STYLE OF NIGERIAN ENGLISH CONVERSATION: A DISCOURSE-STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF A NATURAL CONVERSATION

Amaechi Uneke Enyi

Senior Lecturer, Department of Linguistics and Literary Studies,
Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT: *The study entitled 'Style of Nigerian English conversation: a discourse- stylistic analysis of a natural conversation is a linguistic stylistic analysis of educated Nigerian English conversation. The study following the example of Davy and crystal (1969) was aimed at identifying the common features of conversation in educated Nigerian English in relation to the linguistic features of conversational English. Our findings showed that Nigerian English conversation has the features of inexplicitness of expressions, randomness of subject- matter and general lack of planning;, normal non-fluency and gap-fillers; the use of in-group slang and abbreviations known to participants; extreme informality, etc. In specific terms, Nigerian English conversation closely approximates the Standard English conversation in terms of its style and interactive qualities as a language in use in social contexts. The study discovered, that, Nigerian English conversation, apart from the common core - features which it shares with the general conversational English, has some indexical markers which locate it in its socio-cultural and sociolinguistic context as English as a second language*

KEYWORDS: Style, Nigerian English, Discourse-Stylistics, Conversation

INTRODUCTION

A verbal event can either be spoken or written. For many years, the focus of grammarians and language scholars was on the written text with little or no attention to the spoken text. But with the advent of modern linguistics, attention of scholars shifted from the written text to the spoken text and primacy was given to the spoken word. It is therefore odd to note that despite the general agreement in linguistic circles on the primacy of speech in language study, and the fact that much of our everyday lives are conducted through the medium of conversation, very little linguistics research has been carried out into this variety of English. However, the last few decades have witnessed an increasing and emerging interest, especially by sociolinguists, anthropologists and sociologists, in conversational discourse analysis.

Conversation occurs when at least two people are talking. For it to be a conversation, each person must talk one after the other. There must be a string of at least two turns. Even if the second party keeps quiet, he must show evidence of having heard the utterance by nodding, starring, or other paralinguistic cues that accompany speech. Conversation analysis by extension, is the study of recorded naturally occurring talk-in-interaction whose principal aim is to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk with a central focus on how sequences of actions are generated. (Hutchby and Woofit, 2008). The term conversation, in the framework of conversational Analysis (CA) can be varied and open-ended as scholars vary in their definitions and delimitation of the scope of the term. Levinson, (1983) for example opts for a narrow definition.

> Conversation may be taken to be that familiar predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking; which generally occurs outside specific institutional settings like: religious services, law courts, classrooms and the likes. (p. 234).

The above definition restricts the term to the trivial chit- chat. Members of this school are concerned with the use of language to negotiate interpersonal and role- relationships, peer solidarity, the exchange of turns in a conversation, the saving of face of both speaker and listener (Labov, 1972, Brown and Levinson, 1978, Sacks et al, 1974, Lack off, 1973).

To some other scholars, the term conversation is best regarded as a technical term covering a variety of forms of spontaneous social interaction in a speech community which includes institutional settings like: courtrooms, classrooms and boardrooms. (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975).

For our purpose in this study, preference is given to a less inclusive and relatively informal and natural conversation between educated people. Following the reasoning of crystal and Davy (1968), this is without doubt, the most commonly used kind of English and consequently, the most familiar variety to the vast majority of English speaking people. This is because we find ourselves making use of this variety on daily basis as we concretize our realities as social beings. In addition to the above view is the pedagogical reason. The variety of English used in informal spontaneous and natural conversation would seem to be the most logical and the least artificial variety to expose students in English as a second Language situations as part of their overall communicative competence in the use of English as a means of everyday communication. The present study finds justification in these practical reasons that are quite important especially as Nigerian students and of course, Nigerians at large are said to speak bookish English. This is due to the prevailing situation in Nigeria where the English language is taught and learned through the written medium of text books and not through natural contexts. In addition to the above, it has been observed that not much has also been done in the analysis of Nigerian English conversation and this constitutes the gap which this study has come to fill.

The aim of the present study flows from that of stylistics in general which is the explication of the linguistic features which characterize a text and how writers use them to convey their message. In specific terms, the study, following the example of crystal and Davy (1969), aims at studying, in as much details as possible, the English language as it is used by Nigerians in natural conversation and by so doing, identify the formal linguistic features which characterize it and where possible, explain why such features have been used as opposed to other alternatives.

