonstandard and non-English words associated with SMS, slang, Pidgin, indigenous languages and so on. Usually, all these are considered errors and penalized in writing under *Mechanical Accuracy (MA)* where each error is

rung and half a mark deducted. From the scripts analyzed, no student scored any mark under M.A. Expression, which is also being assessed, has equally been badly affected because of the use of nonstandard English and ambiguous expressions in formal writing influenced by SMS abbreviations, slang, pidgin and even the indigenous languages. This in turn has contributed to the overall poor performance of students and particularly made comprehension of students' work hence accurate grading an uphill task.

Similarly, we are beginning to see a trend where vowel letters are gradually being dropped from words in an attempt to shorten them. Examples include 'msg' for 'message' where 'e' and 'a' are dropped, ystdy for yesterday where 'e' and 'a' are also dropped, 'arnd' for 'around' where 'o' and 'u' are equally dropped. This trend makes pronunciation more difficult than before especially to those who are not familiar with such spellings and the given context. English language pronunciations in most cases are naturally arbitrary. This has further made teaching pronunciation an enormous task.

Teaching students how to use formal language in formal contexts especially in formal writings seems to be yielding little results as students can hardly draw boundaries between when to use Standard English devoid of SMS abbreviations, slang expression, Pidgin and even indigenous languages.

Consequently, a study of this nature that examines the speech behaviour of students has implications for the students, the teachers and other stakeholders because it exposes in a modest way the consequences of the prevalence of the use of nonstandard and non-English words in formal contexts which as this study has confirmed is high among students at all levels and of all fields of study. Exposing

these therefore will act as a catalyst for the not just the English language teachers but teachers of all subjects and courses to be actively involved in ensuring that an end is put to this menace.

Knowledge of this nature is expected to aid stakeholders in taking deliberate measures aimed at curtailing this trend thereby salvaging the Standard British English particularly in its place in formal contexts.

For the students, this study will be of benefit because they will get to understand that the choice of English variety is not something that should be determined by whether the variety is in vogue or trendy but by whether it suits the given context or not. This will go a long way in helping them draw boundaries between when to use Standard British English as an institutionalized variety and when to use informal English.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

We wish to suggest that further studies on the use of nonstandard English in formal contexts should not be restricted to the lexic variation level alone but should look at these variations at the syntactic, semantic, phonological, morphological and even the pragmatic levels which could not be delved into in this study because of the enormity of studying all the levels of language.

Secondly, further research could also be carried out on the prevalence of informal language use in formal contexts among lecturers themselves as it was discovered in the course of data collection for this study that teachers themselves engage in the use of informal English in formal contexts with students and in fact sometimes the teachers are the ones that initiate such usages.

More so, an independent study could be done on the sociolinguistic variables identified to have motivated the use of nonstandard English words in formal contexts for instance, 'Age and Language Choice' among others.

Further research could also be conducted on the future of the Standard British English in Nigeria as the acceptable variety for academic purposes.

I hope, apart from extending the frontiers of knowledge, this thesis would be in the library and students should be referred to it.

