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**Abstract**

This study is on audience perception of pidgin English usage in broadcast media. The total population for the study is 200 staff of Radio kogi, Lokoja. The researcher used questionnaires as the instrument for the data collection. Descriptive Survey research design was adopted for this study. A total of 133 respondents made broadcasters, editors, production managers and senior staffs were used for the study. The data collected were presented in tables and analyzed using simple percentages and frequencies

 **CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

* 1. **Background of the study**

The term Pidgin English or Nigeria Pidgin otherwise known as Brokin English is a term used to denote an English based pidgin; a marginal language used among Nigerians to facilitate communication needs in certain interaction contexts. Like any other pidgin language in other cultural climes where the language is not native to its users. According to Marshal (1950) cited in Abiola (2010) says, language is a means of communication via which myriad of message are transmitted day by day. Nigerian pidgin is contact language that emerged from the fusion of indigenous languages and foreign language (English). Supporting this view, Elugbe and Omamor (1991), cited in Temitope (2012) in their attempt to define pidgin, see it as “some kind of a marginal language that arises to fulfill specific communication needs in well-defined circumstances.”The above definition shows that pidgin is not an official language, but      a marginal language used for communication especially by people who do not speak each other’s language. Writing further, Elugbe and Omamor, quoting Hall (1966), stated two conditions for a language to be qualified as pidgin. In their submission, for a language to be pidgin, “Its grammatical structure and its vocabulary must be sharply reduced; secondly, the resultant language must be native to none of those who use it” (Elugbe and Omamor, 1991). In consonance with the above position, Temitope (2012) quoting Rickford (1998) said: A pidgin usually combines elements of the native language of its users and is typically simpler than those native languages in so far as it has fewer words, less morphology, and a more restricted range of phonological and syntactic options. Rickford’s excerpt to some extent is contextually applicable to Nigerian pidgin in the sense that its phonological, morphological and grammatical structures are basically restricted compared to any other standard language. In addition to this, its social communicative functions are usually limited to the verbal and informal settings. Though scholars like Rickford (1998) are of the view that “a pidgin is 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,” such position on pidgin is not generally applicable to all pidgins. The sociolinguistic reality in Nigeria today reveals that Nigerian pidgin is not used only in informal settings, but also in other formal settings (Akande, 2008). Other places where pidgin is now common is on the media especially in television and radio programme presentation, comedy presentation, advertisement and jingle production among other forms of programmes. To this end, the research examines audience perception of Pidgin English usage in broadcast media: Radio Kogi, Lokoja.

**1.2.    Statement of the Problem**

The use of Pidgin English otherwise known as Broken English is creating a decline in the use of pure, correct English language to the extent that students and teachers that supposed to be speaking good English language are now speaking pidgin because they believe they can speak the language anywhere because broadcast media use the same on programmes. The English speakers use it unconsciously in some former occasions that demanded use of pure English language. On the other hand, many audiences who speak Pidgin English very often find it difficult to understand broadcasting message that are disseminated in pure English language and as such, try to ignore such information. They find it difficult to give a satisfactory and accurate meaning of the communicated messages on pure English language. In view of this, the research aims at finding out audience perception of Pidgin English usage in broadcast media: Radio Kogi Fm, Lokoja.

**1.3.   Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study are;

* To know whether audience understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English.
* To determine the effect of using Pidgin English on audience.
* To find out whether Pidgin English poses problem when used as a language in broadcast.
* To ascertain the reasons for Pidgin English popularity among audience.
	1. **RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

For the successful completion of the study, the following research hypotheses were formulated by the researcher;

**H0:** audience do not understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English.

**H1:** audience understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English.

**H02:** there is no effect of using Pidgin English on audience.

**H2:** there is effect of using Pidgin English on audience.

* 1. **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The research will benefit different people, media practitioners, organization, students and other agencies. Media practitioners will through the findings of this research come to realize the benefit of using the popular language that their audience speak or understand. It will form part of the research materials that will be used in the future especially those that will be working on the related topic or aspect. The research will be value to students and scholars of mass communication and people who are seeking knowledge on the influence of language on broadcast media audience.

**1.6.    SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

This study examined the audience perception of Pidgin English usage in broadcast media at radio kogi 94.0Fm as the study area. Due to time factor and funds, the study is limited to the residence of kogi state.

Therefore, the staff of radio kogi FM, lokoja will serve as source of primary data for the study. The researcher encounters some constrain which limited the scope of the study;

 **a) AVAILABILITY OF RESEARCH MATERIAL:** The research material available to the researcher is insufficient, thereby limiting the study

**b) TIME:** The time frame allocated to the study does not enhance wider coverage as the researcher has to combine other academic activities and examinations with the study.

**c) Organizational privacy**: Limited Access to the selected auditing firm makes it difficult to get all the necessary and required information concerning the activities.

**1.7 DEFINITION OF TERMS**

**Pidgin English**: Pidgin English also known as Broking English is the mixing of English language with native language. Without English structure and grammatical rule. Such as no wahala.

**Broadcasting media:** This is a form of electronic media such as radio kogi FM that disseminated information, programmes to the audience in kogi state.

