



**A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF BEER PARLOUR SPEECH EVENTS IN OWERRI
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL**

CHINWE NKEIRUATQWA

*Department of Igbo,
Federal College of Education, Yola
Adamawa State*

&

THECLA N. UDEMMADU

*Department of Igbo, African and Communication Studies
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Anambra State*

Abstract

Speech communities can coin new words or extend the meaning of existing words to suit them. This study, “A linguistic analysis of beer parlour speech events in Owerri municipal council”, is an analysis aimed at finding out what factors motivate speech events and the roles language plays in speech events. To achieve this, data were collected through recorded conversations and interviews conducted with members (customers and attendants) in the beer parlours within the study area. The data collected were analysed using the framework provided by Newman (1940) and Fishman (1970). The analysis revealed that the interlocutors in a beer parlour communicate without hindrance; code switch and code mix from Igbo to English and vice versa; and in the process of code switching and code mixing they introduce new ideas and new words/lexical items. The study recommended that the new lexical items from beer parlour conversations and extension of meanings of existing words be included in the Igbo lexicon.

Introduction

The study of language has always been hinged on two basic premises which are language and performance. The former sees language as mentalistic and psychological, while the later studies language in use - that is the sociological dimension. If language is fundamentally a way of behaving and of making others behave, then, language has a human sociological dimension rather than the psychological. This is because the only way to get to the root of language is to see it in use. This is why sociolinguistics studies the relationship between language and society. Ike (2007) asserts that language involves itself in examining and explaining why we speak differently in different social contexts as well as in identifying the social functions of language and the ways it is used to convey social meaning. The examinations and explanations of especially the way people use language in different social contexts provide a wealth of information about the social relationships in the community. Ike (2007) provides a wide variety of possible relationships between language and society, and they include:



- (a.) The Age-Trade Phenomenon – whereby young children speak differently from other children, and in turn children speak differently from mature adults. It also includes regional, social or ethnic origin and sex of the speakers who in turn unknowingly show particular ways of speaking, choices of words and even rules of conversing in the language.
- (b.) Linguistic structures and/or behaviours – which either influence or determine social structures, and involves interactions in one’s culture to show knowledge or belief necessary to operate in manners acceptable to the members, or the know how to get through the task of daily living in the society.
- (c.) Language and society influencing each other. This is partly dialectal in nature, and lends credence to a Marxian view that speech behaviour and social behaviour are in a state of constant interaction and that material living conditions are an important factor in the relationship.

Therefore, it can be concluded that sociolinguistics studies the way language is used to communicate needs, ideas and emotions among users. But it achieves all these in conjunction with ethnolinguistics. Ethnolinguistics is part of macrolinguistics of which sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics are also part. It studies language in relation to culture. This relationship obviously involves sounds, words and syntax of a language and the ways in which speakers of the language communicate their needs and emotions in the language, experience the world and behave in it. It is also noteworthy to say that sociolinguistics and ethnolinguistics overlap. Both are concerned with the relationships between language and society.

Ike (2007) notes that in both factors, such as participants we are concerned with, “who is speaking” and “who is being spoken to” matter. Under setting or social context of the interaction, where the speech is made is important. Under topic, what is being talked about or said is necessary as the function; and why it is said or spoken.

Wardhaugh (1986) asserts that the culture of a language determines the way in which speakers of that language view the world. The opposite claim is that the culture of a people is reflected in the language they use. This is because people tend to use their language in ways that reflect the things they value and do.

There is need therefore to study the connection between language use and context, and this can be explicated in a study of language use in a particular context. This informed the choice of the topic, “Alinguistic analysis of beer parlour speech events in Owerri municipal council”. Speech event, according to Yule (1996) is an activity in which participants interact via language in a conventional way to arrive at some outcome. Speech event is directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech (Hymes 1974). A beer parlour is a bar that sells beer/drinks, that has tables where customers may congregate socially.

In this study, a linguistic analysis of speech events in beer parlour in Owerri municipal council will be carried out to find out what factors motivate speech event and the roles language plays in a speech event to showcase aspect of culture of the owners of the language.

Review of Related Literature

In this section, the review of literature relevant to the study is done. The section reviews the theoretical studies and empirical studies, and presents a summary of the literature review.

