CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Linguistics politeness is the way people choose to speak and how the hearers react to their speech. Udosen (2006) observes that languages is a social instrument without which our human interaction would suffer.

The most universal forms of language behaviour are those used to show our routine needs, professional and social. No one is free to say just what one likes in whatever form of discourse. Rather, our conversation is a prescribed ritual in which an individual generally says what his fellow men expects him to say, observing the pragmatic rules, though unconsciously. In our societies today, living in harmony with nature, conforming to the norms of our common experience is the right conduct of interlocutors and politeness is that aspect of social behaviour which promotes harmonious living with nature and conformity to the norms of our common experience.

Coulmans as cited in Dioka (2009) claims that being polite is not an attribute of language but it depends on the interlocutors in a given speech situation. Politeness is socially determined, it is linked with social differentiations with making appropriates choices which may not be the same for everybody. Politeness criteria are not the same in different cultures, sometimes speaking indirectly is considered more polite than speaking directly like the Erq xlq dialect of Igbo.

1.1 Background to the Study

According to Yule (1995), Politeness, in an interaction can then be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person’s face. In this sense politeness can be accomplished in situations of social distance or closeness. Showing awareness for another person’s face when that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect or deference.
Similarly, Lakoff (1957), defines it as saying or doing the socially correct thing. Adebija in Prezi (2003) also says that politeness is associated with situations in which one speaks or behaves in a way that is socially and culturally acceptable and pleasant to the hearer. However according to Dioka (2009) Politeness in the practical sense of the word means doing or saying the right things with or among people.

Politeness is a virtue that is cultivated in every human being from infancy since every society has its own respect system. In all areas of the world, polite expressions are held in high esteem as the key to unlocking the beauty in the human nature and also in the society because without politeness there will be anarchy and chaos in our various societies. From the beginning of time, politeness, there will be anarchy and chaos in our various societies. From the beginning of time, politeness and polite expressions have been in existence, this is evident in the story of the Garden of Eden in the Bible, which can be seen in Genesis (3:1-15). Here, although man disobeyed God, God did not speak harshly to man but still talked to him as he had always done – politely.

In this study however, we will be narrowing our research to a particular area in African society which is Erq Xlq in Enugu state of Nigeria. Here we would take a look at the socio-linguistic implications of politeness and polite expressions and how it affects the very individuals we can relate with even in our rural areas. We strongly believe that politeness and polite expressions did not just start in our own generation and time but as always been in existence.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In our world of today, the younger generation has thrown morality to the winds and gone ahead on the path of such ills as disrespect, disloyalty and lack of allegiance all in the bid to be in vogue. The lack of politeness in our
society has brought about moral decadence of the society. This work we believe will help to restore the dignity of man.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The general objective of this research work is to use a sociolinguistic approach to discuss the issue of politeness as it occurs in Erq Xlq speech community. Then the specific objectives of this study are to:

1. Identify the politeness expression strategies that are used in Erq Xlq speech community.
2. Find out the sociolinguistic implications of Erq Xlq study.
3. Find out the relevance of using politeness expression strategies in the speech community of our interest.

1.4 Significance of Study

This research work will be of immense benefit to all language users since the polite use of language help in achieving the objectives for which the speech is meant to achieve.

Researchers who like to carry out further researches on the politeness expression strategies or related topics will find this work useful.

Students will find this work useful for their academic purposes.

1.5 Scope of the Study

Politeness expressions are used in so many social groups and groups ranging from schools, communities organized and unorganized groups. Students also have their ways of expressing themselves especially when they want to get something from their lecturers parents, elderly and even within themselves. In Erq Xlq speech community, the elders have their own way of exhibiting politeness among themselves.
Also, the young ones have their own ways of expressing politeness to the elderly ones and also the young ones have their own ways of expressing politeness among themselves.

This study is not going to treat politeness in general, rather the work will concentrate on the politeness expression only in Erq Xlq speech community. Any politeness strategies other than those used by people of Erq Xlq speech community will not be investigated.

1.6 Research Questions
The study sought answers to the following research questions:
1. What are the politeness expression strategies used by language users in Erq Xlq speech community?
2. What are the sociolinguistic implications of politeness expressions in Erq Xlq speech community?
3. What are the functions of politeness expressions in Erq Xlq speech community?

1.7 Limitations of Study
There were many limitations that confronted this research work. They include the following:

The respondents focus on the researcher and this had influence on their speech as to make the data unreliable. Again, some of the respondents bluntly refused to give the researcher the correct politeness markers used in asking questions, making requests, greeting, thanks, showing sympathy, condolence, love and endearment and rendering apology. In order to avert these problems, the researcher made series of visits to the respondents in order to make herself familiar. The respondents were made to know that the information they will give will help the government to promote their dialects (i.e
their dialects will be using in teaching in primary, secondary, tertiary and in Universities).

Other major limitations of this work include time and financial constraints. Time was hardly available for this research. This together with some other problems, explains why the research seemed to have lasted on for quite some time. On finance, a research of this type would require a lot of fund to enable the research move smoothly especially for traveling, especially in the area of questionnaire distribution, relevant work from the internet and gathering other research materials. The researcher tried as much as possible to manage the available resources.

1.8 Definition of Terms

It is necessary to define the major operational terms so as to put the reader and the researcher in the same position. According to Leech there is a politeness principle with conversational maxims similar to those formulated by Grice. He lists six Maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy. The first and the second form a pair as do the third and the fourth. Note that these maxims vary from culture to culture, meaning what may be considered as polite in one culture may be strange or downright rude in another.

a. The Tact Maxim:

The tact maxim states: Minimize the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other, maximize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other. The first part of this maxim fits in with Brown and Levinson’s negative politeness strategy of minimizing the imposition and the second part reflects the positive politeness strategies of attending to the hearer’s interests, wants and needs:

Could I interrupt you for a second?

If I could interrupt you for a second?
(b) The Generosity Maxim: Leech’s Generosity
Maxim state: Minimize the expression of benefit to self, maximize the expression of cost to self: Unlike the tact maxim, the maxim of generosity focuses on the speaker and says that others should be put first instead of the self:
You relax and let me do the dishes.
You must come and have dinner with me.

(c) The Approbation Maxim:
The approbation maxim states: Minimize the expression of beliefs which express approval of others. The operation of this maxim is fairly obvious, all things being equal we prefer to praise others and if we cannot do so, to sidestep the issue to give some sort of minimal response (possibly) through the use of euphemisms or to remain silent. The first part of the maxim avoids disagreement, the second part intends to make other people feel good by showing solidarity:
I heard you singing at the crusade last night.
It was um - - - - - different
John, I know you’re a genius-would you know how to solve maths problem here?

The Modesty Maxim:
The modesty maxim states; Minimize the expression of praise of self, maximize the expression of dispraise of self:
Oh, I’m so stupid – I didn’t make a note of our lecture! Did you?
e. The Agreement Maxim:

The Agreement Maxim runs as follows: Minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other, maximize the expression of agreement between self and other. It is in line with Brown and Levinson’s positive strategies of seek “agreement” and avoid ‘disagreement” to which they attach great importance. However, it is not being claimed that people totally avoid disagreement. It is simply observed that they are much more direct in expressing agreement rather than disagreement.

A: I didn’t want my daughter to do this, I want her to do that.
B: Yes, but Madam, I thought we resolved this already on your last visit.

f. The Sympathy Maxim:

The sympathy

Maxim states: Minimize antipathy between self and other, Maximize sympathy between self and other. This includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration and expressing condolences all of which is in accordance with Brown and hevinson’s positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer’s interests, want and needs.

I was sorry to hear about your father’s death.

g. What is Politeness?

All Nations English Dictionary sees polite behaviour as having the following components: “being courteous, having good manners, being considerate of others: “Using correct social behaviour’ Roughly put, politeness is appropriateness of behaviour and speech acts towards other people.

Similarly Yule defined politeness as the means employed to show awareness of another person’s face. In this sense, politeness can be accomplished in situations of social distance or closeness.
Adebija in Prezi (2003) also says that politeness is associated with situations in which one speaks or behaves in a way that is socially and culturally acceptable and pleasant to the hearer. Brown says that politeness can be said to be the act of saying or doing things in such a way as to take into account the other person’s feelings. Journal of Nigerian Languages and Cultures (volume holds) says that politeness is one of the most important aspects of human communication. Human beings can only exist in peace together if certain basic conventions of politeness are observed. Social cohesion depends upon awareness and consideration of the “face needs” of others.

**h. The Concept of Face**

Within an interaction, however, there is a move narrowly specified type of politeness at work. In order to describe it we need the concept of face. As a technical term, face means the public self image of a person. It refers to that emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize. In most English-speaking contexts, the participants in an interaction often have to determine as they speak, the relative social distance between them and hence their ‘face wants’.

**1. Face Wants**

In this discussion, let us assume that the participants involved in an interactions are not living in a context which has created rigidly fixed social relationships. Within their everyday social interactions, people generally behave as if their expectations concerning their public self-image, or their “face wants’ will be respected. If a speaker says something that represents a threat to another individual’s expectations regarding self image, it is described as a **face threatening act**. Alternatively, given the possibility that some action
might be interpreted as a threat to another’s face, the speaker can say something to lessen the possible threat. This is called a **face saving act**.

Imagine a night scene, where a young neighbor is playing his music very loud and an older couple are trying sleep. One of them proposes a face threatening act and the other suggests a face saving act.

Example. Him: I’m going to tell him to stop that awful noise right now! 
Her: Perhaps you could just ask him if he is going to stop soon because it’s getting a bit late and people need to get to sleep.

Because it is generally expected that each people will attempt to respect the face wants of others, there are many different ways of performing face saving acts.

Brown and Levinson (1978) present a cohesive and comprehensive theory of politeness in which the concept of ‘face’ is central. Several researchers have investigated the concept of “face” all of them borrow their use of them from Goffman (1967) who may have derived it from Chinese usage. Goffman defines ‘face’ as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact”. (cf Goffman’s 1965:5). Based on his observational research, Goffman claims that there are three features of a person’s face. A person desires as consistent as having worth and as worthy of respect. He claims that there are two basic rule of social interaction: be considerate and be respectful, both of which exist for the maintenance of face. Following Goffman’s views of face and face-work and his interactional perspective. Brown and Levinson (1987) offer a descriptive analysis of the strategies used by interactants to maintain their respective faces in social interaction.

The concept of ‘face” is explicable in Brown and Levinson (1987:61) thus:

“… each participant is normal human society has two types of face need – ‘positive face need’ and a ‘negative face need”. The positive face need is the positive consistent self-image or “personality”
(crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants’ and the negative face need is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e freedom of action and freedom from imposition.

In agreement with the above, Holmes 1995;154 says

‘… positive politeness’ attends to a person’s positive face needs and includes such speech acts as compliment, invitations greeting and press goodwill and solidarity, while ‘Negative politeness’ on the other hand attends to a person’s negative face needs and include indirectness and apologies. It expresses respect and consideration”.

(J) MAND: It is the cover term coined by Skinner and popularized by Lyons (1977) for utterances such as commands and requests, questions often analyzed by linguists as a sub-type of Mands Brown and Levinson (1987) refer to them as “face threatening acts”.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 Literature Review

Introduction

When we speak, we must constantly make choices of many different kinds: what we want to say, how we want to say it, and the specific sentence types, words and sounds that best untie the ‘what’ with the ‘how’. How we say something is at least as important as what we say, in fact the content and the form are quite insapable, being but two facets of the same object.

This study of politeness strategies have not been embarked upon by various scholars at various times, mention must be made of somebody like Grice who propounded the theory of conversational logic (cf. Grice 1975) it was this theory that led to the formulation of the co-operatation principle which uses four maxims to explain speech acts. Mention must also be made of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson who came up with the theory of politeness Universals and the face. Threatening acts.

In this chapter however, we look critically into some of these works and also into some other works that contributed immensely to the study of politeness.

2.1 Theorical Studies

Brown and Leveinson’s Politeness Theory

In recent years the best-known approach to the study of politeness is found in Brown and Levinson’s work, which was first published in 1978 and then reissued in 1987 with the addition of a fifty-page preface summarizing the research of the previous theory has been considered the most influential and comprehensive work on pragmatic politeness.

In 1963, Goffman published the article “on face Work”. He discussed face in the reference to have people present themselves in social situations
and that our entire reality is constructed through our social interactions. In any society, whenever the physical possibility of spoken interaction arises, it seems that a system of practices, conventions and procedural rules come into play which functions as a means of guiding and organizing the flow of messages. An understanding will prevail as to when and where it will be permissible to initiate talk among whom, and by means of what topics of conversation.