 **1.8 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

This research work is organized in five chapters, for easy understanding, as follows

Chapter one is concern with the introduction, which consist of the (overview, of the study), historical background, statement of problem, objectives of the study, research hypotheses, significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study, definition of terms and historical background of the study. Chapter two highlights the theoretical framework on which the study is based, thus the review of related literature. Chapter three deals on the research design and methodology adopted in the study. Chapter four concentrate on the data collection and analysis and presentation of finding. Chapter five gives summary, conclusion, and recommendations made of the study

 **CHAPTER TWO**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

**2.1 NIGERIAN PIDGIN ENGLISH AS A MARGINAL VARIETY**

Out of many common manifestations of language marginalisation, only one has been extensively researched in Nigeria: the non-recognition of minority languages at the local, state or national level (Oyelaran 1990). However, marginalisation can also come in the form of limited space or attention given to a particular language in printed or electronic forms. A language is considered marginal only when there are other languages to which we can compare it within the same speech community. There is a sense in which NPE can be regarded as a marginal language when we consider the fact that its written form, compared to the written forms of languages like English, Yoruba, Hausa and Igbo, is on the margin. Not many literary works have been produced in NPE in Nigeria. When we compare the literary works written in any of the four languages mentioned above (i.e., English, Yoruba, Hausa and Igbo) in Nigeria with the few ones written in NPE, it would be apparent that NPE has been marginalised in the print medium. Apart from the fact that only a few novels or drama texts exist in NPE, most Nigerians do not often read or pay any serious academic attention to works written in NPE. This is born out of the attitudes that they have to the language. More importantly, while English and the other three national languages are codified, NPE is not. Politically, NPE is marginalised. While English and other major languages are recognised in our constitution, NPE is not at all. Two major reasons can be hypothesised for this. First is the fact that most Nigerians, including the elites, see NPE as a mere contact language which cannot be said to belong to any particular region unlike the three major languages which are regionally or ethnically based. As such, it (NPE) is not the language of any ethnic group. We can more or less see it, therefore, as being ethnically marginalised. Secondly, while each of Yoruba, Hausa, Igbo and English is studied as a discipline in Nigeria’s secondary schools and higher institutions, as far as we know, there is no secondary school where NPE is taught as a subject. Similarly, there is no department of Nigerian Pidgin English in any higher institution in Nigeria although there are some dissertations which have examined one aspect or the other of NPE. This also implies that NPE is marginalised in Nigeria’s curriculum. The nonintroduction of NPE into the curriculum is political. The existence of such a department where NPE stands out as a discipline would mean that the government as well as universities in Nigeria will have to fund it. Ours is a country where the existing programmes in the nation’s citadels of learning and the entire university system are not properly funded by the government not to talk of introducing another one. So, the continuous marginalisation of NPE is indirectly linked to the lack of interest on the part of the government.

**2.2 ATTITUDES TO NPE IN NIGERIA**

Generally speaking, language attitudes can be studied from two theoretical frameworks: the behaviourist approach which focuses on the responses speakers of a language make about the social functions of the language (Fasold 1984) and the mentalist approach which considers attitudes as internal states that can be used to predict other behaviour (Ihemere 2006). In this study, we adopt the mentalist approach as many scholars have done (Apel and Muysken 1987; Baker 1992; Ihemere 2006; Long 1999; Zhou 1999). As Ihemere (2006) and Fasold (1984) have noted, the mentalist framework cannot account for how the mental states of users of a language can be studied directly without having to make inferences from the behaviour, however. Although theoretically speaking, no language is linguistically minor or major, legitimate or bastardised, people tend to perceive NPE as a corrupt, bastardised or lesser language (Igboanusi 2008; Mann 1996). As pointed out by Elugbe and Omamor (1991:146), attitudes to NPE are not determined by any objective criteria. In spite of the fact that NPE is used by more than two-thirds of the total population of Nigeria today (Faraclas 2004; Igboanusi 2008) and despite its use by people from different walks of life including graduates and professionals (Akande 2008), the general attitudes of the majority of Nigerians towards NPE are still not encouraging. Concerning this, Deuber (2005:183) says: Although a major lingua franca, it has no official recognition; even without any policy statements, it performs a growing range of functions, including, for example, that of a medium of public broadcasting, but no efforts have been made to develop it in order for it to be able to cope with these functions, as has been done for the major and to some extent also for minor indigenous languages. Deuber (2005:183) also notes that NPE is the most neglected language in Nigeria since no major roles are assigned to it. Elugbe and Omamor (1991) and Egbokhare (2003) suggest that NPE be given the status of an official or national language while Igboanusi (2008) calls for its use as a medium of instruction in the early stage of primary school education especially for NPE-speaking children. One major argument in support of the adoption of NPE as a national language is that it is a neutral code as it has no ethnic base. Igboanusi (2008:69) examines how NPE could be empowered in Nigeria and remarks that education is ‘the most important institution through which to raise the value of NP[NPE]’. However, Igboanusi’s (2008) study shows that there is no consensus among his subjects as to whether NPE should be given any official or national status as some of them believe, among other things, that NPE has no economic value.