Fishman (1970) notes that, the distribution of acts and means of communication in the round of behaviour is one level of description. Patterns of occurrence and frequency are one kind of comparison



between groups. Much more complex is the analysis of the communicative event itself. In the discussion, a system will not be imposed, but questions that can lead to the ingredients and from the ingredients to the structure of speaking in a group can be. According to him, there seem to be three aspects of speech economy which can be considered separately: speech events, the constituent factors of speech event, and the functions of speech. With each aspect, it is a question of focus, as a full description of one is partly in terms of the rest.

In speech events, Fishman (1970) observes that for each of these aspects, three kinds of questions are useful. Taking first the speech events within a group, “What are instances of speech events?” “What classes of speech events are recognized or can be inferred?” “What are the distinctive features, which differentiate them?” “What is their pattern of occurrence, their distribution vis-à-vis each other and externally in terms of total behaviour or some selected aspects?” One good ethnographic technique for getting at speech events, as at other categories is through words which name them. It is also known that some classes of speech events in our culture are well known.

Fishman (1980) names some classes of speech event to include Sunday morning sermon, inaugural address, pledge of allegiance, etc. Other classes are suggested by colloquial expressions such as heart-to-heart-talk, sales-talk, talk man-to-man, woman’s talk, chat, polite conversation, etc. Fishman is of the opinion that insofar as participants in a society conceive their verbal interaction in terms of such categories, that the critical attributes and the distribution of these are worth discovering. He thinks that an interesting question about speech events concerns what can serve to close them, or to close a sequence within one.

Any speech event can be seen as comprising several components (Factors in Speech Event), and the analysis of these is a major aspect of the ethnography of speaking. Fishman (1970) notes that every speech event involves: a sender (Addresser), a Receiver (Addressee), a Message form, a Channel, a Code, a Topic, and a Setting. This set of seven types of factor is an initial framework for any group. The indigenous categories will vary in number and kind, and their instances and classes must be empirically identified. For example, the sender and addresser or receiver and addressee, need not be the same. Fishman (1970) observes that among the eastern Chirookan groups, a formal occasion is partly defined by the fact that the words of a chief or sponsor of a ceremony are repeated by a special functionary to the assembled people. In general, the categories of these two factors must be investigated in terms of the role system of the group studied. Moreover, depending upon beliefs and practices, the categories of senders and receivers variously overlap the membership of the human group. The form of a message, or the typical form of a class of messages, is a descriptive fact that becomes significant especially as an esthetic and stylistic matter, whether in relation to the resources of a code.

Newman (1940) has shown that Yokuts and English stand in sharp contrast, to a particular context. Cross-cultural differences in channels are well known, not only the presence or absence of writing, but also the elaboration of instrumental channels among West African peoples such as the Jabo, the whistling tones among some of the Mazates of Mexico. The code factor is a variable, given a focus on the speech habits of a population. The range is from communities with different levels of a single dialect to communities in which many individuals command several different languages or dialects of language as can be witnessed in the Owerri municipality.

The topic points to the study of the lexical hierarchy of the languages spoken by a group, including idioms and the content of any conventionalized utterances for evidence and knowledge of what can be said. To a large extent, this means that semantic study is necessary to any study of speaking.



The setting factor is fundamental and difficult. It underlies much of the rest and yet its consistency is not easily determined. Agbedo (2015) in a discussion on ethnography of communication notes that Dell Hymes is considered the founder of the area in sociolinguistics known as ethnography of communication; that in 1962, he proposed ethnography of speaking as a way to study how people talk and that later the name was changed to include other symbolic means of expression. One of the goals was to create a theory that helped researchers study language use in specific contexts. This was then in contrast with the views of some researchers of that time who felt that language should be studied by itself and removed from times and places where people talked. Hymes thought that by looking at how people actually use language, patterns could be discovered that otherwise would not be by just looking at the words themselves. Agbedo reports that Hymes has the following views: i. that the starting point of any ethnography of communication is the analysis of the communicative conduct of the community. Communicative conduct is what people do when they communicate with each other. Agbedo further states that Hymes holds the view that to study the communication of a particular culture, there should be basic units that indicate which one of the culture area one is most interested in examining; that he, Dells set forth the following 6 units: speech community, speech situation, speech event; communicative act; communicative style, and ways of speaking.