Stylistic Features of Natural Conversation:

The linguistic distinctiveness of conversation manifests on all the levels of linguistic and stylistic analysis: phonological, syntactic, graphological, and the lexico-semantic levels. But for our purpose and because of space and scope constraints, it suffices to elucidate a few of a more general features. Harvey sacks in his 1971 lecture series, posits that conversation has much of the marked phonological, grammatical and thematic patterning that usually characterize works of literature. He argues that such features occur too frequently to be rejected as chance occurrences. He observes that participants in a conversation interactively strive to

achieve effects of similar sophistication and complexity to that of literary texts. According to him:

> These phonological echoes are evidence of how closely attentive, speakers are to each other. A speaker's choice of one formulation rather than another is partly determined by the phonological patterning of the previous text and alternative formulations.

In his discussion of an extended version of skip connecting, he also observes that texts also display marked lexical patterning such as contrasts and that conversation also displays marked lexical patterning such as contrasts:

"These and those", "go to and come from", "in and out", "you and they" "men and ladies" "new and old", "ever and never" "depressing and fun", (p. 122).

He suggests that the use of such contrasting forms is usually appropriate at points of "topic conflict".

Crystal and Davy (1969) give a more elaborate and incisive account of features of conversational English and they identify the following.

1. General features: Inexplicitness of expressions due to extreme reliance on extra-linguistic context by participants. This manifests through frequent use of apparent ambiguousness of expressions which will be readily ambiguous once removed from context, incompleteness of utterances; the use of a great deal of abbreviated forms, slangs, subtle references, family jokes, etc.

2. Randomness of subject- matter and general lack of planning which usually manifests through lack of an overall theme and the unpredictability of the direction or end; the unpredictability of a change of topic etc.

3. Extreme informality which usually manifests in the following ways; change of accents, dialects, code for humorous effects; juxtaposition of very separate linguistic features such as formal and informal forms.

4. Normal non- fluency: this occurs in forms of gap fillers, recapitulation, re- starting, word searching features, random errors, and hesitation features.

At the phonological level, they identify such features as; the use of wider range of sounds, artificial clearing of the throat or coughing; snorts and sniffs to communicate attitudes; the permissiveness of onomatopoeic words such as ghoosh! Whoosh! e t c; lack of end- of- utterance pauses due to rapid taking of cues; the prevalence of the use of significant paralinguistic features; nodding, coughing etc.

At the syntactic level, they identify the following features: the use of a large number of loosely co-ordinated clauses and short sentences; the frequent use of minor sentences especially as response utterances, and even non- response utterances in the form of summarizing statements; the frequent use of interrogative sentence types and the paucity of imperative ones; the use of vocatives for attention getting or for identifying function; the use of contracted forms and tense jumbling etc

At the lexical level, some prominent features have also been identified: they include; the avoidance of specialized words and formal phraseology; the permissibility of inexplicity of reference and imprecision; the permissibility of clichés, colloquial idioms, in-group slang, lexical hyperbole;

The above list of features could be extended to accommodate Nigerian English usage as to include; the tolerance of Nigerianisms and other disputed usages as well as the use of the Nigerian pidgin.

The Notion of Style and stylistics

The name stylistics, according to Thorne, (1981) is given to studies of different kinds, and about the only thing they have in common is that they involve in some form or another, an analysis of the linguistic structure of texts. In fact the word stylistics has been interpreted in diverse ways by different linguists. This is probably because the word 'style' from which stylistics emanates, itself has several connotations that make it difficult to be defined accurately. Style and stylistics are related and two interwoven terms. In fact the "simplest definition of stylistics is as "the study of style". Style as a concept is vast, multi- faceted and elusive.

This complex phenomenon is not only related to literature but also to other fields like architecture, painting and the arts.

Crystal and Davy (1969) identify four main characteristics of style.

a. Style may refer to some or all of the language habits of one person, e.g. Shakespeare style.

b. Style may refer to occasional linguistic idiosyncrasies which characterise an individual's uniqueness

c. It may refer to effectiveness of a mode of expression- saying the right thing in a most effective way.

d. It may refer to the language habits shared by a group of people at one time over a period, e.g. the style of American poets.

The concept of style can be studied from different perspectives: style as choice; as deviation, as personality, individuality, as situation, etc. but it is well beyond the scope of this study to expatiate all these perspectives.

Stylistics, for fowler (1969) could be defined in terms of theoretical and non- theoretical usages. He explains thus;

> …in non- theoretical usage the word 'stylistics' makes sense and is useful in referring to an enormous range of literary contexts. Such as John Milton's grand style, the prose style of Henry James, the epic and the balled style of classical literature etc.