**This leads Goffman to posit:** face is a mask that changes depending on the audience and the social interaction (Goffman, 1967) Face is maintained by the audience not by the speaker. We strive to maintain the face we have created in social situations. Face is broken down by Goffman into different categories: Positive face is the desire of being seen as a good human being and negative face is the desire to remain autonomous. Goffman argues that there is a limited amount of strategies to maintain face. A threat to a person’s face has been formed a face threatening act (FTA). Brown and Levinson argue that an FTA often requires a mitigating statement or sort of politeness, or the line of communication will break. With this understanding of face, a definition of politeness can be understood in relation to face.

The most important tenet of Brown and Levinson’s original text on politeness theory is that we change our language based on the hearer and thus our strategies for compliance gaining change depending on the audience. In everyday life, we design messages that protect face and achieve other goals as well.

Politeness is the expression of the speaker’s intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts towards another.

Politeness consists of attempting to save face for another. Brown and Levinson begin with the idea of “Model Person”, rational agents who think strategically and are conscious of their language choices. This influenced Brown and Levinson whom examining Goffman’s version office, where they
agreed that rational agents have both positive and negative face. Simply put they believe that model persons want to maintain others face, but nevertheless are often forced strategies are developed in order to formulate messages in order to save the hearer’s face when face threatening acts are inevitable or desired. This means that the speaker avoids embarrassing the listener or making him feels uncomfortable.

Face needs are thought of as the desire to appreciate and protect. Face is further broken into two different categories. Positive and negative face. Positive face is the desire to be liked and appreciated. Positive politeness is designed to meet the face needs by performing an action like complimenting as well as showing concern for another person. Negative is the desire to be autonomous and not to infringe on the other. Negative politeness is designed to protect the other person when negative face needs are threatened.

Thus, there are different strategies to handle face threatening acts and these strategies are put into a hierarchy of effectiveness.

**Politeness Strategies**

Brown and Levinson outline four main types of politeness strategies: bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness and off-record or indirect strategy.

1. Bald on record Strategies do not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer’s face. This strategy is most often utilized by speakers who closely know there is a direct possibility that the audience will be shocked or embarrassed by the strategy. For example a bald on record strategy might be to tell your sister to do “do the dishes. It is your turn”.

2. Positive politeness and this strategy attempts to minimize the threat to the hearer’s positive face. This strategy is most commonly used in situations where the audience know each other fairly well. Quite often hedging and attempting to avoid conflict are used. For example a
positive strategy might be the request. “I would be grateful if you do the dishes for me”.

3. Negative politeness which presumes that the speaker will be imposing on the listener. The potential for awkwardness or embarrassment is greater than in bald on record strategies and positive politeness strategies. Negative face is the desire to remain autonomous. Thus, a request with consideration of the listener’s negative face might be uncomfortable: “I need $ 5” is awkward if five dollars is outside the listener’s financial capabilities. But if the speaker knowing that the listener wants to maintain their autonomy, adds an out for the listener like “I know you have been kind of strapped for cash, but could I borrow $ 5?”, the listener is more likely to give them that money because he showed a respect for ability to maintain autonomy.

4. Indirect Strategy: This strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential to be imposing. For example, a speaker using the indirect strategy might merely say “Wow its getting cold in here insinuating that it would be nice if the listener would get up and turn off the thermostat with directly asking the listener to do so.

From the above, we can deduce that it is normal for the interactants in a communicative act to respect the face needs of others. Failure to do so is seen as an intrusion into another’s personal space or “territory” and as a face “threatening act” (FTA). FTAs include threats, insults, criticism and orders. The negative effect of FTA may be reduced or totally eliminated by a variety of types of corrective “face work”. Such “face redressive” indirectness such as modal verbs, particles or hedges as in (Wouldn’t you like to close the window) and FTA may also be mitigated by apology as in (I’m sorry to bother you, but would you please close the window?). and FTA may also be the face threatening acts proposed by Brown and Levinson and just as John Laver(1975) rightly puts it on important aspect of the speaker is the hearer’s
need for his social identity to be acceptable. A speaker can obey the social maxim "Be polite" and attend to this aspect of the hearer’s face, by using linguistic routines that acknowledges his identity either explicitly or tautly. The choices of linguistic routine has to be consistent with the relative social status of the hearer and with situational fasteners such as the degree of formality imposed by the occasion of conversation or by the special nature of the setting in which the conversation is taking place. We can therefore get a broader perspective of the conversation if we look at it from the angle of positive and negative faces proposed by Brown and Levinson (1976). According to them positive face is the want of every competent adult member "that his perennial desire, that his want (or the actions / acquisitions/ values resulting from them) should be thought as desirable' while negative face is described as the want of every member that his wants to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. Where Positive politeness is free-ranging, negative politeness is specific and focused, it performs the function of minimizing the particular imposition that the face threatening action unavoidably efforts.

‘Face’ as it is, is a central concept of politeness theory. According to Brown and Levinson (1980), politeness use is actually motivated by a speaker’s desire to save face, either his own or the hearers’. During real speech situations, one can choose to preserve the positive or negative aspect of the face:

All Nations English Dictionary holds that polite behavior has the following component: being courteous, having good manners, being considerate of others, using correct social behavior and speech acts towards other people. Roughly put, politeness is appropriateness of behavior and speech acts towards other people. Politeness is one of the most important aspects of human communication. Human beings can only exist in peace together, if certain basic conventions of politeness are observed. Social
cohesion depends upon awareness and consideration of the “face needs” of others. According to Wikipedia, politeness consists of attempting to save face for another. Brown and Levinson begin with the idea of ‘model person’, rational agents who think strategically and are conscious of their language choices. This influence Brown and Levinson when examining Goffman’s version of ‘face’ where they agreed that rational agents have both positive and negative face. Simply put they believe that model persons want to maintain others’ face, but nevertheless are often forced to commit face threatening acts. Thus politeness strategies are developed in order to formulate messages in order to save the hearer’s face when face threatening acts are inevitable or desired. Politeness is socially prescribed Wardhaugh (1986:26). According to him, this does not mean of course, that we must always be polite for we could not be so if there were no rules of politeness to be broken.

Impoliteness depends on the existence of standards, or norms of politeness.

Coulman’s as quoted in Dioka (2009 ) said that being polite is not an attribute of language but that it depends on the interlocutors in a given speech situation. Politeness is socially determined. It is linked with social differentiation with making appropriate choices which may not be the same to everybody. According to Brown (1980) politeness can be defined to be the act of saying or doing things in such a way as to take into account the other person’s feelings. Lakoff (1957), defines politeness as saying or doing the socially correct thing. Adebija (1976) also says that politeness is associated with situations in which one speaks or behaves in a way that is socially and culturally acceptable and pleasant to the hearer. However politeness in the practical sense of the word means doing or saying the right things with or among people. Politeness is a virtue that is cultivated in every human being from infancy since every society has its own respect system. Yule (1995) said that there are several ways to think of politeness. These might involve ideas
like being tactful, generous, modest and sympathetic towards others. He said that politeness in an interaction can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person’s face. In this sense, politeness can be accompanied in situations of social distance or closeness. Showing awareness for another person’s face when that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect or deference. 

Apologies are viewed as one type of remedial work, action taken to change what might be seen as an offence act into an acceptable one. During the course of our everyday affairs we may offend another. An offence of this sort often arises because we fail to fulfill a personal expectation held by the offended individual. For example when the offended people anticipate a call on his birthday or anticipate being acknowledged as having contributed to the idea underlying a scholarly paper. In such cases, once the offender recognizes that some infraction is perceived by another, he may attempt to put things right, thereby relieving himself of some if not all of the associated more responsibility.

To do this, the offender must undertake what Goffman (1971) has called “remedial work”. Work whose function is:

…… To change the meaning that otherwise might be given to an act, transferring what could be seen as acceptable. This change seems to be accomplished. In our western society at least by striking in some way at the moral responsibility otherwise imputed to the offender page (109). Goffman suggests that such remediation is accompanied by three main devices: accounts, requests and apologies. Speech acts that have to do with politeness are universal in nature. They are universal only in terms of the fact that they occur in practically every a language but there in no consensus regarding specific speech act categories or number. This fact is echoed by Ross & Wilt (2003: 143) when they note “languages not only do not coincide
in speech acts, their speakers perform, but they differ in the formulas they use for similar acts”.

This is further strengthened by Wierzbicke (1991) when he points out that while it is possible to say ‘can you pass me the salt? In both English and Polish, it would be understood as a request only in English. He maintains that Poles do not use questions to make requests and when English speakers do, they sound Wimpish to Poles. Nigerian Journal of Contemporary Language and Communication Studies (2005:Vol.3) holds that politeness is one of the most important aspect of human communication. Human beings can only exist in peace together if certain basic conventions of politeness are observed. Similarly Udosen (2006) says that language is a necessary prerequisite of every human group or society. It importance is found in its relations to culture in its role in the concretization of human relationships and in its functioning in the transmission of information as well as norms and rules that guide the society. Language is a social instrument without which our human interactions will suffer. The most universal is free to say what ones like in whatever form of discourse. Rather, our conversation is a prescribed ritual in which an individual generally says what his fellow men expect him to say observing the pragmatic rules though unconsciously.

According to Lyons (1975), Politeness is socially determined and this means that it is linked to social deferations with making appropriate choices which are not the same for all interlocutors and situations. The ways speakers (interactants) carry out speech acts as commands, requests, elicitations and offers express and reflect the nature of the relationship between them. For example, the difference in relationship between a lawyer and his client can be evident the pitch and tone of voice, the difference in the use of lexical terms and the appropriate placement of syntax. It also involves verbal and non-verbal expression.
Lakoff (1975) says that being polite is not an attribute of a language however it depends on speakers of a specific speech situation. This simply mean that although politeness is universal, however it is not really given a definite place in different or various language as the mode of politeness depends on the interlocutors or interactants. In our every conversation, we are socially expected to show some level of politeness at all times. Consider a situation where we are a group of friends, It can be considered as polite or taken for granted if we say things like ‘get me that plate’ or ‘shut up’ but when we are surrounded by a group of adults may be at a formal function in which our parents or elders are in attendance, it will be seen as polite when we say such things as ‘Could you please pass me that plate, if you don’t mind? ” I am sorry, I don’t mean to interrupt but I am not able to hear the speaker in the front of the room.” It is expected that in different social situations we will be obliged to adjust our use of words to fit the occasion (Fraser 1980).it will also seem socially unacceptable if the phrases above were altered.

Brown and Levinson (1978: 145) base their theory on two assumptions that explains why human beings often restrain themselves from a highly rational maximally efficient communication mode.

(a) Speakers are able to exploit language as a means to reach their goals.
(b) Each human has a ‘face’ consisting of a set of goals that he wants other people to respect.

People generally are typically caught between the wants to achieve their own goals and the desires to avoid infringing their partner’s face wants. Particularly in the case of conventional indirect speech acts, the relevant redress is focused on the imposition itself e.g. Compare, could you give me pen’ with Give me a pen: This leads us to explain what positive politeness strategies are all about and according to Brown and Levinson (1980) it is when a speaker endorses or supports the positive self image of an interactant that he is said to be attending to the positive face of the
interactant. This therefore means that positive politeness strategies consist of an action, phrases or an utterance that indicate that attention is being paid to the positive face wants of an interlocutors and this is most times achieved through a show of friendliness. The positive politeness strategies are used to satisfy the speaker’s needs for approval and belonging. In positive politeness, he or she is treated as a member of an in-group, a friend, a person whose personality traits are known and liked. According to them, there are however certain ways of achieving positive politeness and they can be said to be as follows:

(a) Showing and seeking agreement and this generally involves repeating all or part of what was just said and using positive back channel cues such as –‘its’ true, ‘yes’ of course’ which are seen as markers of agreement.

(b) Expressing an interest in and noticing the hearer, like when a lecturer enters a classroom and says ‘Good morning students’ and the students respond with ‘Good morning sir.’

(c) Using in group languages such as address terms and slangs.