Agbedo (2015) is of the opinion that the primary unit, speech community, follows from the description of linguistic community proposed by John Gumperz (1962). According to him (Agbedo) a speech community is composed of a group of people that often use common signs. Because they communicate in a particular way, they are different from other groups. Hymes (1972) also defines a speech community as people who share “rules” in when, how to speak. Agbedo further observes that in 1974, Hymes said that for someone to be counted as a member of a speech community, he or she must share at least one “way of speaking” with others. Hymes later includes the meaning of what people say. He cites the example of users of a particular website, which may be considered a speech community if they share particular rules for speaking online.

Agbedo (2015) proposes a research proposal after deciding open one of the six basic units, which include speech community; situation, event, act, style or way of speaking, a researcher can then proceed to analyze it by using one of the tools that Hymes developed. He notes that these tools can be remembered easily by thinking about the word, S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G. By using the tools of S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G., a researcher opens up the potential meanings of a speech community or by examining these smaller units. He notes that,

S, the first letter (S) designates Situation, which includes both the scene and the setting where the activities are taking place; and the overall scene in which they are a part. This component explores two aspects of context, the physical setting in which it takes place, and the scene, either participants sense of what is going on when this practice is active; that while analyzing; the setting and scene qualities of the practice help, ground the analyses in the specific context of social life.

P, as the second refers to the Participants involved. This area includes the people present and the roles they play, or the relationships they have with other participants.

E, refers to the ends or goals of communication, it asks about two ends, the goals participants may have in doing the practice, and the outcomes actually achieved.

A, stands for acts, or speech acts; which includes both form and content. That is, any action can be considered a communicative action if it conveys meaning to the participants.

K, stands for the key or tone of speech. How the speech sounds or was delivered and how is the practice being keyed?

I, is the instrumentality or the channel through which communication flows can be examined.



N, stands for norms of communication or the rules guiding talk and its interpretation can reveal meaning. G refers to genres, that is cultural or traditional speech genres, such as proverbs, apologies, prayers, small talk, problem talk, etc.

Agbedo (2015) observes that by using these tools (S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G) to analyze one unit, such as particular speech community, a researcher can come to learn more about how people communicate and how that communication is often patterned.

Obianika (2010) in a study of Eastern Nigerian Commercial Road Transport Workers Language: Cant or slang, notes that the Nigerian Road Transport Worker, in terms of personality, dignity, virtue, and integrity has been looked down upon for a long time. That without any doubt, almost every Nigerian would classify their language as cant rather than slang. The study outlines the language of the Eastern Nigerian Commercial Road Transport Worker and finds out that 53.68% of its language is operational in nature, 30.52% are used for expressing food and eating habit, while 15.80% of the data collected are used for general purposes. Also, the nature of the operational language was examined and found to depict no nefarious despicable activities. Rather, it reveals that their job in itself is legitimate and meets a definite and necessary need in the society and that their language is therefore classified as slang and not cant.

According to Johnson (2005), slang can be described as informal, non-standard words or phrases (lexical innovations) which tend to originate in subcultures within a society. She further states that for an expression to become slang, it must be widely accepted and adopted by members of the sub-cultural group. Slang has no societal boundaries or limitations as it can exist in all cultures, languages and classes of society.

Agbedo (2010) in a study of linguistic ideology and linguistic trauma: Issues and challenges, defines ideologies as systems of ideas that function to create views of reality that appear as the most national view; a view that is based on common sense notions of how the social world ought to be. A derivation of the ideology concept is language ideology; seen as the self-evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of that group. That the study examines the concept of language ideology in Nigeria and how its application in a multilingual and multi-dialectal setting, which dictates linguistic preferences and choices in communication systems, has not only informed the enthronement of linguisticism and conferment of undue linguistic capital on some communications system but also engendered linguistic trauma. Nordquist (2017) sees Linguicism as discrimination based on language or dialect, which is also seen as linguistic discrimination and racism. The ideologies and structures, which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce are unequal division of power and resources between groups, defined on the basis language, provide veritable ground for linguistic disenfranchisement. The study also observes that in pure linguistic ideology, the dominant group/language presents an idealized image of itself to the disadvantage of the dominated group/language. Given that this deliberate ideologization of language traumatizes the dominated group, the study calls for a radical reinvention of language ideology in Nigeria in a manner that guarantees the language rights of all Nigerians.