REFERENCES

- Adegbija, E. (1999) "Tit bits on Discourse Analysis". In Adegbija, E. (ed) *The English Language and Literature in English: An Introductory Handbook*. Ilorin: The Department of Modern European Languages.
- Adekunle, M.A. (1972) "Multilingualism of Language Use" in Lansing, E. (ed) *African Studies Review*. Vol. 15, No. 2
- (1974) "The Standard Nigerian English" *Journal of Nigerian English Studies Association (JNESA)* Vol. 6, No 1
- (1985) *The English Language in Nigeria as a Modern Nigerian Artifact* Jos: University of Jos Press
- Adetugbo, A. (1979) "Appropriateness in Nigerian English." In Ubahakwe, E. (ed) *Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria*. Ibadan: African universities press.
- Agbedo, C.U. (2000) *General Linguistics: An Introductory Reader*. Nsukka: ACE Resources Konsult.
- Ajani, T.T. (1994) "The Influence of Nigerian Languages on Nigerian English" *Focus on Linguistics*. University of Florida Working Papers on Linguistics. Vol 1V. No 1 pp 34-48
- (2005) "Whatever Happened to "Queen's English" Creativity and Innovation in Wole Soyinka's Collected Plays" *West African Review* Issue 7 pp1-23
- (2007) "Is there Indeed a Nigerian English?" *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol 1. Issue 1
- Akindele, F. and Adegbite, W (1999) *The Sociology and Politics of English in Nigeria*. Ile-Ife: O.A.U Press limited.
- Akinluyi, T. O. (1971) "The Place of Pidgin in Nigeria and its Educational Implication" Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Institute of Education, University of London
- Allenton, D.J. (1979) *Essentials of Grammatical Theory*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Alo, M.A. (2004) "Context and Language Variations: The E12 Example". In Oyeleye, L. (ed) *Language and Discourse in society*. Ibadan: Hope Publications
- Appel, R. and Muiyeken, P. (1993) *Language contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold

- Asher, R.E. and Simpson, J.M. (1994) (ed) *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* vol.7. New York: Pergamon press Ltd.
- Atkinson, .M., Briatain, .D., Clahson, .H., Radford, .A. and Spencer, .A. (2009) *Linguistics: An Introduction* Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bamgbose, A. (1971). "The English Language in Nigeria" In Spencer, J. (Ed) *The English Language in West Africa*. London: Longman.
- (1982) "Standard Nigerian English: Issues in Identification" in Kachru, B. (ed) *The other Tongue: English across Cultures*. Oxford: Pergamon
- Banjo, A. (1996) *Making a Virtue of Necessity: An Overview of the English language in Nigeria* Ibadan: Ibadan University press.
- Barber, C.(1993) *The English Language: A Historical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berry, M. (1975) *Introduction to Systematic Linguistics* I. London: Batsford.
- Bex, T. and Watts, R.J.(1999) (ed) *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. London: Routledge
- Brann, A. (1975) "The Democratization of Language Use in Public Domains in Nigeria" paper presented at the 13th LAN conference in Abuja.
- Catford, J.C. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Chambers, J. K. (1992) Linguistic Correlates and Gender in Sex . *English World Wide* , (2) , 173 218
- (1998) "Studying Language Variation: An Informal Epistemology" in Coulmans, F. (1998) (ed) *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* Oxford: Blackwell
- Chambers,J. and Trudgill, P. (1998) *Dialectology. Second edition*. London: C.U.P.
- Chapman, R.L. (1986)(ed) *New Dictionary of American Slang*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cheshire,J.(1982) *Variation in an English Dialect: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Chomsky, N. (1957) *Syntactic Structures* . The Hague: Mouton
- (1983) "The Relationship between Language and Sex in English. In P. Trudgill (ed.), *Applied Sociolinguistics* London: Academic Press ..
- (1991) (ed.)*English Around the World: Sociolinguistic perspectives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

- Chiluwa, .I. (2007) "The Nigerianess of SMS Text Messages in English" in Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association Vol 3 No 1(pp 95-96)
- Cook, V. (1993) *Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. New York: St Martin's press.
- Corder, J. W. and Ruszkiewicz, J.J (1979) *Handbook of current English*. 7th edition London: Scott Foresman and company.
- Crystal, D. (1980) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. London: America Deutsh Ltd.
-(1987) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University press.
-(1989) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- (2008) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Sixth Edition Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Limited
- Dalzell,T.(1996) *Flapper to Rappers: American Youth slang*. Springfied:MD Merriam Webster Inc.
- Dittmer, N. (1976) *Sociolinguistics*. London: Edward Arnold (publishers) Ltd.
- Dumas, B.K. and Lighter, J.(1978) "Is Slang a Word for Linguistics?" " Published in American speech 53. Kansas University.
- Downes, W. (1998) *Language and Society*, Second Edition. Cambridge: CUP
- Eble C. (1983)" Slang: Deviation or Norm" 10th LACUS forum edited by Manning, A. S. Pierre, M. and McCalla, J. (1984) *South Carolina: Horribean press*.
-(1992) "African- American Contributions to American Slang" 19th LACUS Forum edited by Reich, P.A (1993) Illinois: LACUS.
-(1986)"The Subversiveness of Slang" 13th LACUS Forum edited by Fleming L.(1987) Illinois, LACUS.
- Elugbe, B.O. and Omamor, A.(1991) *Nigerian Pidgin(NP) Language and Language Policy in Nigeria*. London: Longman
- (1987) 'National Language and National Development' Paper Presented at the Linguistic Association of Nigeria Conference, Port Harcourt
- Ellis, Y. (2007)"What is Slang?" <http://www.well.ac.uk/cfol/slang.asp>