(d) The use of elipses which is saying a part of your speech without completing it so as to seek approval from your listener, this is generally in concordance with the inductive ‘We’ example is if someone is inviting you to a party, he/she uses ‘We’ just to be polite the fellow can say, can we go to the party?” The use of paralinguistic features such as tone of voice, body gestures, appropriate placement of syntax etc are also ways of achieving positive politeness strategies. This now leads us to the negative politeness strategies. Brown and Levinson in Dioka (2009) see negative politeness strategies as when a speaker interferes or impedes with his actions and values during speech acts and in so doing preserves the negative face of an interactant. Negative politeness strategies indicate actions, phrases or utterances that
show that attention is being paid to the negative face wants of an interlocutor. The negative politeness strategies are generally geared towards preventing infringements upon the hearer’s freedom of action. They are also central to deferential behaviour when addressing people of higher rank and this is a characteristic of social distancing behaviour in general Dioka (2009)

Just as there are certain ways of achieving the positive politeness strategies, there are also certain ways of achieving the negative politeness strategies According to Brown and Levinson (1980:143), there are other five ways of doing this and they are:

(a) Through indirectness- Here the speaker does not make all his beliefs or desires explicit. This type of speech strategy characterizes the speech of superiors, for example-‘We were wondering if you wanted to go with us’ or you could come with us.’

(b) Through hedging- This basically is a strategy used by the speaker to protect the hearer’s face and it has a variety surface manifestations like-‘I wonder if …..,’sort of ……, Something like that……’

(c) Most times during speech, we observe that directives were often accompanied by other features marking politeness, so these co-current features which are known as precequences to directives. It is also another way of achieving negative politeness and examples are – ‘Excuse me,I tell you; please don’t come home.’

(d) Impersonalizing- This involves the use of passives and the inclusive “We” for the avoidance of the exclusive ‘I’ and You and it functions to place greater distances between the speaker and the hearer, example- No student is allowed into that room; Out of bounds ‘ etc.

(e) Also the use of deferential address terms which involves the use of such terms as titles , first names, or last names, example-Dear sir, chief of police etc.
Accordding to Trauth and Kazzazi (1978), acts which involve the speaker in breaking away from either of these face threatening tendencies are known as face threatening acts. This shows that if the speaker does not pay close attention to these principles, he will mitigate ‘face’. According to Brown and Levinson (1980) politeness strategies are developed in order to save face of the hearer. “Face” refers to the respect that individual has for him or herself and mitigating that self-esteem in public or in private situations. Usually we try to avoid embarrassing the other person or making them feel uncomfortable. The face threatening acts therefore are those acts that infringe on the hearer’s need to maintain his/his self-esteem, and be respected. This is the main purpose of politeness strategies –to deal with these face threatening acts.

According to Brown and Levinson (1980) there are actually four politeness strategies of which consist:

(a) The Bald-On-Record Strategy

(b) The Off-Record Indirect Strategies

(c) The Positive Politeness Strategies

(d) The negative Politeness Strategies Of all these however, the most important and most used are the last two i.e positive and negative strategies. There are of course very many occasions in conversation where the need for maximum efficiency of communication overrides the need to be polite. Emergency situations demand urgent action and imperative verb forms are characteristics in examples like ‘Help!’, Don’t burn Yourself!’, Look out!, Brown and Levinson (1978) suggest that urgency of this sort may be metaphorically exploited in formulaic entreaties such as ‘Excuse me,’ forgive me’ pardon,’ and accept my thanks’. It should be clear from the discussion above that the process of conversation displays continual tension between two general communicative needs. The need to communicate efficiently and the
need to be polite. However, in our own opinion, to be polite is very important since it gives you an edge and makes you more acceptable to your listeners.

### 2.2 Empirical Study

Having looked at the theoretical approach to politeness by several renowned scholars, it is now time to look at it’s practical application in some language of the world.

Generally, when we think of politeness in Western cultures it is negative politeness behaviour that is more evident. In the Western cultures, negative politeness is the most elaborate and the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies of Face Threatening acts redress. It is the stuff that fills the etiquettes books, its linguistic realizations – Conventional indirectness, hedges on illocutionary forces, polite pessimism (about the success of requests, etc), the emphasis on H’s relating power are very familiar, (Brown and Levinson 1978). One example that Brown and levinson gave of a conventionally pessimistic request of this sort is:

There wouldn’t I suppose be a chance of your being able to lend me your car for just a few minutes would there?’. However, it is not only in the Western cultures that negative politeness is seen. A study carried out. Ahangar and Akbari as quoted in Dioka (2009), confirms that Persian native speakers like English native speakers use negative politeness strategies more than other strategies. They claim that speakers in all cultures use negative politeness strategies more than other strategies. They claim that speakers in all cultures use negative politeness strategies in the realization of requisite speech act. They also discovered from their study that the power of the hearer affects the speaker’s choice of politeness strategy and the gender of the speaker does not affect his/her choice of politeness strategies in the realization of requestive speech act. They also discovered from their study that the power
of the hearer affects the speaker’s choice of politeness strategy and the gender of the speaker does not affect his/her choice of politeness strategies in the realization of requestive speech act. Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness has been criticized as not being universally valid by linguists working with East-Asian languages including Japanese. Two Japanese linguists, Matsumoto (1988) and Ide (1989) claim that Brown and Levinson assume the speaker’s Volitional use of language which allows the speaker’s creative use of face-maintaining strategies towards the addresses. In East-Asian cultures, like Japan politeness is achieved not so much on the basis of volition as on discernment (Wakimae, finding one’s place), or prescribed social norms.

Wakimae is oriented towards the need for acknowledgement of the positions or roles of all the participants as well as adherence to formality norms appropriate to the particular situation.

According to Mutsumoto (1988), Japanese is perhaps the most widely known example of a language that encodes politeness at it’s very core. It has two main levels of politeness, one for intimate acquaintances, family and friends, and one for other groups, and its verb morphology reflects those levels. Japanese also employ different personal pronouns for each person according to gender, age, rank, degree of acquaintance and other cultural forms.

Also, in the Hungarian language there is a degree of similarity with it and the Japanese notion in purpose.

In the Hungarian language, there exist a four tiered system for expressing levels of politeness. (Gomez Bravo, 2001)
a. towards the person addressed, but it is also the common way of speaking in official texts and business communications. Here, ‘you’ the second person is grammatically addressed in the third person.
b. Maga (Magazas, Magazodas): Use of this form serves to show that the speaker wishes to distance him/herself from the person he/she addresses. Also a boss could also address a subordinate as ‘Maga’

c. Neni / bacsi (tetszikezes): Children are supposed to address adults they are not close friends using “tetszik’ (you like) as some kind of an auxiliary verb with all other verbs ‘Hogy Vagy?’ (How are you?) here becomes “Hogy tetszik leni” (How do you like to be?). The elderly are generally addressed this way even by adults.

d. Te (tegezes, tegezodes or pertu): Use generally, i.e. with persons with whom one of the above forms of politeness is required.

Another language discussed by (Gomez, 2001) is Urdu. According to him, Urdu is seen as a subtle and polished language and a host of words are used in it to show respect and politeness. This emphasis on politeness which is reflected in the vocabulary is known as ‘adab’ and to some extent seen as “takalluf”. These words are generally used when addressing elders or people with whom one is not acquainted. For example the English pronoun ‘you’ can be into three words in Urdu. The singular form ‘tu’ (informal, extremely intimate or derogatory), ‘tum’ (informal and showing intimacy called apna ‘pan’ in Urdu) and the plural form ‘ap’ (formal and respectful). Also verbs for example, ‘come’ can be translated with degrees of formality in three ways ‘aiye’ (formal and respectful) ‘ao’ (informal and intimate with less degree) ‘a’ (extremely informal, intimate and potentially derogatory).

A close monitoring of colloquial or informal Cameroon English speech reveals the use of a number of pragmatic particles for expressing a broad range of attitudinal functions among which politeness is one (Mbagwana, 2004)

. The most conspicuous of these particles are na, ya and eihn generally said with a rising tone / intonation. Cameroon English speakers make use of a number of pragmatic particles in very informal or colloquial speech to express
a wide range of attitudinal functions such as persuasion, impatience, politeness, etc. These particles which include na, eihn and ya are the most commonly used. Among them, two, namely, na and eihn have been mentioned in passing in the literature on Cameroon English as typical features of this non-native variety of English and are generally characterized as tag questions, for example when a speaker says, ‘you will come na’ with a rising intonation, he / he is asking for the interlocators assent.

Bobda (2002) notes that ‘na’ is a particle used in Cameroon English with a wide range of meaning such as in the following examples-

a. You are my friend na? (You are my friend, aren't you?)

b. Oh, shut up na (Oh, shut up, will you?)

c. Mum, buy me this dress na (Mum, buy me this dress please)

It is worth noting that is particle ‘na’ underlined by Bobda (2002) is chiefly examined with reference to its politeness functions, that is its function of narrowing the social gap between the speaker(s) and the hearer(s). Politeness in the Cameroon English is generally seen as a strategy intended to reduce the social gap, between the participants in the conversation and to create a sense of intimacy among them. It is also important to note that the politeness function of the three particles na, ya and eihn in Cameroon English can best be captured by examining their occurrences in narratives in the same way as the particle ‘eh’ has been documented in the New Zealand English as being commonly used mostly in narratives (Meyerhoff 1994). The use of these particles in pieces of narration by Cameroon English speakers does not require any assent or feed-back from the listeners but appears as a strategy used by speakers to narrow the social gap between them and their interlocutors. There have also been accounts in many varieties of English, both native and non-native of some pragmatic particles which also act as international markers and serve mainly as politeness devices. Among these particles are Iah, Lor and ‘you know; in Singapore English (Wee. 2003), ‘eh’ in
Canadian English (Avis, 1972) ‘eh’ in New Zealand English (Wee, 2003), ‘eh’ in Canadian English (Avis, 1972), eh in New Zealand English (Meyerhoff, 1994) and so on.

Much of the work on politeness assumes that the listeners and the speakers are all homogenous. However, gender needs play more prominently in the field of politeness. Although it is well-established that women and men communicate differently, politeness theory has ignored the fact that based on gender, women and men will also perform politeness differently. Along the same lines, politeness is also stereotypically linked with class.

Brown and Levinson’s text is most certainly the foremost scholarly work on politeness. However, since it was published there have been numerous attacks on the completeness of the work. This stems even from the connotations of politeness. Brown and Levinson presume that each culture performs and judges politeness in the exact way that those in America perform politeness and can be judged by the same criterion. For example, Greek notions of politeness stress Warmth and notions intimacy, whereas the American use of politeness quite often means consideration for the individual and many Russians believe that politeness can be summed up with not using course or Vulgar language (Sifanou, 1972) Thus it is dangerous and also ethnocentric to presume that politeness is enacted similarly in all cultures.

The implications of all these is that politeness strategies are universal and that speakers of each language make use of similar strategies to express a wide range of attitudinal functions, among which politeness is one of them (Mbangwana, 2004).
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 Research Methodology

This chapter as the name implies, provides an insight into the method applied in the collection and analysis of data for this study. The significance of this chapter cannot be overstated given the fact that the validity and reliability of the findings of any study depends to a large extent on the methodology employed.

3.1 Area of Study

Erq Ulq is a town located in the heart of eastern part of Enugu state. It has estimated size of about 6,000 sqkm (although the size is subject to scrutiny and amendment) and its population is estimated 800,000 (Eight hundred thousand) people.

Our study of this area however will be centered on their politeness expression strategies and its sociolinguistic implication in this indigenous society. The reason for choosing this area for the study is because of its ease in accessibility and would not be faced with a lot of methodological problems and limitations like problems of understanding the dialect, time constraint, little funding, transportation etc. these limitations could impede the efficiency of the research work and the Erq Ulq community was chosen because of its familiarity with the researcher.

3.2 Research Design

The research design chosen for this study is the survey method. This survey method will be useful in assessing the elders and young ones reactions to the use of politeness expression in Erq Ulq speech community. The method, based on the issues involved can be used to determine the incidence distribution and interrelationship among variables as well as focusing on vital facts, opinions, attitudes, behaviours and disposition of
sample that will be systematically drawn. The method will employ a set of questions on aspects of the subject to which selected members of the population are expected to react.

Babbie (1975:259) agrees with the above position thus: Surveys are also excellent vehicles for the measurement of attitudes and orientation prevalent within a large population. Public opinion polls are a well-known example of this use. Probability sampling and standardized questionnaires provides the means of discovering the prevailing attitude among large population.

The above, basically constitute the fieldwork. The library, the internet also provide a source for some of the pieces of information for this work. The research made extensive use of libraries. Two of these libraries were the University of Nigeria, Nsukka and the University of Nigeria Department of Linguistics libraries.