**2.3 THE ORIGIN, NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF NIGERIAN PIDGIN**

The origin of Nigerian Pidgin may be difficult to state with precision. Evidence in literature points to the fact that, as far back as the eighteenth century, Nigerian Pidgin English, the forebear of Nigerian Pidgin, was already being used especially in the city states of the Niger Delta region (see Agheyisi, 1984, p. 211; Ogu, 1992, p. 85). As suggested by Agheyisi (1984), this early pidgin was used primarily, if not exclusively, in the restricted context of trade. But gradually, the social conditions as well as the introduction of schools by the missionaries and colonial governments led to its spread and development as noted by Flint (1960, p. 83): … The absorption of large numbers of Ibo (Igbo) east of the Niger produced an extra-ordinary cosmopolitan effect, in which most cities became trilingual, speaking the native Ijo; Efik; Ibo (Igbo); and Pidgin English, the language of trade with Europeans. By the end of the eighteenth century, there were even rudimentary schools in Calabar for the teaching of Pidgin English, reading and writing with the object of producing clerks and book keepers. Today, what Nigerians speak may be described as Nigerian Pidgin which developed from Pidgin English, a variety of English. Like any other human language, Nigerian Pidgin is not uniformly characteristic in all parts of Nigeria. In fact, varieties abound in all places, spheres and situations where it is found and used (see Marchese & Shnukal, 1982; Agheyisi, 1984; Elugbe & Omamor, 1991; Faraclas, 1996; Osoba, 2000). Interestingly, as noted by Agbegisi (1984, p. 213), sociolinguistic profile of NPE (Nigerian Pidgin English) has not failed to produce some linguistic effects. Such a label as “Pidgin English” (or Pidgin or Broken English, alternative names for NPE) has come to be associated with a wide range of forms, united essentially by their negative classification as “non-standard English”. Indeed, “Pidgin English” is used and understood, often loosely, to apply to all of those names or labels. Thus the erroneous name, “Pidgin English”, is today still attached and given to “Nigerian Pidgin” which has now been observed to be a non-variety of English, but a linguistic system on its own (see Elugbe & Omamor, 1991; Faraclas, 1996; Osoba, 2000). It is on this basis that my analysis is based on a sample of Nigerian Pidgin discourse found in the Nigerian media. Ifode’s (1983-1984, p. 201) attempts to put NPE in the general social context may also provide an insight as follows: The main contexts of NPE use are markets, hotels, motor parks, government and private offices and schools at all levels. In markets and motor parks, it is the primary mode of communication. In the schools, NPE is prevented from becoming primary by the social stigma attached to it as a non-standard variety of the former colonial language. Some churches reproduce this stigma and hold on to Standard English, while others use NPE as the primary medium. The same can be said of offices, where social hierarchy is the primary determinant of pidgin use. In her attempt to determine whether or not NPE is creolising, Ifode (Ibid.) conducted an illuminating survey showing the number of children who used the language in Port-Harcourt (between the ages of 8 and 12 and living with their parents) as mother tongue, first language or primary language at home. From her summary above, out of a total of 70 children, 20 spoke NPE as their primary language; only 6 spoke it as their first language (FL) while 10 spoke their mother tongue first. To her, the most significant correlation which emerges here is a negative one: less than half of those who had either NPE or MT as a primary functional language were known to have had it as their first language; and correlation is worse for NPE (38%) than with MT (62%) by a very large margin if the unknowns are regarded as neutral. This is ironic in the sense that, in spite of its wide currency, NP is still perceived as a low/sub-standard variety of the English language especially among the educated speakers (see Bronahan, 1958; Obiechina, 1974; Adekunle, 1974, 1979). Ogu’s (1992, p. 85) observation is illuminating in this regard: The Nigerian Pidgin variety has also been identified by linguists. This is a variety that has become highly integrated into our Nigerian culture. It does not use English language structures, spelling, and phonology. When vocabularies are similar, they may not be identical. This variety is used all over the country so much so that it should be regarded as language of itself. However, in our situation in Nigeria, it is seen as a variety of English. This is perhaps why media adverts in NP are set against the background of cordiality, intimacy, humuor, or other informal situations.

**2.4 NP MEDIA ADVERTS AS COMMUNICATIVE EXCHANGES**

From a layman’s perspective, media adverts may be interpreted as any piece of linguistic communication. It may be described as a written or spoken form of language used in interaction by interlocutors. In every communication, the interlocutors tend to be concerned with the way information is organized. Thus any form of communication, such as dialogues, poetry, drama, prose, memos, letters, commentaries etc. in any linguistic form or language can also be described as a piece of discourse. In his work, Language and Power, Fairclough (2001, pp. 16, 18-19) provides a fascinating conception of language as discourse, language as a form of social practice. In an attempt to make clear what discourse is, he differentiates discourse from text. To him, “a text is a product rather than a process—a product of the process of text production.” In his work, the “term, discourse, is used to refer to the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part”. This process is said to include both process of production and process of interpretation, for which the text is a resource. Thus discourse is seen as involving two types of social conditions: (1) social condition of production and (2) social conditions of interpretation; which relate to three different “levels” of social organization, the level of the social situation, or the immediate social environment in which the discourse occurs; the level of the social institution which constitutes a wider matrix for the discourse; and the level of the society as a whole. In sum, discourse can be described as the relationship between texts, interactions and contexts.

**2.5 PRESUPPOSITION IN NP MEDIA ADVERTS**

In any linguistic enterprise, effective communication depends to a large extent on the shared knowledge or values that exist or prevail contextually among interlocutors. It is this shared knowledge or values that enhance the interlocutors correct interpretation of each other’s utterances and messages. It is on this assumption that the pragmatic notion of presupposition rests. Yule (1996, p. 134) regards the assumption that the hearer and the speaker have about what they assume to be true as presupposition. To him, When a speaker uses referring expressions like this, he or Shakespeare, in normal circumstances, she is working with an assumption that the hearer knows which referent is intended… What a speaker assumes is true or is known by the hearer can be described as a presupposition. As noted earlier, linguistic messages are designed based on the assumptions about what hearers already know. These assumptions are based on the shared knowledge or values that exist among interlocutors but may sometimes be mistaken. Yule (1996, p. 132), Palmer (1996, p. 166), Mey (2001, p. 28) and Levinson (2003, p. 167-176) provide illustrative accounts of the notion of presupposition. Levinson (ibid, p. 173) illuminates a set of important distinctions and alternative approaches adopted by linguists as follows:

1) the distinction between logical implication or entailment and presupposition (in the work of Frege and Strawson )

 2) the contrast between assertion and presupposition (again in the work of Frege and Strawson)

 3) The issue of whether it was proper to think of presupposition as a relation between sentences (as Frege sometimes did) between statements (as Strawson held) or between speakers on the one hand and assumptions on the other (as Frege did, on other occasions).