- Erkert, P.(1998) “Age as a Sociolinguistic Variable” in Coulmas, F. ed *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* Oxford: Blackwell
- (1988) “Sound change and adolescent social structure . Language in Society”, in Coulmas, F. ed *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* Oxford: Blackwell
- (1989) “The whole woman: sex and gender differences in variation . Language Variation and Change” , in Coulmas, F. ed *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* Oxford: Blackwell
- Ervin- Tripp, S. “On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternative and Co-occurrence” in Gumperz and Hymes. (1972) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Fasold, R. (1984) “Language Choice” In *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- (1986) “Choosing a Code” In *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Ferguson, C.F. ‘The Role of Arabic in Ethiopia: A Sociolinguistic Perspective’ in Pride J.B. and Holmes, J. *Sociolinguistics*. Hammondsworth: Penguin
- Flexner, S. B. (1975) Preface to the *Dictionary of American Slang*. New York: Crowell.
- Firth, J.R. (1957a) *Papers in Linguistics. 1934-1951*. London: Oxford University Press.
- (1957b) *A Synopsis of Linguistic Theory. 1930 -53* (special volume of the Philological Society) Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Fishman, J.A. (1971) “The Links between Micro and Macro Sociolinguistics in the Study of Who Speaks what Language, to whom and when” in Fishman, J.A. Cooper, R.L. and Ma, R. *Bilingualism in the Burro*. Bloomington: Indiana University publishers.
- (1972) “Language in Sociocultural Change: Essays by J.R. Fishman” (ed) by A.S. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- (1975) *Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Fought, C. (2002) “Ethnicity”, in J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill and N. Schilling-Estes (eds) *Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- (2006) *Language and Ethnicity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Francis W.W.R. (1986) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Third Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd
- Fromkin, V.A.(2000) *Linguistics: An Introduction to Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Gani-Ikilama,, T.O. (1999) “ A Case for Nigerian Pidgin as Official Language in Nigeria” in *Advanced Studies in Literature*.
- Giles, H., Taylor, D.M., Lambert, W.E. and Buorhis, R.Y.(1973) “Towards a Theory of Interpersonal Accommodation through Language” *Some Canadian Data*
- Giles and Powesland (1975) *Speech Styles and Social Evaluation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Giles, H., Noels, K., Ota, H. et al(2000) “Age Vitality Across Eleven Nations” in *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* Vol. 21. Pp308-23
- Giles, .H. (2001) “Speech Accommodation” in Mesthrie, .R. (ed) (2008) *Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Grossman, A.L. and Tucker, J.S.(1997) “Gender Differences and sexism in the knowledge and Use of Slang Sex Roles” *a Journal of Research of* [http://www. Find articles com/pl articles](http://www.Findarticles.com/pl/articles).
- Gumperz, J. J. (1971) *Language in social Groups*. Stanford: Stanford University press.
- (1972)*Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Halliday, M.A.K. Hassan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Limited
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Helfrich, H. (1979) “Age Markers in Speech in Social Markers in Speech” Scherer ed., Cambridge: CUP
- Holmes, J. (2001) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (2nd edition)* London: Longman
- (2004) *An Introduction to Pidgin and Creoles* Cambridge: CUP
- Hudson, R.A. (1980) *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- (1974) *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Igboanusi, H.(2001) *Language Attitude and Language Conflict in West Africa*