3.3 Population of Study

The population to be used in this study include the young and old native speakers of the dialect under investigation, since in a community of this size to be able to get the beauty of the intricacy of the language, you would have to reach-out to old and young alike because most of the renderings in this dialect have undergone changes not only because of the effect of time but also because of the eccentric and exuberent nature of the youths and also for the fact that the youths want to be seen in the big picture. This has promoted changes in some words of the dialect and even the language in general.

3.4 Sampling Procedure

The largeness of the population makes it impossible to study it. Hence a sampling procedure that will ensure a representative sample to work with. Three respondents comprising of males and females were selected through random sampling from the speech community under investigation.
3.5 Research Instruments

Basically, the research instruments for collection of data for this study are observation, and structured interview. The structured interview involves questions relating to different politeness expressions used for various actions and activities which have to do with different aspects of lives.

3.6 Methodological Problems

Sociolinguistic research, notes Wardhaugh (1986:146)” …has two basic dimensions: devising some kind of plan for collecting relevant data, and then collecting those data from a representative sample of speakers. Neither task is an easy one…..’’. Dittmar, in apparent confirmation of Wardhaugh fears ,’’observes that”……a fundamental problem is to ascertain what information on what type of speech behaviour should be obtained from what speakers and in what way…’’. Agbedo(2001:61) recognized the same problem when he notes that “… the elementary steps of locating and contacting informants and getting them to talk freely in a recorded interview are formidable problems for students……”. The problem of reliable observation of linguistic facts is compounded by four difficulties which consequently handicap systematic investigation of everyday language use. These difficulties, according to Labov (1970a) in Agbedo(2001:61) include the ungrammaticality of actual speech, Variations in speech behaviour and in the speech community, difficulties in hearing and recording and the rarity of certain syntactic forms. These difficulties as Labour observes are however not all equally serious and can therefore be deciding on methods of obtaining valid speech data. vvvThis task ,’’as Dittmar (P.102) notes”…… imposes various demands on the inquirer: the suitable selection of speakers , establishing an appropriate rapport with them, arranging the techniques necessary for eliciting and recording data, and defining social and linguistic parameters….’’. Labor formulated five
methodological principles which he refers to as methods logical axioms. These axioms as Dittmar puts it”..... lead to a methodological paradox the solution of which is central for empirical enquiry.” They include the following: style, shifting, attention, Vernacular, formality and good data (for example, Agbedo 2001:61)

Analyzing speech behaviour on the basis of those five methodological axioms would not present any great difficulty if it were not for what labour has aptly named the ‘Observer's paradox’. As labour 1972:20910) notes,” the aim of sociolinguistic research is to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed , but the data are only available through systematic”. This implies that the successful collection of empirical data depends mainly on how the paradox can best solved. Nonetheless, Labour proposed a number of techniques aimed at solving this methodological problem. As earlier observed, by labour and associates is that the best data base for a sociolinguistic analysis is the vernacular. According to Miroy as quoted in Agbedo 2001:62) the reasons that informed this preference is compelling:

Its (the vernaculars) highly regular character is an empirical observation. The vernacular inherent variation but appear to be more formal superimposed’ styles that are acquired later in life. Each speaker has a vernacular form at least one language......in some cases, systematic data can be obtained from more formal styles, but we do not known this until they have been calibrated against the vernacular.

Labov (1978:5) quoted in Miroy (1980:23)

While there are good linguistic reasons for taking the vernacular as the best data base in variation studies, such an approach is fraught with a number of problems. This perception of the interview as a speech event subject to a set clear sociolinguistic rules tends to heighten the formality of the situation and consequently exacerbates the problem of the observer’s paradox. The implication is that the most regular structures which are expected in speaker's
least overtly careful style-his vernacular tends to disappear. One other
dimension to the interview situation is the informants are usually isolated
individuals participating in a series of exchanges with the interviewer who may
be a stranger. The consequence of the informants isolation as Miroy observes
is at pre-existing norms of behaviour including linguistic behaviour, do not
necessarily apply. This may not have been the case if the informants were to
be in the presence of members of their own pre-existing social networks.
However, researchers tackled these problems in different ways.

The other methodological problem is the axiom that the data base
should be a wider community and not just a circle of friends. If the axiom is
accepted, then the investigator, according to Miroy must encounter the
problem of obtaining representative data. This issue has been tackled by use
of sampling techniques, yet random sampling tends to worsen the central
problem of the observer’s paradox. This is not surprising insofar as the
population to be studied is usually sampled for isolated individuals or house
holds, who then recorded out of context of the social networks within which
they customarily interact. The implication of it all is that the data obtained are
often very sharply limited in their capacity to present a wide range of speech
styles. Because of the obvious limitations of such methods, labor enlisted the
services of both the insiders and the outsiders as field workers.

Finally, one methodological problem the investigator has to grapple with
is the issue of interpreting the results and verifying its validity and reliability.
Variation studies employing the analytic tool of linguistic variable are
essentially correlational in nature, i.e they attempt to show what happens to a
language when considered in relation to a number of social factors such as
age, region, education, contact, social class, gender, age etc. Such studies as
Wordhaugh (1986:150) observes “… are statistical in nature and statistical
treatments must follow certain basic principles…”. The implication of this
requirement is that scholars of variation studies must be prepared to employ
proper statistical procedures, not only in their sampling but also in the treatment of data collected and testing hypothesis formulated. This requirement is a necessary prerequisite for any serious variation study of which results are expected to be of major linguistic significance. However, most sociolinguistics apparently handicapped by their limited knowledge of basic statistical methods tend to, as Wardhough puts it, “Pick and choose among statistical procedures rather than employing statistical procedure comprehensively and coherently in their work”. In this way, they refrain from being rigorous in their statistical treatments but even this hardly discourages them from drawing very strong conclusions which seem obvious and interesting to them. Moreover, whether those conclusions are significant in the sense of having met a good statistical test of a well-tested hypothesis or not, is scarcely of any relevance to such researchers.

However, in spite of the seemingly intractable nature of the methodological problem of interpreting and verifying results statistically in variation studies, we shall endeavour within the limits of our knowledge of basic principles of statistical methods to follow the standard procedures in sociolinguistics.

It is in the light of the methodological problems that sociolinguistics studying texts quantitatively have, according Hudson as quoted in Agbedo (2001) “… paid a good deal of attention to methodology”. Sociolinguistic studies cast in this mould are normally carried out in a number of stage as methodology, as Hudson observes is both important and problematic at all stages. These stages are outlined by Hudson are as follows:

1. Selecting the speakers, circumstances and linguistic variations.
2. Collecting the text
3. Identifying linguistic variables and their variants in the text. (4) processing the figures.
4. Interpreting the results.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of data collected on the study. The first analysis is on the description of the concept of politeness in languages use. The second aspect of the analysis has to do with the explanation of politeness Expression strategies in Erq Xlq speech community. The third aspect of the analysis has to do with expressing politeness in the Erq Xlq speech community. The final aspect of the analysis has to do with the sociolinguistic implications of adopting politeness strategies during speeches in the speech community.

4.1 Concept of Politeness in Language Use

Politeness in Erq Xlq is predominantly expressed in their greeting system. This may be verbal, non-verbal vocal but non-verbal or non-verbal and non-vocal greetings. The forms of greeting and salutation and their social as well as communicative functions are the preoccupation of this section which also aims at examining and describing the communicative functions of politeness in Erq Xlq speech community. It considers the various sociolinguistic manifestations of politeness in Erq Xlq and some explanations to their syntactic occurrences.

Language is a necessary prerequisite of every human group or society. Its importance is found in its relation to culture, in its role in the concretization of human relationships and in its functioning in the transmission of information as well as norms and rules that guide this society. Language is a social instrument without which our human interactions would suffer. The most universal forms of language behaviour are those used to show our routine needs, professional and social. No one is free to say just what one likes in
whatever form of discourse. Rather, our conversation is a prescribed ritual in which an individual generally says what his fellow men expects him to say, observing the pragmatic rules, though unconsciously. In our societies today, living in harmony with nature conforming to the norms of our common experience is the right conduct of interlocutors and politeness is that of social behaviour, which promotes harmonious living with nature and conformity to the norms of our common experience.

4.2 Politeness Expression Strategies in Ekp Xlq Speech Community

In the preceding chapters, we saw that politeness expression strategies are generally geared towards saving ‘face’ or mitigating ‘face’ threats carried by certain face threatening Acts (FTA’s) towards another. On its own ‘face’ refers to the desire of been seen as, a good human being and also the desire to remain autonomous (Goffman 1967). Our analysis of data will be in line with Brown and Levinson (1980), Politeness expression strategies which according to them are distinct kinds. They are:

A BALD – ON – RECORD STRATEGY – This strategy does not attempt to minimize the threat to face as it is most often utilized by speakers who closely know their audience. With this strategy, there is a direct possibility that the hearer or audience will be shocked or embarrassed by the strategy, for example somebody might say: (a) Jee sama afere ṣe, Q be ge kweshiṣa [sanọ (b) Imecherị ihe i na-eme, I jee eme ihe qzq qshwa qshwa.

Gloss – When you finish that thing you are doing, you will still go and do the other one right now.

C. Biko I ji ọshi nwa be f★aa!

Gloss: Please will you get out here!

B Positive Politeness Strategy: This strategy attempts to minimize the threat to the hearer’s positive face.
It is most commonly used in situations where the audience knows one another fairly well. Quite often, hedging and attempts to avoid conflicts are used. For example a positive politeness strategy might be the request - (a) Ḍ ji ad★ kwa m oy [ mẹẹ I nyenọ m ẹka saama afere nà h★.
Gloss – I would love it if you could help me wash the plate
(B) I jinọ enyenọ ọmọ kwa memenọ e, Ḍ kwa nya?
Gloss – You would help me do it, won’t you?
See appendix on pages…

4.3 Expressing Politeness in the **Erq Xlq** Speech Community

As we have learn earlier, politeness is universal and involves almost every language all around the world. This also goes for the **Erq Xlq** speech community where politeness strategies are seen in the language. Given that speakers of different language posses different means of expressing politeness, it is important to look at the particular politeness strategies speakers resort to in this language. According to Fraser (1960), the claim that speakers, in all cultures use negative politeness in the realization of requestive speech act could be disproved in this language as it makes use of both positive and negative politeness strategies in its speech acts. We are however really interested in the ways which these politeness strategies bring forward considerations of social relations and social interaction signaling that considerations of politeness are being taken into account in addressing others.

**Positive Politeness Strategies**

When a speaker addresses or supports the positive self image of an interactant, he or she is attending to the positive face of an interactant. This is often achieved through shows of friendliness that shows that attention is being
paid to positive face of an interlocutor. The positive politeness strategies are used to satisfy the speaker's needs for approval and belonging.

In positive politeness, he is treated as a member of an in-group, a friend, a person whose personality traits are known and liked.

**Ways of Achieving Positive Politeness in Erq Ulq Speech Community**

There are some certain ways of achieving positive politeness which are equally evident in the dialect under study.

**A Showing and Seeking agreement:** This generally refers to or involves the repetition of all or part of what a preceding speakers has just said.

Examples: Igbo

1\textsuperscript{st} Speaker Any [ ji-ejeryiri h\=abee ntaa.
Gloss – We will go there today

2\textsuperscript{nd} Speaker Ke ejegadena
Gloss – Let’s go

See the appendix page 60

1\textsuperscript{st} Speaker K\=e any [ n\=ag\=ed\=e di n\=e nwunye
Gloss – Let’s us get married as husband and wife.

2\textsuperscript{nd} Speaker isi h\=e\=e anyi n\=ag\=ed\=e
Gloss – If you want us to . . . . . .

See the appendix page - - - -17

1\textsuperscript{st} Speaker Any [ ji-eshiryiryi oshikapa n\=e o\=n\=g\=e ha ntaa.
Gloss – We must cook rice in this house.

2\textsuperscript{nd} Speaker s [n\=e any [ shig\=ade, any [ shig\=ade
Gloss – If you ask us to cook, we will cook.

1\textsuperscript{st} Speaker B[a\=g\=ed\=e ke any [ je-k\=aga\=de \=era.
Gloss – Come let’s go to sleep.

2nd Speaker [sənə ke ʃə nyə] jegade, any[jegade.

Gloss – If you say we should go to sleep . . . .

See the appendix page 60

In this method of expressing politeness, the second speaker tries to protect the positive face of the first speaker by repeating at least part of the first speaker has said and this shows agreement which is actually what the first speaker seeks.