 4) the issue of whether the apparent ambiguity of negation between a presupposition- denying sense and a presupposition-preserving sense is to be thought of as a scope distinction (a structural ambiguity) or lexical ambiguity.

5) the possibility that apparently background assumptions, presuppositions, could in fact be viewed as assertions of entailments, on a par with the rest of a sentence’s meaning(Russell’s approach).

**2.6 IMPLICATURE IN NP MEDIA ADVERTS**

Implicature may be described as a principle or communication strategy which implies what the speaker does not actually say and what the hearer does not know (see Palmer, 1996, p. 173). This may be seen as one of the most complex nature of communication in the sense that both “speaker and hearer”, or interlocutors must be very cooperative in their social interaction for efficient communication to take place. This principle, with four maxims, was first propounded or expounded by Grice (1975) (see Yule, 2006, p. 145). According to Grice, talk exchanges are characteristically “cooperative efforts” in which each participant recognizes a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction (see Jianmin, 1999, p. 8). The four maxims or criteria supporting the principle are as follows: Quantity: Make your contribution as informative as is required, but not more or less, than is required. Quality: Do not say that which you believe to be false or for which you lack evidence Thus, the notion of implicature may be interpreted as suggesting additional or extra information or information beyond the literal sense. This is applicable to NP discourses in which interlocutors may have to interpret verbal exchanges, texts, and discourses beyond their ordinary or literal sense. Having examined the relevance and usefulness of both notions/ theories of Presupposition and Implicature as they relate to NP discourses, I now apply them as analytical tools to demonstrate their strengths, relevance and adequacy in the interpretation of the samples of the NP Radio discourse

**2.7 NIGERIAN PIDGIN (NIGP) – OUTLOOK AND FEATURES**

NigP is a variant of the larger group of English-based pidgin and creole languages, which developed in West Africa as a result of contact with British colonialists. Nigeria shares this linguistic history with other British colonies in West Africa, which include countries like Ghana, Cameroon, Gambia and Sierra Leone, who all share a similar background of multilingualism. The English language exists alongside its Pidgin English variety in most of these countries (Eze, 1980). West African Pidgin English is one of the three varieties of West African Pidgins: the two others are Sierra Leonian Krio and Liberian Kru (Holm,1988 cited in Mowarin, 2010:2). The three sub-varieties of West African Pidgin English are Ghanaian Pidgin, NigP and Cameroonian Pidgin (Mowarin, 2010: 2). The major difference in these variations, according to Lothar and Wolf (2007), is in pronounciation. Structurally, it has been noted that each variety of West African Pidgin English (WAPE) closely corresponds with the respective national variety of West African (standard) English (WAE) (Barbag-Stoll,1983). NigP19 has been a spoken medium for centuries, primarily because of its history as a contact language. It was a coastal phenomenon of the southern states of Nigeria (Eze,1980), which later spread to the interior of the country (Elugbe and Omamor, 1991). It is the mothertongue of a substantial population of people in the Niger Delta, particularly in the Sapele and Warri areas. This gives the language the status of a creole. Faralas (2004: 828) asserts that “there is no creole language worldwide with nearly as many speakers as NigP”. It is, however, an expanded pidgin in the rest of Nigeria. This is because NigP is “...no longer a makeshift language used for limited communication needs”, it is now used in “...every conceivable aspect of daily life” (Elugbe and Omamor, 1991:122; Ativie, 2010:1-3). An expanded pidgin has ‘a complex grammar, a developing word formation component, and an increase in speech tempo...it is used in almost all domains of everyday life” (Romaine, 1988:138). It develops in special social circumstances and is said to be “instrumental in providing cohesion in heterogeneous groups” (Romaine, 1988:138). Migration by Nigerians from one region to another has contributed to the development of NigP into an expanded pidgin and simultaneously enriched its lexicon. This has resulted in an abundance of loan words and slangs from regional languages and cultures in NigP (Ativie, 2010). Indigenous languages contribute to the vocabulary for West African Pidgin English (WAPE). The superstrate of NigP is the English language, while any of the three major languages, namely Hausa,Yoruba and Igbo can be used as a substrate language. Minority languages in the Niger Delta (Ijaw, Itshekiri, Urhobo, Edo, etc.) also form part of the substrate language, because of their principal position in the contact situation through which NigP evolved centuries back. NigP has expanded in different ways. It