Agbedo (2010) further reports that the study is mainly inspired by a typical Nigerian joke. The joke is reproduced below for critical analysis/ segmentation.

A Nigerian of Igbo extraction in the employ of an oil servicing company as a driver attached to an expatriate maintenance engineer was on his regular duty schedule. He was driving through the early morning busy traffic with his big *Oga* seating behind him jointly ensconced in his paraphernalia. Then suddenly, the whiteman let out a violent sneeze. Almost instinctively, the driver crooned, "*Ndu gi*". In a



typical Igbo setting, when someone sneezes, it behooves anybody around to say, “*Ndu gi*”, which literally, translates as “Your life”. It is an expression of solidarity with the sneezing person, which also doubles as a kind of supplication to God, asking Him to preserve the person’s life. Moments later, the *Oga* convolved with another round of sneeze that boomed in quick succession. As usual, the driver responded with *Ndu gi*. Yet, the sneezing would not let the white man be. What a stubborn type of sneezing that would not yield to the nullifying effect of “*Ndu gi*”, the driver wondered. Just then, he remembered that the person sneezing was an *Oyibo* and probably an “*Ndu gi*” prayer would be an effective antidote for an *Oyibo* sneezing. That was it. The driver got ready for his ever-sneezing *Oga*. Luckily, the *Oyibo* did not keep his waiting for too long as he promptly sneezed, this time with a gob of thick sputum jutting out of both nostrils. Quickly, the driver yell out, ‘Your life’. “What?” the white man asked, cocking his ears in appreciation. “*Oga*, I say your life,” the driver explained. “My life?” the *Oga* screamed, a questioning stare, boring into the driver’s squinted face. “Yes, your life for sneeze, *Oga*”. Having confirmed his worst fears, the white man directed his driver to make a detour and drive straight to a nearby police station where he made a formal report, accusing the driver of threatening his life. Instantly, the driver was declared guilty as charged before being volleyed headlong into one of the detention cells where hardened criminals pummeled him into pulp. All efforts made by the driver to tell his own version of the story failed.

The driver’s experience reflects in microcosm the linguistic trauma, which victims of pure linguistic ideology suffer in the typical Nigerian sociolinguistic setting. These privations form the subject of analysis of the study which was done from the intra-language and inter-language perspectives. The first perspective borders on the rationalization of unequal division of power and resources (both material and non-material) between groups; which are defined on the basis of dialects of a given language. The second perspective looks at the valuation of the linguistic resources of a given language as symbolic of social groups at the expense of the devaluation of the linguistic resources of other languages.

In summary, the review of literature reveals levels of communication which include the round of behavior in one level, the patterns of occurrence and frequency and the analysis of the communicative event itself. Among all the levels, the analysis of the communicative event is a more complex aspect. For each aspect of speech event, three kinds of questions are useful. The questions aim at eliciting answers in these areas: instances of speech, classes of speech events present, differentiating features of each class of speech event, their pattern of occurrence, the ethnographic techniques for getting at speech events. It also shows that speech events involve participants.

It is also seen that for a meaningful study of a speech event, people gather at a designated spot where they chat, discuss over issues that cut across issues of the moment, politics, economy, entertainment, et cetera. They eat, drink, play and occasionally dance. In the process of these events, they code switch and code mix and invent new words and expressions that are new entries into the dominant and non-dominant language.

Analysis of beer parlour speech events

This section presents and analyzes the statements from speeches collected for the study. Examples of statements from some of the speeches collected in the course of a speech event in the beer parlours include the following:

1. Customer : Madam, pepe supu, o di a? (Madam, is there pepper soup?)
Attendant : Pepe supu, di ya. (There is pepper soup)
Attendant : Anyi nwere pepe supu, ugba na nkwōbi. (We have pepper soup, ugba and nkwōbi)
Customer : Achorō m pepe supu nke di hotu. (I want hot pepper soup)



Customer : Madam, biilu m ọ bụ ego ole? (Madam, how much is my bill?)