B Expressing an Interest in and Noticing The Hearer:

This mostly takes place in greeting and exchanging of pleasantries and in other general situations. Examples:

Igbo | Gloss
---|---
{me agaa? | How are you?
A de m qy | I am alright.
{ boo chi? | Are you up today?

Yes

How are your children?

they are alright.

See the appendix page 56,69,77

In this method, the speaker actually seeks the hearer’s response and if not gotten, the hearer might be considered rude thereby irritating or hurting the face of the speaker. This could actually be seen properly if the speaker tells the hearer – { bqq chi? – Have you woken and does not get a response.

C The Use Of In-Group Language: This method is mainly used in situations where a particular group or groups are gathered or for some individuals and it mainly comes in address terms, examples:
Igbo Gloss

Ndị Ọgbam kwen ọ Age group/salutations
Ọyị di nye her husband’s friend
obadinye her husband’s heart
Nke m My own/mine
as m My friend
Onye nke m My darling

See the appendix pages 71, 79

The in-group language is especially used by people or persons who are very familiar and are generally accepted into the scheme of things. The in-group brings intimacy and acceptance.

**D The Use Of Inclusive ‘WE’:** This is generally used when making speeches where we do not know whether listener will agree with us. Here, the speaker tries to make the listener agree with him by promoting him/her with the inclusive ‘We’. Examples:

Igbo Gloss

ança sịre nẹ any ? ji-arọ a? Did you say, we will do the work?
ança chọre kẹ any ? je? Did you want us to go?
Ọ dekwane kẹ any ? May be, we should start going.
ji-ejegadekwen ọ

Biane kẹ any [ nagadena] Come let’s go.

See the appendix page 60,61,65,66,67,70,73,74,75,76,78,80

In the use of the inclusive ‘We’ the speaker seeks to bring into consideration the hearer’s judgment and acceptance of his desires so as to avoid impeding the hearer’s face ‘Anyi’ in the above examples given represents the Igbo version of the inclusive ‘We’.
E Positive Back Channel Cues: These are mainly agreement markers and are used to show agreement. For examples:

Igbo          Gloss
Q  bɛ eziokwà  That’s true
Q  bɛ nyaa    That’s is it.
E kwàrà menà ekwà  I said it.
èhèèè        yes (in confirmation)
Ngwanae      Okay
kè q  dègède  let it be.
Q  dè qìpì  [  That is good.
[ nɛmɛmɛ nə    Have you heard it?

See the appendix page 59,62,68,72,75,78,80

These are mainly statements made to show agreement with what is being said or what has just been said. Other forms of positive politeness can be seen in conversation closings according to Buctton (1987) by moving to a conversation, one risks a chain of interpretations leading to a negative conclusion about the other. Moving to a conversation may be interpreted to mean that one does not wish for the conversation to continue, this in turn risks the implication that the company of the other is not bring enjoyed, which then could imply that the interlocutors is boring or annoying, however, there are ways to achieve or and conversations politely in the dialect under investigation and they are:

A Positive Comment: This is mostly frequently used in conversation ending strategy as it states or implies that the conversations was enjoyable, which removes the source of any such implication. For examples:

Igbo          Gloss
Anyi ji-ahɛ mgbe  qɔq  We will see some other time
imeneke maka okwà gə  Thank you for your advice
 Alright later

See the appendix page 62,64,66,70,71,73,75,77,80

This strategy basically is almost a direct negation of the possible implication that the other is boring or annoying and is therefore a device for saving the positive face of the other.

**B The Exuse:** This gets to the root of the face threatening chain of implications. It removes the implication that one wishes to end the conversation by pronouncing an alternative motivated, an alternative explanation for one’s potentially face threatening behaviour. Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kẹ m gbanagadẹ</td>
<td>Let me run home and go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>je chẹmane əmẹ</td>
<td>and wash clothes for my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m ẹkwa</td>
<td>children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kẹ m nachime mbe m</td>
<td>I better get back to my place of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-are qrẹ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyi ji-ahọ mgbe qzq</td>
<td>We will see some other time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kẹ q dẹgẹdenọ</td>
<td>later now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ meenạ</td>
<td>Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oge anyị nwerịa agwọma</td>
<td>Our time is up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the appendix on page 63,65,67,69,71,73,76,78,79

This strategy tries to bring about the end of conversations politely by looking for alternative motivation or explanation to avoid impeding the face of the other.

**Negative Politeness Strategies**
In these strategies, a speaker deliberately interferes or impedes with his own acts and values during speech acts and in so doing, preserves the negative face of an interactant. Negative politeness strategies indicate actions, phrases or utterances that show that attention is being paid to the negative face wants of an interlocutor and this is mainly achieved through a show of deference. The negative politeness strategies avoid offence by showing deference they are strategies geared towards preventing infringements upon the hearer’s freedom of action and they are also central to deferent behaviour when addressing people of higher rank and is a characteristics of social distancing behaviour in general. Brown and Levinson (1980) says that there are certain ways of achieving negative politeness just like in positive politeness and they are —

A. Expressing Uncertainty through hedging: This is mainly used in situations where the speaker does not know what the hearer has in mind and tries to promote him/her so as to find out. Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanagọ m ntaa tẹ mẹẹ - -</td>
<td>I don’t know if - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di kẹ tẹ</td>
<td>something like - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O nwerọ ike - - -</td>
<td>May be - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echerọ m si - - -</td>
<td>I wonder if - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any[ nwerọ ike</td>
<td>We may - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sh] okwọ bọ</td>
<td>The major thing is - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the appendix page 60,62,65,74,76,80

This particular strategy is characterized by non-completion of speech by speakers so as to know what the hearer feels about is being said. In this strategy, the speaker puts himself at risk of impediment.
B  **Indirectness:** In this case, the speaker does not make all his beliefs or desires explicit or known. This strategy mainly characterized speech being addressed to supervisors. More than that being addressed to equals or subordinates. Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biko ke m sora ana jegade</td>
<td>Please let me go with you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any[ sire ke any[ b[a jeta ga</td>
<td>We have come to find out from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ihe any[ ji-eme</td>
<td>you what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any[ ne-eche me i ke esora</td>
<td>We were wondering if you would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any[ ntaa.</td>
<td>Come today with us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ihe obene i sire any[ meeme</td>
<td>Whatever you tell us to do,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be any[ ji-eme</td>
<td>we will do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See appendix pages 70, 74

This strategy prevents the impeding of the faces of the hearer and shows politeness.

C  **Impersonalizing:** This strategy involves the use of passives and inclusive ‘We’ for the avoidance of exclusive ‘I’ and ‘you’. This strategy actually functions to place greater social distance between the speaker and the hearer. Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any[ ji-eje agbamê nkwa</td>
<td>We will go for Chinyere’s Chinyere traditional wedding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O nwega onye e kwerâ ke q</td>
<td>Nobody is allowed to cross here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gahera ne nwabee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i gware hee ke hee naa?</td>
<td>Did you tell them to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mmadê niine ne eme e</td>
<td>Everybody is doing it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using deferential address terms: This involves the use of deferential address terms such as titles, last name, first names etc. in the language of study (the Erq Xlq Dialect) there is a way of applying this strategy and it is done by affixing a prefix before the name of the listener especially if he or she is a superior, the prefixes are Nnam, Ogbo m, Ike m, Agaba m etc. for addressing young and old males and Nne m, Ike m, Ogbo m etc. for addressing young females for example:

- **Nna m**, **Ike m**, **nne m**, **ogbo m** etc. for addressing young males and females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nna m Ugwu</td>
<td>Ugwu my father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nna m Eze</td>
<td>Eze my father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nna m Omeje</td>
<td>Omeje my father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ike m Ona</td>
<td>Ona my strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nne m Ezema</td>
<td>Ezema my mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbo m Ugwu</td>
<td>Ugwu my name sake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agaba m Ezema</td>
<td>Ezema my ultimates strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other address terms are also used:

- **Nze nwa** Omeje Igwe Agaba, Amushi Okenwa, Ogbueshu Ezeja, Ogbulagodo Ngwu, Ÿkatigburu qnx Ugwu, Òtqmashi Ugwoke, Ojiri eshu bido ije nwa Ona. etc.

The use of these deferential address terms in the language of study helps reduce impediment to the face of the listener (as far as he or she is a superior) in any type of conversation.

Use of Tag Questions: Most times, tag questions are used in the place of direct statements to avoid conflicts. Example
Igbo                     Gloss
[ shirạ oshikapa nta, qkwa nya?  You cooked rice today, didn’t you?
i jedagạ ękwękwọ nta, i jerah  You did not go to school today or did you?
[ ji ab[a ne bee any[ n’enyasi nta. You will come to our
house today in the
Q bẹ kwa nya?              Night. Will you?
Nye m ego m kẹ q bẹ nẹ [ nyekogọ mẹ. Give me my money, could you?

See index pages:

Igbo                     Gloss
anya ọterọ ọkpape ntaa, kẹ q bẹ nẹ You bought groundnut today, didn’t you?
anya egotedaga?
Q bẹ ezigbo mmadọ, qkwa nya? He is a good person, isn’t he?

See the appendix pages 62,63,65,67,78,79

All these forms of strategies are discussed for the implementation of
avoidances of face-threats and institutions of politeness are evident in the
dialect under investigation unlike the British or American English that favour
positive politeness to the negative politeness.

4.4 The Socio-Linguistic Implications of Adopting Politeness Strategies
during Speech in the Erq X1q Dialect of Igbo.

Just as politeness strategies vary from culture to culture, due to
politeness being culturally bound, it is important to note that strategies
employed in Erq X1q dialect of Igbo may not be evident in other distinct
dialects of the Igbo language. It is also important to note that the politeness
expression strategies as they affect the Erq X1q dialect of Igbo is seen in the
day to day life of the people of this community, therefore it is not something
vagues or abstract.
A. Acceptance: In any society, whenever the physical possibility of spoken interactions arises, it seems that a system of practices, conventions and procedural rules come into play which function as a means of guiding and organizing the flow of messages. An understanding will prevail as the when and where it will be permissible to initiate talk among whom and by means of what topics of conversation (Goffman 1967)

Just like it was discussed in positive politeness strategies (in-group language), politeness brings about acceptance of a person in a particular group because his straits and ideals are liked and or she uses in group language belonging to that group, example.

Ndi nne mama
Ndi Igbo kwenu (see the appendixes) on pages...

B. Helps to Avoid Conflicts and Controversy: According to the most important tenet of Brown and Levinson’s original text on politeness theory we change our language based on the hearer and these strategies for compliance gaining change depending on the audience. In our everyday life, we design messages that protect face and achieve other goals as well. Brown and Levinson argue that an FTA (face threatening act) often requires a mitigating statement or some sort of politeness or the line of communication ill break down (Brown and Levinson 1987). This is very true in the language under investigation, during such times when the communication gap has been broken, a speaker can say –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ndo kwe n’ọ</td>
<td>Sorry o o!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike, ewene iwe</td>
<td>Don’t be annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biko, gbayar★</td>
<td>Please forgive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(see the appendix)

(C) **Fosters Good Relationships**: The understanding and usage of the basic politeness strategies in the research language helps to bring about good-will and foster fruitful relationships and thereby avoid conflicts. It is important to note that in the language under investigation, politeness is expressed by both male and female at all levels without any particular group having the upper and over the other and this helps in fostering good relationships. This does not however mean that conflicts relating to or arising from FTA’s do not occur as this lead to verbal and non physical abuses. Imbibing politeness in our lives and the activities of our daily lives helps to bring about good relationships, an ordinary ‘thank you’, good morning’ or ‘God bless you’ can fetch a lot of goodwill.

**D. Shows a Mark of Respect** – In the language under investigation, extra effort is actually made to show politeness to elderly ones by the younger ones hence the emergence of what we may call ‘politeness affixes’ which are in the forms of ‘nna m’ for addressing elderly and young males and ‘nnem’ for the young and older females. Because of the nature of politeness as culturally bound, these appendages may not be seen in other cultures but they will doubtlessly have their own methods of showing politeness which is unique to them. In the Erq X1q dialect, it is considered impolite for someone elderly and fail to use or apply these appendages appropriately in conversation for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nna m ugwu</th>
<th>My Father Ugwu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ike m Ezema</td>
<td>My strength Ezema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nne m Eze</td>
<td>My mother Eze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolo any [ Ugwueze</td>
<td>A little given to old women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oji eshu amu ije etc

A tile given to someone who celebrated his / her mother’s funeral rite with a cow.

The use of those affixes help a lot of in mitigating face threatening acts because someone could say – Q be maka n’ibe nna m uguw mer q ji eme ke ka ge qy[].