> … stylistics, in theoretical usage, is a distinctive term that may be used to determine the connections between the form and effects with a particular variety of language, (p.76)

Stylistics from the theoretical usage above looks at what linguistic associations are, that the style of language reveals. For decades, the discipline of stylistics suffered the misconception of belonging exclusively to the domain of literature. In corollary to this, literary tropes such as metaphor, metonymy, irony and so forth in an ordinary language use are regarded as exclusively literary phenomena. Exponents of linguistics are quick to point out however that stylistics techniques can be applied to texts other than those included in the established literary cannot. Indeed, a central axiom of much modern stylistic analysis is that there is no such thing as an exclusively literary language 'that the elements of literariness' inhere in all constructed texts; newspaper editorial/headlines, political speeches, spontaneous conversation and so on. Todorov (1981:71) captures the arguments when he says"… there is no any reason to confine to literature alone the type of studies crystallized in poetics: we must read as much not only literary texts but all, not only verbal production but symbolism".

The present study aligns itself with the central axioms in modern stylistics which studies varieties of language whose properties position that language in context. For example, the language of advertising, politics, religion, and, in our own case, natural conversation, all of which are used distinctively and belong in a particular situation

Features of Conversation:

Turn- Taking.

One of the most noticeable features of conversations is that speakers change. In fact in most cases, in a face- face conversation, only one person talks at a time and speakers take their turns interchangeably with few gaps or little overlap. Overlaps, where they occur, are always seen to be interactively significant. Gaps and overlaps are in fact often interpreted by participants as indicating that something additional is happening. Generally speaking, a system of turn-taking is an organizational requirement of any coordinated joint activity or action as people require some way of organizing and managing the contributions of the various persons who are engaged in it. Turns and turn-taking provide the underlying framework of conversation because turns and the specific ways in which they are distributed among participants shape, influence and determine vast phenomena in conversation. Liddicoat (2007:3) points out that "speaker change is a normative process which must be achieved by participants in the conversation. That is to say, turn- taking behaviour is socially constructed, not the result of an inevitable process". What the above observation means is that, the fact that one person speakers at a time most of the time is not as a result of any physical or psycholinguistic constraint on human beings.

There are a variety of strategies or devices used in turn- taking. Wardhough (1985) lists the following: using interjections to signal a request for a turn , (e.g. Mn- hmm, Yeah!); and rising intonation; accepting a turn offered by another speaker by responding to a question or by providing the second pair part of an adjacency pair, completing or adding to something said by the previous speaker, and so on. In order to hold the turn, speakers use devices indicating that they are making a series of remarks: first of all or to begin with, followed by then; after that, next, and expressions such as: another thing, after that, next, another thing, etc, and connectors like: so, because, and however which promote continuity.

Topic Selection/ Management.

The way speakers in a conversation select the topics for discussion and the strategies they use in nominating, developing and changing them, constitute an important dimension of

conversational organization (Richards and Schmidt, 1983). For example, for a conversation to be coherent, speakers must handle topics delicately by respecting the norms concerning the choice of topics. Richards (1990:7) terms this, topicalizing behaviour by which he means bringing up topics, responding to other people's topics; mentioning something, avoiding the mention of something, carrying the discussion one step further, and so forth. Coulthard (1985) also observes:

> we experience, see, hear about events all the time; some are tellable, some aren't and of those that are tellable, some are tellable to everyone, some have restricted audience; some can wait and still retain their interest (p.79).

In the same vein, Richards (1990) points out those participants select a topic as first topic though a process of negotiation.

Adjacency Pairs.

Adjacency pairs are the basic structural units of a conversation. They are automatic sequences that consist of two parts produced by different speakers (Yule, 1996: 17). The concept of adjacency pair was developed by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) who describe it as a sequence of two utterances that follow one another or are adjacent, and has two parts- a first pair part and a second pair part. The kind of first pair part that is used by a speaker determines the kind or range of second pair part the other participant in the conversation can give, as only specific second pair parts can correlate to each first pair part. A question, for example, requires some kind of answer; an invitation requires an acceptance or rejection, a greeting requires a greeting; a complaint requires an apology or a justification and so forth.