Item '1' above shows that the customers know the types of drink and food the attendants serve; and the attendants know what they want and how to provide for them. In the beer parlours, different types of alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks are provided. The statements reveal clear cases of code switching (e.g. Madamu, pepe supu ọ dị a?; pepe supu dị ya; achoro m pepe supu nke dị hotu; and biilu m ọ bụ ego ole?). Code-switching can also be observed at two levels within this speech event. Some of the participants are really bilinguals judging from the case with which they switch from English to Igbo and from Igbo to English.

2. Customer : Madam, wot andi wot ka unu nwere? (Madam, what and what do you have?)

Attendant : Wot andi wot ka unu choro. (What and what do you want?)

Customer : Enidiri m pileti ugba na nkwoji. (I need one plate of ugba and nkwoji)

Costomer : Enidikwuru m pileti ugba na nkwoji (I need extra plate of nkwoji)

The statements in item '2' reveal clear cases of code mixing and code switching. Examples of code mixing are represented by the words '**enidiri**' and '**saavuo**'). Enidiri is a word, produced from the morpheme 'nidi' spelt as 'need' in English language. Enidiri is produced by attaching affixes to the morpheme 'nidi' (prefix '**e-**' and suffix '**-ri**', to the Igbonised verb '**nidi**'). Enidiri simply means 'to need'. (That is, 'ichq' in Igbo.) Saavuo, is also a word produced from the Igbonised verb 'saavu' which is serve in English'. Saavuo is produced by attaching the suffix 'o' to the verb 'saavu', to produce the new word, '**saavuo**'.

Examples of code switching in item '2' are seen in the following: wotu andi wotu ka unu nwere?; pileti ugba na nkwoji; pileti ugba na nkwoji.

3. Customer : Bja Nwanyi Okwaose saavuo anyi mmanya, motuari sitandadi. (Nwanyi okwaose, serve us drinks, mortuary standard.)

Customer : Saavuo onye obula asi yuzual. (Serve everybody his usual.)

Customer : Nwanyi Okwaose nye anyi sekondụ raundụ. (Nwanyi okwaose, give us second round.)

Item '3' also reveals that customers know the types of drink and food the attendants serve, and the attendants know what they want and how to provide for them. The statements contain cases of code mixing (e.g. 'saavuo'), code switching (e.g. saavuo anyi mmanya, motuari sitandadi; onye obula asi yuzual; and nye anyi sekondụ raundụ) and the use of slangs (e.g. motuari sitandadi, asi yuzual, and sekondụ raundụ) to convey a message.

4. Customer : Ana m aga feloshipu ebe a na-anu mma. (I am going to fellowship in the beer parlour.)

Customer : Bja Baamanu, wetara m wan botulu ka m nuo wan fo di rodu. (Come Barman, bring one bottle let me drink one for the road.)

Customer : Echefukwala isavu m buush miti; anunchi m ri veri impotanti. I nugo. (Don't forget to serve me bush meat, my anunchi is very important.)

Customer : Egejiela m. (I have drunk to my satisfaction.)

In item '4', it can be seen that some customers in the beer parlour regard going there as going to fellowship with others. Unlike the people who go to churches in the evening to pray, the customers in the beer parlour go there to drink together, tell stories crack jokes and discuss issues of the moment, including politics. The speech event here shows examples of code switching (e.g. ka m nuo wan fo di rodu; anunchi m ri veri impotanti) and code mixing (e.g. isavu and egejiela). Isavu is produced from the Igbonised verb 'savu' which is serve in English with the prefix '**i-**' attached to it. Egejiela, on the other hand is from the Igbonised verb geji which means gauge in English with the affixes '**e-**' and '**-ela**'.



5. Customer : Nna a, o dika ichoro ifinishicha manyi a niile. (Nna a, it is like you want to finish all these drinks.)
Customer : I choro inu motogbuo? (Do you want to drink motor-kill?)
Customer : Kama o ga-adọ n'iteka o doro n'afọ. (Instead of it to remain in the pot, let everything be in the stomach.)
Customer : Nwanne, achoro m iri hai bifọ mu alaa. (Nwanne, I want to be high before I go.)