The examples show a willingness to do something for the person because he/she is an elder. This does not however means that it implies sheer subordination over another, but it helps to bring about a narrowing of the social gap brought about by age differences. No recognition or acknowledgement of seniority in the Erq Xlq dialect causes a lot of conflicts.

**E Better Co-existence:** It is important to note that important subjects such as salutations, acknowledgements of greetings, etc play a very large part in the native life and customs of the people of the language under investigation, the importance of the trivial, muttered, more or less automatic polite phrases become clear and serious when they are omitted or not acknowledged. Therefore the application of the most basic polite remarks like-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Igbo</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q q q</td>
<td>Okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeedo</td>
<td>Bye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see the appendix on pg 4.5)

Are very important for better co-existence. Non-verbal Expression of politeness in the Erq Xlq dialect of Igbo.

So far we have been discussing the expression of politeness in verbal forms of greeting. As stated earlier, greeting/salutation can take verbal form; it can be vocal but non-vocal. So far we have been discussing the expression of
politeness in verbal forms of greeting with a view of eliciting how they are politely expressed.

**A Handshake:** The act of shaking hands is a simple ceremony that is widely recognized. This form of greeting is remarkable and occurs in the most varied cultural areas. The habit of shaking hands to establish a cordial relationship with a stranger seems part of Western cultural repertoire, as is the act of rubbing the nose among the Fijians, or folding of the palms among the Hindus. It is however not certain whether handshaking as a form of greeting is as a result of European influence or had been in existence before their incursion (Escor 2006).

Whatever is the case, handshake remains a form of greeting that involves body contact, which must be introduced by an elder and never by a young person.

It would be the height of impudence and an act of impoliteness for a young person to be the first to initiate a handshake in Erq Xlq speech community. It is only polite that when an elder stretches his right hands, the younger person takes it gently and respectfully both hands. It would be impolite and insulting to return an elder’s handshake with just one hand. It shows disrespect, and scorn as well as treating the elder’s greeting with contempt.

Handshake as a non verbal form of greeting can be preceded or followed by the verbal form.

Here, it is the younger person who must greet (verbally) first after which he waits for the elder person to stretch out his hand for a handshake. This obligatory as the elder person may decide to respond verbally without any accompanying handshake. But an elder person may decide to initiate the greeting particularly where he is as stranger.

It is customary for any person who arrives after others have taken their seats, to go round shaking the people’s hands. In a very familiar circle and when a
meeting or gathering has not opened, it is no longer desirable to do so does not exhibit any form of politeness. Handshake here does not express politeness but nuisance and waste of time. A general greeting like “dēje nu – o “ndxx bee any [“ is enough. Proximity is very important in this form of greeting. For handshake as a form of greeting to be executed, the interactants must be close enough for the act. However, if the person greeting is distant from the person being greeting, then it is a mark of politeness for him to get closer before greeting verbally and wait for response and possible offer of handshake.

B Embrace: Another form of non-verbal form of greeting that involves body contact is the embrace.

This form of greeting has restricted performance as it is only women and to some extent girls who perform this act of greeting in public. Men may occasionally embrace one another to express profound intimacy when they have been long separated. Persons of opposite sex do not normally embrace each other in public as a form of greeting. However, close relatives of opposite sex like mother and son may embrace in public to express intense emotion.

As observed above, there is a performance restriction in the act of embrace as a form of greeting. For instance, no man is expected to initiate an embrace no matter how familiar he is with the women (except perhaps in a situation where the age difference is much). It is the older woman who initiates this act of greeting after verbal form. But the man is not expected to embrace direct face – to face. In the situations above that is, handshake and embrace respectively where elders are involved, the verbal greeting is normally matched with handshake and embrace if however this is not the case, then the person so greeted may say that person who greeted merely “threw the greeting at him or her.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.

5.1 SUMMARY:

The Erq X1q dialect of Igbo heavily relies on politeness expression strategies to bring about peaceful co-existence among its people. This does not mean that occasions of impeding people’s face do not occur or that the Erq X1q dialect of Igbo is a perfect example of a polite dialect, the contrary however is the case as the Erq X1q people are known for their numerous aggravated insults and Wanton cursing and swearing. These anomalies however are mainly directed to people who are not part of the Erq X1q community.

The use of the politeness appendages of “nna m Ugwu” and “nne m Ezema” could be said to be unique to the Erq X1q dialect and this helps them a lot in mitigating face threatening acts. There is a somewhat strictness obeyed and enforced in the people in the use of politeness expression strategies especially when a younger person is addressing an older person.

5.2 Conclusions: In conclusion, the use of politeness strategies by the speakers of Erq dialect Igbo is very outstanding and worthy of emulation because for many years, it has fostered peaceful co-existence among the people and it is still doing that day. It is often interesting to watch Erq X1q indigenes ask for forgiveness or make a request. The addition of the prefixes ‘nna m’ and ‘nne m’ is a powerful and almost cult-like insignia that brings about total respect and polite expressions even if not really intended but outwardly it still shows, unlike in other dialect of Igbo like the Obollo dialect of Nsukka where everybody is addressed on first name basis.
5.3 **Recommendations:** Having seen from the study that politeness expression strategies are quintessential to the success of communicative events in the community, we therefore recommend that the members of this community should do everything possible to retain and maintain their use of politeness strategies and to endeavour to pass it down to the younger generation by inculcating these politeness strategies into them. By so doing, there will be good relationship among the people and they will be able to remove alimony, controversies and conflicts.
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NOTES

OTORGRAPHY CONVENTION

These are the special characters I am going to use in this work. And these otographies are not represented in Qnwu’s Otography. These characters are:

[Sh] which we represented as [Shw]
[ri] which we represented as [ry]
[X] which we represented as [ә]
[U] which we represented as [ạ]
[∑] which we represented as [e]
APPENDIX

INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ugwu Gladys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Erq-xlq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td>2/01/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greetings

**Interviewer**
[ bqq chi?

**Interviewee**
Éeh, a bqq m nẹ q ga-be ke [ bqrọ, Jishie ike.

**Interviewer**
[ ga-ejekome?

**Interviewee**
Éeh, m ga-ejekome

**Interviewer**
[ natama?

**Interviewee**
Éeh, a natama m dejee ooo.

**Interviewer**
Anọa o!

**Interviewee**
Ooo.

Commands

**Interviewer**
Mee mee ihe họ qsiisq qsiisq

**Interviewee**
Ooo, anọqq m!

**Interviewer**
B[a nwabe Qshwa Qshwa!

**Interviewee**
Ooo, Mọ ga-ab[ajama!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>[ meehera iye họ [ nẹ-eme jee ke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imekwe mee qzq qshwa qshwa!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Ooo, emegbạdeme m!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements

**Interviewer**
B[a ke m jọma gọ
Interviewee: Ma ga-ab[ajama
Interviewer: Q be ihe q be i na ekwa maka nyaa be ihe ha?
Interviewee: Q be nya
Interviewer: Gana be ihe [ kwarṣa?
Interviewee: Leena ihe m kwarṣa
Interviewer: Onye nwe afere haa?
Interviewee: Q be nke m
Interviewer: Ihe a na ekwa maka nya, q gbasara gə?
Interviewee: Q gbasara m.

Request

Interviewer: Onye be m ji e woteną ihe haa?
Interviewee: Woteną m iye hə nna m Eze
Interviewer: [ ji-enyeną m eka sama afere haa?
Interviewee: Q ji adə m qy[] mee [ si m samanə ge afere haa.
Interviewer: Q be m natana ihe haa?

Questions

Interviewer: keede ndaa ba nwaɓe?
Interviewee: [ shi weeną? i sira ne [ ba onye ?
Interviewer: O teeme eka m biara nwaɓee?
Interviewee: keede mbe I jerə eshite eshite?
Interviewer: E wochiteme m ego ga m ji.?
Interviewee: be Weena be [ tqrana?
Interviewer: Gana be [ jeko je-eme qshwa?
Interviewee: I ji- enyeną eka sama ekwa q be.

Name: Ugwoke Comfort
Age 38 years
Occupation Trading
Community Erq Xlq
State Enugu State
Date of interview 2/01/2009

Greetings
Interviewer keede ndaa ba a nwabe?
Interviewee Q be any[, ] b[ama? Anəa.
Interviewer anə abqchara chi?
Interviewee Any[ abodogo , nə q ga-bə kə anə bqra?

Deeje ooo.

Commands
Interviewer A nakqqə m Qshwa.
Interviewee Nagade! si m ahəkwane gə nwa bee qzq!
Interviewer Mə ga- anakq nə bee m
Interviewee B[a !
Interviewer Weenə bə mbee j sirə m jega de?
Interviewee Asi m ga jega de mbee q bə!

Interviewer keede mbee m ji etəkwo anə?
Interviewee Takwara nə oche Qshwa!
Interviewer [ marə nə a gbanyikogə m nwabe Qshwa.?
Interviewee Shi nwabe Fəa!
Interviewer Weenə bə I chqrə kə m nega de ənya?
Interviewee Negade ənya nwabe Qshwa!

Statements
Interviewer anə ji-ejeryie həbee ntaa?
Interviewee Any[ ji-eje həbee ntaa.
Interviewer: Xra nê-erãekwe m nwabee m nqq.
Interviewee: B[a kê any[ baa jee kume əra.
Interviewer: A chqrə m kê anə b[a
Interviewee: [ si any[ b[a, any[ b[ana.
Interviewer: anə jegadenə
Interviewee: B[a nê any[ ejenə
Interviewer: anə jeko weena?
Interviewee: Kê any[ jeeme Qnitsha.

Requests

Interviewer: Onye bə onye m ji anə afere haa?
Interviewee: Nye mə na
Interviewer: anə ga-anqkwama nwabee emeganə?
Interviewee: Biko bjàna, kę any[ naqədenə
Interviewer: I ke agwamakwa m ikâ nwa ha.
Interviewee: kę m kâkwote gə nwa.
Interviewer: Gənə bə nsogbâ gə?
Interviewee: Biko mee mee nə m ihe Ọ bə.

Questions

Interviewer: [ nqq həbee emekweme gənə?
Interviewee: I sira m biagadə,
Interviewer: Hee ejegəde mee mbeə q bə?
Interviewee: I sɨə hee jegade?
Interviewer: O nwega mbeə m jera ntaa niine
Interviewee: I jera əshwa ntaa, kə q ba nə ijedaga?
Interviewer: Keede maka əkwa q bə?
Interviewee: Hee sərə əkwa q bə, kə q bə nə hee asədəmaga?
Interviewer: Q bə nwo qshwa bə [ b[arə?
Interviewee Q đə kwa m kẹ O temee ẹka m bjarə?

Name Ogbonna Sylvester
Age 25 Years
Occupation Student
Community Erq X1q
State Enugu state
Date of interview 3/ 02/2009

Greetings
Interviewer ẹshi đə gə ike?
Interviewee Ẹẹ h deeje nna m Ugwu
Interviewer ọnà niine đə oyi?
Interviewee ẹẹ h, ne Ω ga-bə kẹ ọnà đə?
Interviewer kẹ q dinə mbqshi qzq
Interviewee Ooo.

Commands
Interviewer Keede mbee i sira kẹ m jeeme qshwa?
Interviewee B[a kẹ i jeeme ashwa qshwa!
Interviewer Q bə m nqdəga nwabee?
Interviewee Gbanyie  hàbee qshwa qshwa!
Interviewer Anakqgəmə os[[so
Interviewee Nagədə os[[so os[[so!
Interviewer Keede mgbe a ji-asə ẹkwa q bə?
Interviewee B[a səmanə m ẹkwa qs[[sq qsiisq!
Interviewer Mgbe onee bə mgbe m ji jekona?
Interviewee Jegəde qshwa qshwa!
Interviewer Keede ihe [ chqə kẹ m mee mee nə gə?
Interviewee Jee gəfətana m ji n’ite qshwa!
Statements

Interviewer  Nne gə q nq n’xnq nwa qshwa?
Interviewee  O nwerə ike q əama.
Interviewer  Ngozi o ji-ab[a kẹ q bə nẹ q b[akqgə?
Interviewee  Amanəgə m me q ji-ab[a me q b[akqgə.
Interviewer  {shi okwə gə bə gənə?
Interviewee  {shi okwə m bə nẹ emenəgə eme.
Interviewer  Q bə eziokwə bə [ kwəra?
Interviewee  O nwerə ike bərə eziokwə.
Interviewer  Mgbe onee bə hẹẹ b[arə?
Interviewee  Hee biakwarə ntaa.