Ibadan: Enicrownfit Publishers

- Johnstone, B. (2000) *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics* Oxford: Oxford university press
- Jibril, M(1986) "Sociolinguistic Variation in Nigerian English" *English World-wide* 7
- (1982) "Nigerian English: An Introduction" in J.B. Pride (ed) *New English* New York: Routledge
- Jowitt, D. (1991) *Nigeria English Usage: An introduction*. Lagos: Longman.
- (2000) "Patterns of Nigerian English Intonation" *English World-wide* 21:1
- (2007) "Standard Nigerian English: A Re-Examination" in *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association*. Ikot Ekpene: NESAS and DEVCONSORT publishers. P2-3
- Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics* Vol 2. Cambridge: CUP
- Kassam, .M..N. (1991) "Language Choice among some Segment of the Ahmadu Bello University Community" Unpublished MA Thesis submitted to the Department of English Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
- Kerlinger, F.R.(1973) *Foundations of Behavioural Research* second Edition New York: Holt Saunders.
- Kerstin, .K. and Trauth, .G. (ed and translated) (2009) *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* New York: Routledge
- Labov, .W. (1970) "The Study of Language in its Social Context Studium Generale", Vol. 23 In Pride and Holmes (1972) (ed) *Sociolinguistics* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin
- (1981) *Sociolinguistic Patterns* Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia press Inc
- (2001) *Principles of Language Change: Social Factors* Vol. 2. Oxford: Blackwell
- (2006) *The Social Stratification of English in New York* Second Edition Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lehman, W.P. (1976) *Descriptive Linguistics: An Introduction*. New York: Random House.
- Le Page, R. and Tambouret-Keller, A. (1985) *Acts of Identity*. London: C.U.P.
- Levinson, S.O.(1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1979) *Semantics* (2). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

- Lippi-Green, R. (1997) *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*, New York: Routledge.
- Malmkjaek, K. (1991) *The Linguistic Encyclopedia* London: Routledge
- Malmkjaek, .K. (2010) *The Linguistics Encyclopedia* Third Edition New York: Routledge
- Maxwell, K. (2005) “New Word of The Mouth” *Med Magazine* London: Macmillan publishers Ltd.
- Mayerhoff, M. (2006) *Introducing Sociolinguistics* London: Routledge
- Mendoza D. N. (2002) “Language and identity”, in J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill and N. Schilling-Estes (eds) *Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mgbemena, .J. (2007) “The Language of GSM/SMS: Some Pedagogical Implications” in *Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association* Vol 3 No 1(p110)
- Milroy, L. (1980) *Language and Social Networks* second edition. New York: Blackwell.
- Milroy, J. and Milroy,L. (1998) "Varieties and Variation." *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Coulmas,F. (ed). Oxford: Blackwell
- Mosoud, S., Raskh, E.S. and Parvaresh, V. (2009) “ The Effects of Speakers’ Gender and Educational Level on their Regional Dialect: A Case of Hemedani Persian” in *Parkistan Journal of Social Sciences* Vol.6 Issue 6 pp76-85
- Muhlhausler, P. (1986) *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Myers-Scotton, .C. (1998) “Code Switching” in *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* by Coulman, .F.(ed) Oxford: Blackwell
- Nunan, D. (1993) *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin Books ltd.
- Ogu, J. N. (1992) *Historical Survey of English and the Nigerian Situation*. Ibadan: krafts Books Ltd.
- Ogunsiji, A. (2004) “Status, Features and Functions of English in Nigeria and Their Implication for EL2 Teaching/Learning” in Oyeleye, L. *Language and Discourse in Society*. Ibadan: Hope publication
- Onadeke, .T. (2000) “Discourse Analysis: The Fundamentals” in *Studies in English Language* Babajide, .A. (ed) Ibadan: Enicrownfit Publishers