It's like you want to ensure that there is no left over drink in this beer parlour. You want to drink to stupor, to a state of obesity. This indicates that sometimes the customers in a beer parlour drink excessively.

The speech event here is a clear case of code mixing and code switching as revealed by the lexical items 'ifinishicha' and 'motogbuo'(code mixing); and the statement 'achoro m iri hai bifọ mu alaa' (code switching). Ifinishicha is a word produced from the Igbonised morpheme 'finishi' which is finish in English. The prefix 'i-' and enclitics '-cha' are attached to produce the new word, 'ifinishicha'. In a beer parlour speech event, it is used to replace the word 'inucha'. Motogbuo is produced by a combination of two free morphemes 'moto' (English) and 'gbuo' (Igbo). In beer parlour speech event, it means 'drinking to stupor' It also reveals some typical beer parlor/bar slangs such as 'inx motogbuo', 'kama o ga-adọ n'ite ka o doro n'afọ', and 'iri hai (to be high)'. This speech event also indicates that sometimes the customers in a beer parlour drink excessively.

6. Customer : Nna a ihena-eme n'obodoanyi a. (Nna a, things are happening in this our country.)
Customer : Asi na ufodu govono kega ofe na gari e shiri eshi as palietive? (Did they say that some governors are sharing soup and eba as palliative?)
Customer : Tiivi agbavoola/emevoola ha. (The television has exposed them.)
Customer : Kedukwanu maka steeti ndi kerela umu akwukwo ndomi mere espaya? (What about the states that shared expired indomie to school children?)
Customer : Nna a shem adighi ndi a n'anya. (Nna a, this people lack shame.)
Customer : Aka m ha mma. (I am better than them.)
Customer : O burugodi obi utu wanu botulu a m nuga, aka m ha mma. (Even if it is only the happiness I am getting from this my one bottle of drink, I am better than them.)

The statements in '6' above are also clear cases of code switching. It shows that customers in a beer parlour share information about political issues and crack jokes in the process.

7. Participant 1: Palietivus a si e kere, mmadu ole nwetere ya? (The palliatives they said that were shared, how many people got it?)
Participant 1: E butere honderedis ofu terelasi mmadu ole shina sitrit unu nwetara ya? (They brought hundreds of trailers, how many people in your street got it?)
Participant 2: Hafu ndi ahụ. (Leave those people)
Participant 2: Ha jiecheshi anyi bu mugu. (They think we are mugus/fools.)

The palliatives that were said to be distributed by government how many people benefited from the distribution? How many people in your street were beneficiaries? Do not mind them, they think we are fools. The participants here expressed displeasure over the mode of distribution of government's palliatives, indicating that speech events in a beer parlour also contain criticisms of unpopular government policies and actions.

8. Nna a, were nwayo na-anu mkpuru mmiri ebe onye na-akpo eluigwe oku no. (Nna a, be careful while drinking in the midst of this smoker.)

When somebody walks into the group of smokers in a beer parlour, he is required to be calm and careful. The speech event in item '8' above reveals that when somebody walks into the group of smokers in a



beer parlour, he is required to be calm and careful. This signifies that beer parlour speech events is a combination of slangs, gossip and humour; for instance, 'mkpürümmiri' (slang/lexical item) and 'onye na-akpọ eluigwe oku' (slang, gossip and humour). It also shows that beer parlour is a place for different categories of people, hence, requires tolerance from all participants.

9. Participant 1: Ufọdu umu akwukwo haya insutushon ndi a abiaghikwanu igu akwukwo. (Some students in our higher institutions have not come to study.)

Participant 2: O bu na i maghi? Ha na-agrajuetikwanu agrajueti? (Don't you know? Do they ever graduate?)

Participant 2: Eviri ye ha no na sukul. (Every year they are in school.)

Participant 1: Ha bira icho di. (They come to look for husband.) (participant 1)

Participant 1: Ha na-achọ satifiketi diploma na nwaploma. (They are looking for diploma and nwaploma certificates.)