Requests

Interviewer  Gənə bə ihe ka gə qy[ kẹ m mee mee nə gə?
Interviewee  Biko chutena m mmənyi.
Interviewer  Chinyere q nqdeə wenə biko nə
Interviewee  Nemenekenə m ənya me q nq nə xnq.
Interviewer  Keedeneke nə mbee m ji etikwara anə.
Interviewee  Takwara n’oche.
Interviewer  Gənə bə də nə any[ ji emenə qshwa?
Interviewee  Bianə kẹ any[ shigade oshikapa q bə.
Interviewer  Bianə i worə ekwəkwq q bə.
Interviewee  Wotenə m ekwəkwq q bə.
Interviewer  anə enwedaga qji də.
Interviewee  Taanə qji q bə nə.
Interviewer  E mekokwəga nə ihe q bə?
Interviewee  Jeenə kẹ [ meeme nə ihe q bə.

Questions
Interviewer: Q na-asə ᐋkwa.
Interviewee: {si nẹ-gənə mera?
Interviewer: M ga-agbanyiko
Interviewee: O jekodə weenə?
Interviewer: Onye bąa nwabe?
Interviewee: Weenə bx ishi? { bədə nwa onye da?
Interviewer: A sirə m nẹ m ga-afəkə
Interviewee: { na-afəə qshwa?
Interviewer: Q dəkwa m kə həə ab[ama?
Interviewee: Həə ab[ama?

Name: Adama Onyeka
Age: 40 years
Occupation: Civil servant
Community: Erq xlq
State: Enugu state
Date of interview: 3/02/2009

Greetings

Interviewer: Ndəə onee bəə nwabe?
Interviewee: [ b[ama?
Interviewer: anə daə qy[?
Interviewee: Deeje
Interviewer: [ bqq chi
Interviewee: Abqq m nə q ga-bə kə [ borə.

jegədena nə q ga-abə emecherə.

Any[ ji ahəə mbqshi qzq.

Commands
Interviewer: Ween ә bә sirә m nqdeә?
Interviewee: Pierә nә ime әnq qshwa!

Si m ahәkwanegә nwabe qzq!

Interviewer: Kә m takwәra nwabe.
Interviewee: Gbanyie hәbee.!

Interviewer: Amagә m mgbe m ji-ebido megәde ihe haa?
Interviewee: Meeme ihe hә qs[ sq qs[ sq!

Interviewer: Ike adәgә m osәsә әkwa hә.
Interviewee: Sәmә әkwa hx osiiso qs[ sq.

Statements

Interviewer: Gәnә bә echiche gә banyerә okwu m kwәra?
Interviewee: Okwә gә dәqy[
Interviewer: [ nakqә je-emegәnә?
Interviewee: Kә m nagәdә je-shimenә әmә m nryi.
Interviewer: Keede mgbe any[ ji agbasa әka?
Interviewee: Oge any[ nwerә agwәmakwa.
Interviewer: Onye nwe qәqәqә=qqa hә?
Interviewee: Qәqәqә=qqa hә bә nke any[.

Requests

Interviewer: Amakwagә m mgbe m ji-ebido jee eme ihe hә?
Interviewee: Bikonә meemenә m ihe q bә qshwa.
Interviewer: Gәnә kwamadә bә any[ na-echekweme dә.
Interviewee: B[anә kә any[ nagәde.
Interviewer: Amakwagә m mee o nwerә ihe [ na-eme oshwa?
Interviewee: Jeemenә m ashwa.
Interviewer: Gọnọ bọ [ chqρ̣ kẹ-enyẹ gə?
Interviewee: Keọọ mọ ọma mmọnyi obere.

**Questions**

Interviewer: A tarọmọ ntaa ahọọ nẹ ashwa hẹẹ m jerọ ntaa.
Interviewee: i jerọ ashwa, q bọ m sirọ gọ jeme?
Interviewer: A ji m ab[a ntaa
Interviewer: i ji-ab[a ntaa?
Interviewer: A chqkqry[dọ m mmanya
Interviewee: [ nọgq mmanya q bọ?
Interviewer: O bọọ Aba.
Interviewee: O bọọ Aba keẹ q bọ Abxja?
Interviewer: Gọnọ bọ echiche gọ maka okwọ anyọ kpọ nẹ qọọ?
Interviewee: I jí-eme ihe m gwarọ gọ keẹ q bọ nẹ i mekọgạ?
Interviewer: Keede maka ọgọ q bọ?
Interviewee: [ kpachama ọgọ q bọ?

Name: Ezea Anthonia
Age: 45 years
Community: Erq X1q
State: Enugu state
Date of interview: 4/02/2009

**Greetings**

Interviewer: Nne m i mee agaa?
Interviewee: Keede keẹ ana merọ?
Interviewee: Nwa m nsogbọ ad[ọ.
Anọaa.
[ b[ama
Deeje.
Q ga-bọ o mecherà

**Commands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Q bọ gọnọ bọ ihe q bọ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>B[a nwabe!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Kẹ m jeme ashwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>E jene!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>E jekogọ m ąbeee oshwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Jegде qς[qς[qς!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Mgbe onee bọ a ji enye gọ ekwọkwọ q bọ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Nyeme na qς[qς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Keede mgbe m ji-etạkwụ nẹ oche?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Takaara nẹ oche qshwa!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Mgbe onee bọ mgbe any[ji-ejekọnà?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Q d[kwanọ kẹ any[ji-ejegade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Gọnọ bọ [ na-eme hubee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B[a kẹ any[nagade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Gọnọ bọ echiche gọ gbasaraọ ihe m kwaara?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Okwa gọ dọ qy[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Ada b[aja mbqshi onee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Ada ab[ama.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Onye ji-ewodo nọ a ose?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Wotenọ m ose q bọ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mgbe onee bə mgbe any[ jekodanə Enugwu q bə.

Bianə kẹ any[ jeme Enagwa q bə.

Gəna bə ihe a ji-egotenə gə nẹ ashwa?

Gotenə m ᥱə mgbe i ji-anata.

I sirə m nye gə genə biko?

Biko nə m azə kẹ m ryienaə.

E jekogə m mbee ne haa ntaa.

Jeedenə ekwekwq q bə.

Questions

E jera m Abọja

I jememe mbee q bə?

Ke m nyomenekə meeq mə ji ego ji ab[a.

[ ji-ego jे ab[a?

A hərə m Emeke

Emeke, o merə qfəma?

Mgbe onee bə Oninyechi sirə nə nyaa b[aja?

O ji ab[a ntaa ma q bə echi?

Name Asogwa Martin
Age 49 years
Community Erq Xnq
State Enugwu state
Date of interview 4/02/2009

Greetings

Nna m [ bqq dochera?

wa m, a boq m, nə q ga-bə kẹ [ bqrə?
Interviewer  Deeje ooo
Interviewee  Anəa ooo

Commands

Interviewer  Gənə bə ihe sirə mə mee mee?
Interviewee  Gbagəde qsq!
Interviewer  Anq m hëe mbee m nqq
Interviewee  Sh[[( nwabee fəa oshwa!
Interviewer  A nakggəmə m bee any[!
Interviewee  Nagəde bee əna!
Interviewer  O nwegə ihe m ji-eme ntaa.
Interviewee  Chəmee mmanyi!
Interviewer  E jeko m ashwa
Interviewee  E jene ashwa!

Statements

Interviewer  I sirə nə q bə gənə?
Interviewee  A gwarə m gə agwa.
Interviewer  I sirə m mee mee gənə?
Interviewee  Q sirə gə jee wora.
Interviewer  Q nqdə nə weenə
Interviewee  Q nq nə enq.
Interviewer  O shirə gənə?
Interviewee  O shirə oshikapa

Requests

Interviewer  I sirə m mee mee agaa?
Interviewee  Mee mee nə m ihe q bə.
Interviewer  I sirə m wotenə gənə?
Interviewee  Wotenə m ji.
Interviewer  Keede ihe a ji-eme nə gə?
Interviewee  Dujenọ m ashwa.
Interviewer  Keede ihe m ji-emenọ gọ.
Interviewer  Rẹmanọ m ĝkwọ nẹ qkọ.
Interviewer  A chqrọ m ke [ b[a nẹ beem.
Interviewee  Kẹ m bianọ bee gọ.

Questions

Interviewer  O nwerọ mbee m chqrọ ojije
Interviewee  i jeko nwe na?
Interviewer  Ehq m shiryọ ike?
Interviewee  [ nọrọ mmanya?
Interviewer  O nwerọ mbee any[ jẹrọ
Interviewee  ṣọna anata ma?
Interviewer  Nee kwe akọ gọ
Interviewee  Q ṣẹ onee?
Interviewer  A chqgq m nwonyeke q bọ
Interviewee  i ṣẹrọ nwonyeke q bọ?

Name  Omeje Boniface
Age  38 years
Occupation  Civil Servant
Community  Erq Xnq
State  Enugu state

Greetings

Interviewer  Jishie ike nna m
Interviewee  Ooo
[ b[arọ nẹ bee any[?
Anọaa oo
Interviewer  [ meenọ
Interviewee  Ooo
Commands

**Interviewer**  M ga-agbanyikome

**Interviewee**  B[a nwabee!

**Interviewer**  E jekogəma qshwa

**Interviewee**  B[a ke any[ jee qs][s]!

**Interviewer**  Keede mgbe e ji-ede ęha?

**Interviewee**  Deme ęha gə qshwa!

Statements

**Interviewer**  Gənə bə ąnə chqrə oməme qshwa?

**Interviewee**  Ihe nənha [ sirə any[ meeme bə any[ ji-eme.

**Interviewer**  ąnə b[arə nwabee ji-eme gənə?

**Interviewee**  Any[ sirə ke any[ jəta gə ihe any[ ji-eme.

**Interviewer**  Ihe qzq ąnə ji maka nyaa ji-ab[a nwabee bə gənə?

**Interviewee**  Any[ nɛ-eche ke any[ ji-eje.

**Interviewer**  M ga-afəkq

**Interviewee**  Biko ke m jəma gə ihe.

Requests

**Interviewer**  Biko gwa m ihe m ji-eme nə gə

**Interviewee**  Nyenə m ękwəkwq ke m gəmaa.

**Interviewer**  Gənə də bə m ji egotenə gə?

**Interviewee**  Gotenə m qkpape.

**Interviewer**  ęgəə na-agəkwə m

**Interviewee**  Shimenə ji ke any[ rylie.

**Interviewer**  Weenə bə any[ ji-anə je həə?

**Interviewee**  Bíanə nɛ bee m.
Questions
Interviewer  A b[arə m nɛ bee gə.
Interviewee  O teme ęka [ b[arə?
Interviewer  I jeko nę weenə?
Interviewee  E jeko m nę Aba
[ nərə ihe m kwara?
Interviewee  E vaaa kwe m akpa m nwabee
Interviewer  Keede ihe [paa nę akpa?
Interviewer  Ntaa bə kwa nzako
Interviewee  I jikodə nzako q bə?
Interviewer  Kẹ m je-akwadome
Interviewee  [ ga-ejekome?

Name  Urama Charles
Age  42 years
Occupation  Farming
Community  Erq Unq
State  Enugu state
Date for interview 5/02/2009

Greetings
Interviewer  Ogbo m, keede kẹ ọna dẹ?
ẹshi dẹ ọna ike?
ọmọ gẹ hee?
Interviewee  Any[ də qy[[ nę q ga-bə kẹ ndi nke gə mera?
[ biama?
Anəaa
Commands

Interviewer: Ike adọ kwa ọ m imetetọ ihe nee hụ ntaa.
Interviewee: [ jememe mbee m sirọ ọ jeme!

Interviewer: A naka qgọ m qshwa!
Interviewee: Nagọde qshwa!

Interviewer: Jegọde!
Interviewee: A b[aja m hàbee qshwa!
Interviewer: A b[anọ nwabee ha!

Statements

Interviewer: Onye mara me hẹ ẹ ratera n’oge?
Interviewee: Hẹ ẹ ratera n’oge.
Interviewer: A nq shieme m ike nwabee
Interviewee: i ji ab[anọ kẹ I nagọde.
Interviewer: Gẹna bọ echiche ọ nẹ mbee onyeka m nq
Interviewee: Any[ nagọde di nẹ nwunye, q ji-adọkwa m qy[ Interviewer: [ ọ ọ ọ ẹ q ga-emechigerọ
Interviewee: E kwara m e nà ekwa
Interviewer: A naka qọ m qshwa kwa.
Interviewee: Bianọ kẹ any[ nagadẹ.
Interviewer: E jeko m ọnq
Interviewer: I rẹ ẹ ọnq nyenọ me nà ego ha.