has done so by extending the basic meaning of specific expressions; calquing, creating entirely new lexical items which it does through reduplication, and nativisation through phonologocial adaptation (Mafeni, 1971:103-106). It does not have a reduced vocabulary; rather it expands and “...falls back on well known events within and outside Nigeria to coin new items of vocabulary”(Elugbe and Omamor,1991:55, 56). It also weighs in on special events in the country to create “specific lexical items” (Elugbe and Omamor,1991:54). There are other coinages which are cultural and peculiar to certain genres like music20 (Ugot, 2009). NigP however lacks “subject–verb agreement” (Ugot and Ogundipe, 2011:228; Onuigbo, 1999: 205) as well as “...grammatical categories like gender, person, number, mood and voice (Ugot and Ogundipe, 2011: 228). It also lacks inflections for plural possessive or derivational types. It however has its own syntactic pattern, which is a reduced form of inflections and derivations, which differs from the English language (Ugot and Ogundipe, 2011: 228; Onuigbo,1999:205). NigP is sometimes referred to as Pidgin and errorneously as ‘broken English’ or ‘broken’. This has been vehemently contested by scholars like Omamor (1982b), who recognise that the term ‘ broken’ is a denigration arising from the politics of language in Nigeria. They have thus made a distinction between NigP and ‘broken English’ by stating that, while the latter results from an inadequate mastery of the English language, NigP is a distinct language, which operates on well defined and discoverable governing principles (Elugbe and Omamor 1991:73). In addition, Kperogi (2011) says ‘broken English’ approximates the linguistic conventions of standard English while NigP on the other hand, is “the product of a historically specific, socio-linguistic alchemy of Nigerian languages and English”. NigP has also been described as “the medium of intranational and interethnic communication in Nigeria” (Bamiro, 2009: 277). It is noted to be “a performance variety, which resides in the public domain” (Bamiro, 2009: 277). One, which is formally acquired in the streets, in the neighbourhood and at home, as opposed to Nigeria’s official languages, English or French which are learnt in formal settings (Yuka, 2001cited in Ativie, 2010: 3). It is imperative to note that majority of the world’s pidgin languages, like NigP, do not enjoy official recognition and are excluded from the education system. Scholars like Ndimele (2003), however, note the use of NigP in Niger Delta states like Rivers and Bayelsa in the early stages of primary education. He writes that despite the exclusion of NigP as a language of instruction in classrooms, teachers resort to NigP for “explanatory purposes” at this level because “there is no other common language among the pupils” (Ndimele, 2003:357). In terms of linguistic and social status, certain scholars argue that NigP is spoken by the underprivileged (Agheyisi, 1971; Obilade, 1979). Agheyisi in particular describes this social class as “the majority of people who have little or no formal education” (1971: 30). They include unskilled labourers in government projects and agencies, petty traders, store keepers (Agheyisi, 1971), market women, taxi and lorry drivers. NigP is said to lack prestige because it is often perceived as a ‘bad’ form of English and “associated with non-literate persons and a socioeconomically deprived group” (Igboanusi, 2008:1). This criticism is, however, not peculiar to NigP, the Sierra Leone Krio suffers this aspersion, despite benefitting from language planning, having a dictionary and being used extensively on radio. In contrast to Agheyisi (1971), and in conformity with present day reality, Elugbe and Omamor assert that speakers of NigP “span the different strata of the society and include highly literate people in the different professions…” (1991:50). This is supported by Deuber, whose focus is on NigP “spoken by educated speakers” (2005:6; 42). They argue that the fortunes and statuses of NigP and its speakers have been increasingly positive since Nigeria’s independence. There are also areas in Nigeria where those in their mid-forties and below speak NigP as a first language across all social classes and backgrounds (Omamor,1982b). NigP is spoken fluently by over half of the 140 million inhabitants of Nigeria, making it the most widely spoken language in Nigeria and, it is also the indigenous African language with the largest number of speakers in the world (Faraclas, 2004). NigP has become the native language of approximately three to five million people and a second language for at least other 75 million (Ihimere, 2006 cited in Esizimetor 2010:17). In a 2008 study, Marchese and Schnukal, attested to hearing NigP in the market place, in government offices, department stores, schools, hotels and petrol stations. NigP is regarded as ‘the language of solidarity among university students and used by politicians who attempt to identify with the people (Obilade,1979 cited in Elugbe and Omamor,1991: 51).