The interlocutors in item '9' stated that some of the girls in our tertiary institutions have not come to study rather they have come to use their institutions to catch husbands (diploma) and therefore do not attend lectures. In that speech event, there are instances of code mixing (grajuetikwanu, diploma and nwaploma) and code switching. This indicates that beer parlour conversations sometimes convey gossip, rumour and humour. The statement, 'Ha na-agrajuetikwanu agrajuati' is an expression of both gossip and humour; the words, 'diploma', 'nwaploma', and 'grajuetikwanu' represent both code mixing and humour (di + ploma, nwa + ploma, grajueti + kwanu).

10. Participant 1: Nna a, sit ati homu a, ike gwuru. Mmadu ga-arahugide ura ike agwu ya. (Nna a, I'm tired of this sit at home. One sleeps and gets tired.)

Participant 2: Nke ka njo bu ma nne ma umu bu givu us moni, wii wanti to bayi dis, wii wanti to bayi dat. (The worst is that both mother and children are requesting for money, we want to buy this and that.)

The beer parlour speech event above reveals code switching, and that such events include family, marriage and political issues.

11. Some participants who engage in a speech event in a beer parlour refer to people who smoke marijuana (Indian hemp) as 'ndi bi n'ohia' (People who live in the forest.).

Some of the participants are really bilinguals judging from the case with which they switch from English to Igbo and from Igbo to English. Closely related to that is the issue of the speakers also being diglossic.

Ferguson (1972) reports diglossia as a situation whereby two or more varieties of the same language are used by some speakers under different conditions. Hymes (1976) recognizes H (the higher variety) and L (the lower variety); he further asserts that in such a situation, there is a functional division between the two; the H being reserved for formal public use, in contrast with the unofficial status, heart and home use of L.

In the case of some participants in this speech event as is usual with the educated in the Nigerian society, the H variety is English while their indigenous Language is the L variety. Hence, in informal chatting sessions like this, the tendency is to mix up the two. In actual fact, the L variety ought to have been used here but as is the case with most Nigerian background, when they need a switch, it is always from English to their native language.

As noted by Agbedo (2019), speech event can also be regarded as having taken place within a speech community. Jino (2003) believes that the verbal behaviour of such groups always constitute a system. It is observed that within a speech community, various occupations exist, and participants that live within the speech community exhibit its linguistic characteristics that can be studied and to show that they



exhibit the same social experience with very intelligible statements. This is true of our speech event under focus.

Summary of the findings

The analysis of this study revealed that the people who go to beer parlours, unlike the people who go to church fellowship in the evening after the day's work, go there to drink alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks, eat, chat, crack jokes and sometimes sing and dance in the name of fellowship.

It was also discovered from the analysis that the participants in beer parlours communicate without hindrances, because they see one another as people who share the same social experiences and belong to one speech community. This accounts for reasons why they code switch and code mix. It is discovered that the people can code mix from English to Igbo and vice versa as shown in the analysis. They are able to do this because the participants are bilinguals who acquired English as a second language and are therefore fluent speakers of English and Igbo Languages; this accounts for the use of lexical items from the two languages either at the beginning or at the end of sentences. This accounts for the introduction of new meanings for words or items which are capable of entering into the Igbo lexicon, examples include such items as:

Feloshipu- This is derived from the word 'fellowship', the gathering of Christians, where they pray, sing and dance. The beer parlour patronisers now extended the meaning to their own gathering, where they eat and crack jokes.

Mkpurummiri - Mkpuru mmiri is a slang expression which means Indian hemp.

Motogbuo- This is a codemixing and a slang expression derived from two words 'motor' and 'gbuo'. Motor kills a person that obstructs its road. The literal meaning is extended to mean that when a person drinks to stupor, there is a possibility that he falls down on the main road, and there is also a possibility that a vehicle can smash the drunkard.

Egejiela m – There is an indication of codemixing in this structure. In a vehicle when oil is gauged, it means that it is saturated. There is an extension of meaning of the word. The beer parlour patronisers use it to mean that someone has drunk to his satisfaction.