Requests

Interviewer: Gẹna bọ kwama ọhụ [ na-enyenọ m nsogbu?
Interviewee: Memen a m ihe q bə nə
Interviewer: E jeko kwe m je gəə ekwəkwə qshwa
Interviewee: Bianə ke i jemenə m ashwa.
Interviewer: M ga-anakqmakwa.
Interviewee: Shimenə m nyri meeq gə
Zaa kwa ma nə m ənq nne m.
Interviewer: B[agəə ke any[ ji 'kəgade əra.
Interviewee: isina ke any[ jegade, any[ jegade.

Questions

Interviewer: Q də kwa m kə m arəchamarə qəə haa?
Interviewee: I mechemedərə ə hee oshwa?
Interviewer: A zachamakwarə m ənq q bə.
Interviewee: I sirə nə [ zachamadərə
hee ənq amaara q bə ə hee?
Interviewer: Amakwa gə m mgbe any[ ji-eji je-eje
mbee q bə?
Interviewee: Ngwanə ke any[ jegade, [ nəgq?

Name: Atta Nnamdi
Age: 45 years
Occupation: Trading
Community: Erq Xlq
State: Enugu state
Date of interview: 5/02/09

Greetings

Interviewer: Ndə onee baa nwaala?
    ḣana abqcharə chi?
    ɛshi də niine ike?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>ẹẹh, nẹ q ga-bọ kẹ [ dọ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ b[ama?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeje</td>
<td>ooo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anaa</td>
<td>ooo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degade qy[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>E jeshitakogọ m ike kwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>B[agade qsiisq !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Any[ ji ehiryiryi oshikapa nẹ anọ ha ntaa!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Isinọ any[ shigade, any[ shigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>O nwekwegọ mbee qkọ aọ qshwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Jee shiyinọ m mmọnyi qkọ !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Gọnọ bọ nsogbọ gẹ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Nye m nryi kẹ m rye !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>O nwerẹ mbee m jekoo !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Ruteme nwabee qshwa !</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>E jekogẹ m mbee hẹẹ!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interviewee** jegade !

**Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>anọ ga-ekomedọ mbee q bọ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Sorọ any[ jeme mbee q bọ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>anọ nq nwabee e mee gẹnọ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Any[ ne-eche gẹ kẹ any[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maarọ me i ji-eso any[ je eje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Mmadọ nine ji-eje mbee q bọ daọ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>ẹẹẹ Mmadọ nine ji-eje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Weena bọ hẹẹ nq qshwa?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewer

Biko Ọọnọ bẹ̀ [ chqra kẹ̀ m meeme na ọ̀dẹ̀?

Interviewee

Nyemenà m ọ̀kà.

Memenà m ebere na

Interviewer

I sirè m b[a meeme ọọnọ̀?

Interviewee

Biko b[a kẹ̀ [ kiyinà m mmànyì

Interviewer

gàà ji kwenà m

Interviewee

Ryiena ji

Interviewer

Qq kwa [ na-achq afere ọ̀ṣa ọ̀ṣẹ̀?

Interviewee

Chqtanà m afere q bẹ̀ Ọọnọ̀.

Questions

Interviewer

Igba nkwọ̀ Chinyere eràteme kwe.

Interviewee

Any[ ji-ejeda [gbọ̀ nkwọ̀ Chinyere?

Interviewer

A ọọnọ̀ kwa ọ̀ṣa ọ̀ṣẹ̀ ihe i kwàrọ̀?

Interviewee

I sirè m b[agàde?

Interviewer

Any[ aràgà qzq.

Interviewee

àna emechemerà?

Interviewer

Qkàkq haa kweshìra kẹ̀ egbue.

Interviewee

E nwere a m ike igbọ̀ qkàkq q bẹ̀ qṣhwa?

Interviewer

Onye nẹ̀-eme hubeè?

Interviewee

[ shi weenà jẹ̀ fàta?

Interviewer

Lee kwe ego ọ̀ṣa dafàre mẹ̀ [ magà.

Interviewee

àna sirè nẹ̀ q bẹ̀ ọọnọ̀?

Name

Okanya Veronica

Age

45 years

Occupation

Civil servant

Community

Erq Xnq
State: Enugu state
Date of interview: 8/03/2009

Greetings

Interviewer:  }).  `qyi?
i mee agaa?
[ bqq chi?
Deeje

Interviewee: Any[ də qy[.
Anəaa
Jishie ike.

Commands

Interviewer: Onye merə ite haa nwaa?
Interviewee: Jee sama ite həə, q bə gə kweshirə [ sanə !
Interviewer: Gənə bə i sirə m meeme?
Interviewee: jeegəde mbee m zirə gə qshwa !
Interviewer: Kę m zachama nwabee.
Interviewee: { mecherə ihe həə [ na-emə
[ b[ə nyenə ęka mefue qnəme !
Interviewer: E je takọgə m hubee !
Interviewee: B[agəde kə any[ jegəde !

Statements

Interviewer: Ego onee bə [ chqrə kę achqmanə gə?
Interviewee: A chqrə m adi ishi akpa ego.
Interviewer: Q bə gənə kpataʃə [ jirə je gbanə m nkiti?
Interviewee: Q bə maka nə i bə nne m kpataə m jirə hafə gə.
Interviewer: A chọrọ m kẹ m zame ike.

Interviewee: B[a kẹ any[ jegade mbee any[ jeko.

Interviewer: Mgbe onee bọ any[ ji-jekọ a mbee q bọ?

Interviewee: Any[ ji-eje hẹbee ntaa.

Requests

Interviewer: Ike ađakwa gọ m nọ.

Interviewee: B[agădenọ.

Interviewer: A nq m nẹ qrọ biko ka.

Interviewee: E mecherọ, i ji-abianọ.

Interviewer: Keede ihe i chọrọ kẹ m mee nọ gọ?

Interviewee: Kutenọ m ofe kẹ m rashira

Interviewer: Biko kwe nẹ akpa gọ dẹ nwabee.

Interviewee: Vătenọ m akpa m nwabee.

Questions

Interviewer: Ezigbo oyi d[ kwa.

Interviewee: Oyi haa na-atọ m, q na-atọ kwa gọ kẹ o shi atọ m?

Interviewer: ejọ ne-ekpo m

Interviewee: Egeọ q ga-ejime gọ?

Interviewer: Mgbe onee bọ anà na-akwado [ nach[ Enagwa?

Interviewee: Any[ nwerọ ike [nachi Enagwa ntaa ma q bọ echi.

Interviewer: E jerọ m ashwa ntaa

Interviewee: anà egoteme ose q bọ?

Name: Ngwu Vincent

Age: 50 years
Occupation: Civil servant
Community: Erq Xnq
State: Enugwu state
Date of interview: 15/04/2009

Greetings

Interviewer: Ndọọ, enq, hee dina qy[. əmə gə dina qy[
keede ƙe i mera?
[ bqq charə?
əshi da gə ike?

Deeje

Interviewee: Any[ da qy[. Ndọọ bee gə kwena?
Anəaa oo.

Commands

Interviewer: A chqqə m ishi nwabee je fəə
Interviewee: Shi nwabee fəə !
Interviewer: A nakqgə m nɛ bee any[
Interviewee: Nagəde nɛ bee ənə ![ Interviewee: O nwerə ihe m chqre omame qshwa
Interviewee: Megəde ihe m gwarə gə meeme q{[sq ![ Interviewer: Kɛ m takwarə nɛ oche
Interviewee: Gbanyie nɛ oche həə qshwa
Interviewer: Onye nwe də nkata haa?
Interviewee: Wote nkata həə nwabee.
Interviewer: B[a kɛ m əshigə ihe
Interviewee: E nyene m nsogba ![ Interviewer: Afere həə ivə d[ kwa erəa.
Interviewee: Nyenə əka qsiisq.
Statements
Interviewer  ọnọ dọnọ qy[?
Interviewer keede kẹ i shirẹ họ okwara m gwarọ gọ?
Interviewer Q bx eziokwu.
Interviewee Ihe ọ kawọ bọ ihe mere eme.
Interviewer jegade mbe m zirọ gọ
Interviewee M ga-ejekome mbe m ọ bọ.
Interviewer Onyinye nq dọ nwenọ
Interviewee Q natama mbe m ọ jẹra.

Requests
Interviewer Biko kẹ m gbanyigade.
Interviewee Ngwanọ, q gaa-abọ o mecherọ
Interviewer Bikonọ kẹ anyṣ zumenọ ike.
Interviewee Anyṣ ejenọ mbe m ọ jekqna
Interviewer Gọọ ọọ ishi obọ ọsq gọ?
Interviewee E ji m Chineke anya [sh].
Interviewer Mmanya q gwamadọ?
Interviewer }ọmanọ mmanya q ọ bọ.

Questions
Interviewer Emeke gatakwarọ ne beem ntaa.
Interviewer O jegademe mbe m ọ bọ?
Interviewer [ ji-ab[anọ, me [ nata?
Interviewer eeeh. i ọqq ihe m kwarọ?
Interviewer Nee kwe ego haa jidenọ m
Interviewee Q dọ ọnee?
Interviewer Gøyemenekọ ọsq họọ.
Interviewee Chi abqma ọ?

---
Interviewer: Nee kwe qba q bə
Interviewee: Mmənyi q də nə qba həə?

Name: Eze Echezonachi
Age: 55 years
Occupation: Civil servant
Community: Erq Xnq
State: Enugwu state
Date of interview: 15/03/2009

Greetings
Interviewer: [ bqq
          Ka chi foo
          Jishie ike
          Erq kwena
          Qhane Eze ənə anqkorə
          Deeje nə oo.
Interviewee: Ooo

Commands
Interviewer: Kə m nachite
Interviewee: B[a nwa bee !
Interviewer: Worə qji gə !
Interviewee: Taa qji həə qsiisq !
Interviewer: A fəkqgə m nə əzq !
Interviewee: Gba nə əzq !
Interviewer: əra nə-erəkwe m
Interviewee: i mechemerə ihe a gwarə gə meeme !

Statements
Interviewer: Mgbe onee bə any[ ji eji je-eje
Interviewee: Q dəkwanə kə any[ ji-eje oshwa.
Interviewer  A hәrәm әŋq q rәrә
Interviewee  Q bәkwanә әziokwә
Interviewer  Q bә nyaa bә nвonyeke q bә b[әrә?
Interviewee  Q bә nyaa.
Interviewer  Obә aԁәgә m гy[ ntaа
Interviewee  E wene iwe.
Interviewer  i mәqqә nє  Ezechi ejегәdемe Obodo Oyibo
Interviewee  Еkwәrәm әnә ekwә.
Interviewee  Q kwa m gwarәgә anә agwa.

Requests
Interviewer  Gәnә ә һе q ә һе?
Interviewee  Meemenә m һе m gwarә әә.
Interviewer  Gәnә ә һе nsogә әә?
Interviewee  Nwa m meyimeneke m mmәnyи hәә bee.
Interviewer  anә nqkwamәdә hәәbee eme gәәnә da.
Interviewee  Anя[ ejenә
Interviewer  A chqrә m иryи anә
Interviewee  Ryиенә anә.
Interviewer  Е kwәkогә m оквә.
Interviewee  kwenә okвә.

Questions
Interviewer  Deejәnә
Interviewee  [ b[әrә nwәbee?
Interviewer  Q bә m tie әә ihe onye әәra iхaa?
Interviewee  i нwekwerә uчe?
Interviewer  B[ә keә m ёmә gә ihe hаа
Interviewer: Q ga-bọ omecherọ
Interviewee: [ji ab[a ntaa, kẹ q bọ nẹ i b[akqgẹ?
Interviewer: M ga-anakọ, nẹ ike agwọcharẹ m.
Interviewee: Okwa anyị kpọ nẹ qnọ, o nwerọ ishi kẹ q bọ nẹ o nwẹrọ?
Interviewer: Gẹnẹ bọ ihe q bọ?
Interviewee: Onye merọ ihe na nwaa?
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ABSTRACT

The main thrust of this study is to identify the politeness expression and strategies used in Erq-xlq speech community. The study examines the concept of politeness. It discusses politeness expression strategies as they occur in Erq-xlq speech community. It explains the various ways of expressing politeness in Erq-xlq speech community. It finally highlights the sociolinguistic implications of adopting politeness strategies during speech in Erq-xlq speech community.