- Oyeleye, L.(2004) *Language and Discourse in Society*. Ibadan: Hope publications.
- Palmer, F.R.(2002)*Semantics (second edition)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Parker, F. and Riley, K.(1994)*Linguists for Non linguists*. New York: Allyn and Bacon
- Poplack, S.(1985) “Contrasting Patterns in Code- switching in Two Communities.” In Warkentyne, H.J.(Ed) *Methods V: Proceedings of the International Conference on Methods in Dialectology*. Victoria: University of Victoria Press.
- Quirk, R. (1990) “Language Varieties and Standard Language”. *English Today* 21.
- Reinecke, J.E.(1973) “*Marginal Languages: A Sociological Survey of the Creole Languages and Trade Jargons*” Unpublished Ph D.Thesis, Yale University.
- Rickford, J. R. and McWhorter, J.(1998) "Language Contact and Language Generation: Pidgins and Creoles." *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Coulmas, Florian (ed). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Romaine, S.(1988) *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman
- (1992) *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Richards, J. Heidi,W, John P.(1985) *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics* Great Britain :Longman group limited
- Saeed, T.I.(2006):*Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
- Salami, A.(1968) “Defining a Standard Nigerian English” in *Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association* Vol. 2. No2 pp 99-104
- Saville-Troike, M. (1982) *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schmied, J.J. (1999) *English in Africa: An Introduction* London: Longman
- Schneider, .E.(2011) *English Around The World: An Introduction* Cambridge: CUP
- Seweje, E.O. (1998) “English Language Teaching and Presents’ Economic Situation” in *Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association* .Vol. VII: III p180
- Sinclair J.M. and Coulthard, M. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by Teachers and Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Singleton, D. (2000) *Language and the Lexicon :An Introduction* . London: Arnold a member of the hodder headline group
- Sridar, S. (1982) “Non-native English Literatures: Context and Relevance” in

- Kachru, B. ed *The Other Tongue; English Across Cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press
- Spencer, J. (1971) *The English Language In West Africa* London: Longman
- Stockwell, .P. and Trask, R.L. (2007) (ed) *Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts* New York: Routledge
- Szabo, E. (2005) "Hungarian Prison Slang Today" [http:// nevarchivum.klte. Hu /szleng/phd/szabo-eh-eng.htm](http://nevarchivum.klte.hu/szleng/phd/szabo-eh-eng.htm)
- Todd, L. (1974) *Pidgins and Creoles* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Toivanen, P. (2000) "American Slang and Colloquial Expressions for Lying and Cheating " a FAST - US - (TRENPP2A) Introduction to American English First Paper, University of Tampere
- Trudgill, P. (1974) *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society* England: Penguin Book Ltd.
- Trudgill, P. and Cheshire, J. (1989) "Dialect and Education in the U.K." In Cheshire, J. Edwards, H. Minister, M. and Welten, B. (eds) *Dialect and Education: Some European Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- (1992) *Introducing Language and Society*. London: Penguin
- (1999) in Bex, T. and Watts, J.R. (ed) *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. London: Routledge.
- Vincent T. (1974) "Registers in Achebe" in Nigeria in *Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association* Vol 3:1
- Walsh, N. (1967) "Distinguishing Types and Varieties of English in Nigeria" in *Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association* Vol2. No 2
- Wardhaugh, . F. (1983) *Dialectology: An Introduction*. New York: Longman Group.
- Wigwe, C.(1990) *Language Culture and Society in West Africa* Ems Court: Arthur .H. Stockwell Ltd
- Wolfram, W.(2007) "Ethnic Varieties" in Llamas, C., Millany, L. and Stockwell, P. (ed) *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics* New York: Routledge
- Wodak, R. and Benke, G.(1998) "Gender as a Sociolinguistic Variable: New Perspectives on Variation Studies." *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* . Coulmas, F. (ed). Oxford:Blackwell
- Yule, G. (1985) *The Study of Language* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- (2010) *The Study of Language* Second Edition Cambridge. CUP