Diploma – Diploma is a certificate obtained from Polytechnics. The patronisers of beer parlours interpret the word from its Igbo language point of view. 'Di' in the Igbo language means husband. So 'diploma' in their context means getting a husband while schooling. Nwaploma – The interpretation of 'diploma' is also giving to 'nwaploma'. 'Nwa' means child. 'Nwaploma', then means to have a child while schooling

Onyena-akpo eluigweokwu –When something is burning, the smoke moves towards the sky. This fact is extended to mean one who smokes Indian hemp or marijuana. This is because when one smokes, the smoke moves towards the sky.

Ndi bi n'ohja – It means those who hide in the bush to smoke illicit drugs.

While the participants drink, eat, discuss and crack jokes, they communicate ideas that border on aspects of the tradition and culture of the people; issues of the moment which cut across issues like assessing the performance of governments at all levels. They express their displeasure over certain actions. An example is the government's distribution of palliatives in the 2020 covid-19 period. The participants achieve all these through the language of social contexts and changes in situational contexts, an action that is a prominent sociolinguist feature of a speech event.

Conclusion

Our study has shown that within a speech community various occupations exist, and participants that live within speech community exhibit linguistic characteristics that can be studied and shown to exhibit the



same social experience with very intelligible statements. This is true of our speech event under study. The speech form represents the only way by which one can study language in use. This assumption underlies the exercise in this study since it is in this kind of analysis that we can find the key to better understanding of what language is and how it works.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Given the fact that language is evolving everyday with the participants' introduction of new lexical items in the Igbo lexicon, this study suggests that the following be included in the Igbo new words coinage or lexicon: mkpūrūmmiri, ifinishicha, motogbuo, saavūo, egejiela, grajuetikwanū, diplōma, nwaplōma, enidiri; onyena-akpō eluigweōkū, ndī bi n'ōhīa (smokers).
2. Students, teachers, lecturers, and language policy planners should consider including more slots in the academic table for teaching lexicography in our tertiary institutions, one course for it in a four year programme is grossly inadequate.

References

- Agbedo, U.C. (2010). Linguistic Ideology and Linguistic Trauma in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges. In Ozo-MekuriNdimele (Ed.). *Language Policy, Planning and Management Nigeria: A Festschrift for Ben. O. Elugbe*. Port Harcourt: M. & J. Grand Orbit Communication.
- Agbedo, U.C. (2015). *General Linguistics*. Enugu: KUMCEE-NF-NTESHE Press.
- Agbedo, U.C. (2019) *Multilingualism and National Development: Issues and Challenges*. Nsukka: University Press
- Anasiudu, B.N. (1987). Nigerian English Slang: Coinage Processes. *Nsukka Journal of Linguistics and African Languages*, 30.
- Bell, R.T. (1976). *Sociolinguistic Goals, Approaches and Problems*. London: Batsford.
- Ferguson, C.A. (1972). 'Diglossia' in P. Giglioli (Ed.). *Language and Social*. London: Penguin
- Fishman, J.A. (1970)(Ed). *Readings in the Sociology of Language (2nd Ed)*. 7 Netherlands: Moutonxco Printers.
- Gumperz, I.J. (1968). The Speech Community in D. Hills (Ed) (1982). *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornsby, A.S. (1981). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Ike, J.N. (2007). *Sociolinguistics, Kwakwalaga*. Abuja: Willert Educational Publishers.
- Jimoh, R. (2003). Code-switching and Code-mixing in Conversational as Consequences of Bilingualism in Yoruba speech Community. In *Journal of School of Languages*, Vol 1 No 1, (ed) WeleOsisanwo & Co. Ondo: Crofes Computers, Press and Publishers.
- Johnson, S. (2005). What is slang? Unpublished seminar paper, University of North Cardina at Permbroke.
- Nordquist, R. (2017). Linguicism. www.thoughtco.com.
- Obianuka, E. C. (2010). Eastern Nigerian Commercial Road Trans Workers' Language, Cant or slang In Language, Policy, Planning and Management in Nigeria. Ozo-MekuriNdimele (Ed.). *A Festschrift for Ben O Elugbe*. Port Harcourt: M & J Grand Orbit Communications. pp 333-347
- Whorf, B.C. (1966). *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge: Mass M.I.T. Press