**2.8 SCOPE OF NIGP USAGE**

A language which cuts across and survives in a heterogenous nation like Nigeria, must be “... easily understood by both the educated populace and the illiterate members of the society” (Olatunji, 2007:29). According to Olatunji (2007), the only language that best qualifies for this purpose in Nigeria is NigP. His assertion is affirmed by other scholars like Akande, who state that NigP is an inter-ethnic code available to Nigerians who have no other common language, therefore it is “a marker of identity and solidarity” (2008:38). Other scholars see NigP as a neutral language, one which escapes both the “elitist connotations” of English and “the ethnic connotations” of the indigenous languages (Deuber, 2005: 51). The absence of these connotations, I believe, is a critical factor in the continual survival, spread and vitality of NigP, as well as its preference by Nigerians. By applying the domains of language use classification by Fishman (1972) to NigP, it becomes evident that NigP features prominently in the family, friendship, and the unofficial business domains. It is, however, only partially used in the religious domain and significantly excluded in both the official and education domains (Ndimele, 2008). It has been observed, however, that despite the exclusion of NigP officially as a medium of instruction in schools, “in Rivers and Bayelsa states, teachers resort to the use of NigP for explanatory purposes, especially in the early stages of primary education, since there is no other common language among the pupils” (Ndimele, 2003:357). In a study on the language spoken by various Nigerian groups in informal domains by Igboanusi & Peter (2005), 24 percent of the population of minority language speakers in Southern Nigeria spoke NigP at home, while 39 percent spoke standard English. In the overall survey, Hausa, English and NigP are projected as languages that will “dominate communication in Nigeria in the informal domains where mother-tongues are expected to be used” (Igboanusi, 2005:142). NigP has also been framed ideologically. Its ideological dimensions are said to be in the nature, meaning and function of the language variety (Bamiro, 2009). It is inherent in the social and functional power of NigP in interpreting the Nigerian social structure27, a structure which is said to be “polarised along the rich-poor axis” (Bamiro,2009:277). NigP as a language thus provides an ideological zone for “working out social meanings and enacting social differences between the dominant and dominated classes” (Bamiro, 2006: 316). It is also seen as a ‘deviant’ language, which challenges “the authority and hegemonic territoriality” of the English language (Bamiro, 2006: 319). This view is particularly useful in media studies because the appropriation of the concept of hegemony has consistently given NigP more visibility. This invariably played out in the adoption of the language as a medium of broadcast for twenty four hour radio services. Even in a regimented society like the Nigerian armed forces, NigP has since emerged as the lingua franca (Luckham, 1971). It has been described as the “unofficial language of the armed forces28 and the police” (Bamgbose,1991:29). It has “widespread use in the army and the police”, (Simpson and Oyetade 2008:192). Apparently, this is because the heterogeniety of the population in army formations across the country reflects the multi lingual and multicultural nature of Nigeria. But Eze (1980) adds that the mobility of people of different ethnic groups as well as the “educational and social background during the civil war and the subsequent social restructuring contributed to the liberalisation of pidgin usage in the army” (Eze,1980:52). Police, army and other service barracks are considered as “areas traditionally associated with NigP” (Elugbe and Omamor, 1991:140-141). Presently in Nigeria, comedy is a thriving profession and NigP is its major medium of communication.This is largely because of the humour inherent in NigP as a spoken language (Kemper, 2008), and NigP’s ability to retain sounding qualifiers or words (Olatunji,2001). Grammatically, qualifiers in NigP have onomatopeic characters, unlike English adverbs or adjectives, which qualify a noun in abstract. This conforms with features of indigenous African languages, most of which operate by using a word and a corresponding sound to convey a meaning. These words thus describe the meaning, sound it and qualify it (Olatunji, 2001). These are words like ‘gragra’, ‘gbosa’, ‘fiam’, which mean ‘commotion-hustle’, ‘sound of a loud explosion’, and ‘all of a sudden’ respectively (Orhiunu, 2000). NigP is used in songs, oral literature, radio programming and sections in several newspapers (Barbag-Stoll,1983:39). The use of NigP in newspapers dates back to the 1980’s with Lagos Life29 and ‘Wakabout’ (Elugbe and Omamor, 1991: 55). Despite the nonrecognition of NigP officially, all tiers of government in Nigeria use it for social and health mobilisation programmes, political campaigns and public service announcements (Mann, 2000). In music, NigP has featured in songs since the country’s independence, nowadays contemporary and popular musicians blend NigP, English language and other Nigerian languages in songs. Major stage plays31 have been performed in NigP, popular radio and TV drama in NigP abound from the 1950’s and boomed especially in the 1980’s and '90’s. Nollywood, Nigeria’s movie industry, has also influenced the currency of NigP. A new commercial television station WAP TV, in Lagos now devotes a large percentage of its airtime to NigP programmes Although NigP has no standard orthography, prominent literary figures in Nigeria like Wole Soyinka, Chinua Achebe and Ken Saro Wiwa34 have used NigP in their works. Today, NigP is primarily used in corporate newspaper and magazine adverts. There are several examples of the preference for NigP as a medium of communication in advertising, because of the mass market of NigP speakers . Orally, NigP is used in popular radio and TV jingles. In terms of usage on new media platforms, there are websites, blogs and Facebook pages which use NigP as the medium of communication. In sports, NigP is the official language each time the national football team is in camp (Ayinor, 2012). It has been observed that “even the national football team” use NigP on the pitch (Esogbue cited in Osuagwu, 2010:3). This is in response to the heterogeneity of languages spoken by these footballers, who are drawn from different ethnic groups in Nigeria (Ayinor, 2012). NigP has, however, been continually excluded in the politics of language in Nigeria, both formally in the language policy of the nation formulated in the 1970’s and informally in the lack of socio-linguistic associations and pressure groups which could press for its inclusion. Rather than press for the official recognition of NigP, speakers of minority languages35 in areas where NigP has creolised, struggle for the recognition, survival and rights of their more marginalised languages in Nigeria’s language policy (Ndimele, 2011:12; Mowarin, 2010:4- 5). Despite this opposition to NigP, it has survived primarily because it functions as the ‘fall back’ language when there is a language crisis in Nigeria. During the Nigerian civil war, NigP was used for propaganda purposes (Todd 1974 cited in Elugbe & Omamor,1991:123). After the war, minority groups in Eastern Nigeria switched to NigP for the purposes of intergroup communication (Igboanusi & Peter, 2005; Kemper, 2008). Despite its treatment in the past as ‘uneducated speech', and reservations by some scholars about NigP attaining a national language status (Jowitt,1991), there are calls for NigP to be accorded the status of a national language (Okon,1997; Onuigbo,1999; Essien, 2003; Deuber, 2005). Deuber argues that it is “a more realistic one, than the trilingual option which forms the basis of present language policies” (Deuber, 2005:188-189). NigP has also had notable influence on neighbouring countries to Nigeria. NigP is referred to as ‘Abongo Brofo’ which means ‘English of the military’ in Ghana (Dako, 2002). This is because at a point in history, NigP speaking troops formed a sizeable portion of the Ghanian military (Dako, 2002; Pipkins, 2004; Simpson, 2008; Huber, 2004)

**CHAPTER THREE**

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

* 1. **Research design**

The researcher used descriptive research survey design in building up this project work the choice of this research design was considered appropriate because of its advantages of identifying attributes of a large population from a group of individuals. The design was suitable for the study as the study sought to audience perception of pidgin English usage in broadcast media

* 1. **Sources of data collection**

Data were collected from two main sources namely:

(i)Primary source and

(ii)Secondary source

**Primary source:**

These are materials of statistical investigation which were collected by the research for a particular purpose. They can be obtained through a survey, observation questionnaire or as experiment; the researcher has adopted the questionnaire method for this study.

**Secondary source:**

These are data from textbook Journal handset etc. they arise as byproducts of the same other purposes. Example administration, various other unpublished works and write ups were also used.

* 1. **Population of the study**

Population of a study is a group of persons or aggregate items, things the researcher is interested in getting information on the study audience perception of pidgin English usage in broadcast media. 200 staff of radio Kogi, Lokoja selected randomly by the researcher as the population of the study.

* 1. **Sample and sampling procedure**

Sample is the set people or items which constitute part of a given population sampling. Due to large size of the target population, the researcher used the Taro Yamani formula to arrive at the sample population of the study.

n= N

 1+N(e)2

n= 200

1+200(0.05)2

= 200

1+200(0.0025)

= 200 200

1+0.5 = 1.5 = 133.

**3.5 Instrument for data collection**

The major research instrument used is the questionnaires. This was appropriately moderated. They staff were administered with the questionnaires to complete, with or without disclosing their identities. The questionnaire was designed to obtain sufficient and relevant information from the respondents. The primary data contained information extracted from the questionnaires in which the respondents were required to give specific answer to a question by ticking in front of an appropriate answer and administered the same on staff of the organizations. The questionnaires contained about 16 structured questions which were divided into sections A and B.

* 1. **Validation of the research instrument**

The questionnaire used as the research instrument was subjected to face its validation. This research instrument (questionnaire) adopted was adequately checked and validated by the supervisor his contributions and corrections were included into the final draft of the research instrument used.

* 1. **Method of data analysis**

The data collected was not an end in itself but it served as a means to an end. The end being the use of the required data to understand the various situations it is with a view to making valuable recommendations and contributions. To this end, the data collected has to be analysis for any meaningful interpretation to come out with some results. It is for this reason that the following methods were adopted in the research project for the analysis of the data collected. For a comprehensive analysis of data collected, emphasis was laid on the use of absolute numbers frequencies of responses and percentages. Answers to the research questions were provided through the comparison of the percentage of workers response to each statement in the questionnaire related to any specified question being considered.

Frequency in this study refers to the arrangement of responses in order of magnitude or occurrence while percentage refers to the arrangements of the responses in order of their proportion.

The simple percentage method is believed to be straight forward easy to interpret and understand method.

The researcher therefore chooses the simple percentage as the method to use.

The formula for percentage is shown as.

% = f/N x 100/1

Where f = frequency of respondents response

N = Total Number of response of the sample

100 = Consistency in the percentage of respondents for each item contained in questions.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**PRESENTATION ANALYSIS INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

**4.1 Introduction**

Efforts will be made at this stage to present, analyze and interpret the data collected during the field survey. This presentation will be based on the responses from the completed questionnaires. The result of this exercise will be summarized in tabular forms for easy references and analysis. It will also show answers to questions relating to the research questions for this research study. The researcher employed simple percentage in the analysis.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

The data collected from the respondents were analyzed in tabular form with simple percentage for easy understanding.

A total of 133(one hundred and thirty three) questionnaires were distributed and 133 questionnaires were returned.

Question 1

Gender distribution of the respondents.

TABLE I

|  |
| --- |
| **Gender distribution of the respondents** |
| Response | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Male | 77 | 57.9 | 57.9 | 57.9 |
| Female | 56 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the above table it shows that 57.9% of the respondents were male while 42.1% of the respondents were female.

Question 2

The positions held by respondents

TABLE II

|  |
| --- |
| **The positions held by respondents** |
| Response | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| **Valid** | Broadcasters  | 37 | 27.8 | 27.8 | 27.8 |
| Editors  | 50 | 37.6 | 37.6 | 65.4 |
| Production managers | 23 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 82.7 |
| Senior staffs  | 23 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

 The above tables shown that 37 respondents which represent27.8% of the respondents are broadcasters, 50 respondents which represents 37.6 % are editors 23 respondents which represents 17.3% of the respondents are production managers, while 23 respondents which represents 17.3% of the respondents senior staffs

**TEST OF HYPOTHESES**

 Audience do not understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English.

 **Table III**

|  |
| --- |
| **audience do not understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English.** |
| Response  | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
| Agreed | 40 | 33.3 | 6.8 |
| strongly agreed | 50 | 33.3 | 16.8 |
| Disagreed | 26 | 33.3 | -7.3 |
| strongly disagreed | 17 | 33.3 | -16.3 |
| Total | 133 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | audience do not understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English.  |
| Chi-Square | 19.331a |
| Df | 3 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .000 |
| a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 33.3. |

Decision rule:

There researcher therefore reject the null hypothesis that state audience do not understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English as the calculated value of 19.331 is greater than the critical value of 7.82

Therefore the alternate hypothesis is accepted that state audience do understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English.

 **TEST OF HYPOTHESIS TWO**

There is no effect of using Pidgin English on audience

Table V

|  |
| --- |
| **there is no effect of using Pidgin English on audience**  |
| Response  | Observed N | Expected N | Residual |
| Yes | 73 | 44.3 | 28.7 |
| No | 33 | 44.3 | -11.3 |
| Undecided | 27 | 44.3 | -17.3 |
| Total | 133 |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Test Statistics** |
|  | there is no effect of using Pidgin English on audience  |
| Chi-Square | 28.21 1a |
| Df | 2 |
| Asymp. Sig. | .000 |
| a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 44.3. |

Decision rule:

There researcher therefore reject the null hypothesis that state that there is no effect of using Pidgin English on audience as the calculated value of 28.211 is greater than the critical value of 5.99

Therefore the alternate hypothesis is accepted that state that there is effect of using Pidgin English on audience

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

**5.1 Introduction**

It is important to ascertain that the objective of this study was on the audience perception of pidgin English usage in broadcast media. In the preceding chapter, the relevant data collected for this study were presented, critically analyzed and appropriate interpretation given. In this chapter, certain recommendations made which in the opinion of the researcher will be of benefits in addressing the challenges of audience perception of pidgin English usage in broadcast media

* 1. **Summary**

This study was on audience perception of pidgin English usage in broadcast media. Four objectives were raised which included: To know whether audience understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English, to determine the effect of using Pidgin English on audience, to find out whether Pidgin English poses problem when used as a language in broadcast, to ascertain the reasons for Pidgin English popularity among audience. In line with these objectives, two research hypotheses were formulated and two null hypotheses were posited. The total population for the study is 200 staff of Radio kogi, Lokoja. The researcher used questionnaires as the instrument for the data collection. Descriptive Survey research design was adopted for this study. A total of 133 respondents made broadcasters, editors, production managers and senior staffs were used for the study. The data collected were presented in tables and analyzed using simple percentages and frequencies

* 1. **Conclusion**

The outcome of this research shows that the audience are really favoured and better informed when Pidgin English is been used as a medium for disseminating advert messages and information. The rationale as to why Pidgin English favoured the people of this particular target audience is that, most of the Lokoja residents are not all “Bini” speakers or indigenes; they comprises of diverse tribal groups from various parts of Nigeria. In a nutshell, why the dilemma or issue falls to the other side of the coin by the act of majority loving the Nigerian Pidgin English more than the Standard English language is simply because of the cosmopolitan nature of the municipality which is made up of individuals representing different ethnic groups from all over Nigeria as well as being one of the major commercial centres in the middle belt region of the country. Nigerian Pidgin is commonly used for public communication and interaction in this city by the residents; settlers or indigenes alike. However, Respondents flow easily with Pidgin English because majority speaks Nigerian Pidgin English more than any other Nigerian languages or dialects. Therefore, most 60 respondents favour the use of Nigerian Pidgin English as a medium of disseminating advert messages as well as a language of public communication. Finally, the finding shows that Nigerian Pidgin English is playing an effective role in informing, educating, persuading and entertaining broadcast media audience in Lokoja

* 1. **Recommendation**

In view of the findings, the use of Pidgin in broadcasting should be encourage since it is a good medium of communication in Nigeria and the population of the study prefers advertisements made in Pidgin English more than those made in Standard English. Advertisers and advertising agencies should also take advantage of the popularity of Pidgin English and employ its usage in packaging and disseminating advert messages, especially for products and services meant for the general public. Broadcast media and government agencies should also endeavour to make use of Pidgin English in packaging their grassroots programmes and development-oriented messages respectively since they are more likely to be understood and interpreted effectively than Standard English language. Since few publics are involved in this study (residents of lokoja), the researcher therefore recommended that further studies should be carried out nationwide, in order to involve a larger audience with a view to find out whether the general public would perhaps embrace the culture of using Pidgin English language as one of the country’s lingua franca. It is of uttermost importance that further research be conducted into the Nigerian Pidgin usage in order to ensure its standardization.
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**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**INSTRUCTION**

Please tick or fill in where necessary as the case may be.

Section A

1. Gender of respondent

A male { }

B female { }

1. Age distribution of respondents
2. 15-20 { }
3. 21-30 { }
4. 31-40 { }
5. 41-50 { }
6. 51 and above { }
7. Marital status of respondents?
8. married [ ]
9. single [ ]
10. divorce [ ]
11. Educational qualification off respondents
12. SSCE/OND { }
13. HND/BSC { }
14. PGD/MSC { }
15. PHD { }

Others……………………………….

1. How long have you been radio kogi
2. 0-2 years { }
3. 3-5 years { }
4. 6-11 years { }
5. 11 years and above……….
6. Position held by the respondent in radio Kogi
7. Broadcaster { }
8. Editor { }
9. Production manager { }
10. Senior staff { }
11. How long have you been working in radio kogi
12. 0-2 years { }
13. 3-5 years { }
14. 6-11 years { }
15. 11 years and above……….

SECTION B

1. Audience do not like pidgin english
2. Agrees { }
3. Strongly agreed { }
4. Disagreed { }
5. Strongly disagreed { }
6. There is effect of using Pidgin English on audience

(a) Agrees { }

(b) Strongly agreed { }

(c) Disagreed { }

(d) Strongly disagreed { }

1. Always problem when use pidgin English in broadcast
2. Agreed { }
3. Strongly agreed { }
4. Disagreed { }
5. Strongly disagreed { }
6. There is reduced misappropriations/embezzlement in the Ministry of Finance.
7. Agreed { }
8. Strongly agreed { }
9. Disagreed { }
10. Strongly disagreed { }
11. There are reasons for Pidgin English popularity among audience?
12. Agreed { }
13. Strongly agreed { }
14. Disagreed { }
15. Strongly disagreed { }
16. Audience do not like pidgin english in broadcast
17. Agreed { }
18. Strongly agreed { }
19. Disagreed { }
20. Strongly disagreed { }
21. Audience understands messages disseminated in Pidgin English more than in Standard English.
22. Agreed { }
23. Strongly agreed { }
24. Disagreed { }
25. Strongly disagreed { }
26. There are basic challenges and prospects of Pidgin English use for advertisements
27. Agreed { }
28. Strongly agreed { }
29. Disagreed { }
30. Strongly disagreed { }
31. There is rationale of Pidgin English use in advertising in Nigeria
32. Agreed { }
33. Strongly agreed { }
34. Disagreed { }
35. Strongly disagreed { }