The norm in the production of adjacency pairs is for the current speaker, having produced the first part, to stop speaking, and the next speaker mush produce, at that point, a second part to the same pair. If an initial request or greeting does not receive a second part, or if there is a delay, that will be understood to be interactively significant. For instance a silence may indicate disagreement while a delay can signify hesitation, both showing a lack of connection between people in conversation.

Adjacency parings can yield conversational patterns of varying degrees of complexity. 'Pre-sequences' can be used as initial enquiries, to obtain information that will help a person decide how the next pair part will be answered, and insertion sequences can be included in the middle of the pair parts to clarity what has already been said.

Analysis and Discussion

The conversation below is a naturally occurring and spontaneous conversation between two intimate friends (Eze and Uche) . The participants are reasonably educated as they are fresh university graduates.

The conversation stated with an opening conversational move by Eze in exchange 1: *Nwanne, I greet Oh!* This functions as phatic communion which usually constitutes the beginnings and endings of conversation. According to laver (1975, 1981), it normally takes the form of the routine formulae of greeting and parting (Hi! Good morning, greetings! Good- bye etc). It also includes stereotype remarks on issues such as the weather. Eze's use of Phatic communion in this text functions to secure attention, agreement and solidarity with the listener- Uche.

The question in exchange 5: *Guy! Have you heard*? interactively functions not as an interrogative, but as a summon used by Eze to secure a conversational common ground and to introduce a topic for the conversation.

The text, as it is characteristic of conversational English, displays a significant preponderance of in- group markers/slang

In exchanges 1-4, we can see:

1. Eze : Nwanne! (My brother) I greet O !

2. Uche: How far guy?

3. Uche: Udo! (Igbo- peace).

4. Eze: Guy, have you heard?

5. Eze: Oh boy! You mean you were not there

6. If you enter the church eh!

According to Simpson (1997) in- group marker or in- slang are used to close down the social distance between speakers and to proclaim common identity. The more the participants know each other, the more they rely on in- group markers, or in-group slang, abbreviated forms, family or group jokes and so on, to communicate. Simpson (1997: 168) identifies such terms as: pal, guys, dear, mate, etc. as popular in- group markers.

Another feature, which is also diagnostic of conversation is the phenomenon of inexplicitness of expression. The is abundantly in evidence in this text. Inexplicitness in language use is usually attributed to shared background knowledge between the interlocutors and the extreme reliance on the extra-linguistic context in which the conversation is taking place. The ability of participants in a conversation to arrive automatically at interpretations of the unsaid or unwritten is usually used due to pre-existing knowledge structures. According to Yule (1996: 85), these structures function like familiars patterns from previous experience that we use to interpret new experiences.

Features of inexplicitness found in the text include: the use of words and remote references which, when removed from their contexts, become apparently ambiguous. In line 7, Eze asks Uche*: Oh boy, You mean you were not there*. The use of the spatial (place) deixis: *there* here is hazy or unclear and would not have been understood if Uche, the Co-conversationalist had not been present. There is the use of other reference features of language such as the use of the proper nouns in sentences like:

When *Dave* was declared… (line7)

People say that *Chinedu* will be the first victim (line 13) etc. all of which, need to be further explained or expatiated for them to be intelligible.

In the same vein, the anaphoric use of pronominals and demonstratives in line 11 - Eze: <u>He</u> *also delivered a speech and said*… and in line 16-Uche: Hmm, Hmm! <u>*That guy deserves*</u> *whatever he gets*; and line 17-Eze*: <u>He</u> has dealt with people of this state*; is only permissible in spontaneous face-face conversation and rarely present in writing.

There are also instances of in-completeness of many utterances that the co- participant has to rely only on the context or shared - background knowledge to interpret. For instance, in line 8- Eze told Uche: *when Dave was declared*. This utterance, when removed from the context of the speech event, will elicit the question. declared as what? This incompleteness of utterances and indeed, other features of inexplicitness of conversation derives from the fact the possibility of the hearer asking for recapitulation in the course of the discourse, is ever present. In conversation the fact that the participants know each other well meant that they were often able to take a great deal of what they were trying to say for granted.

The data also exhibit another marked feature of conversational English which is randomness of topic or subject- matter and a general lack of planning. We notice the movement, in this conversation, from the topic of Dave's celebration of election victory to the beauty and the serenity of the premises of The Christ Embassy Church; to the request of financial assistance by Uche and finally to Eze counseling Uche to quit some of his bad habits. Spontaneous conversations as opposed to such genres as discussion, debates etc, characteristically lack an overall theme. It is however possible for a participant to interactively guide the course of the conversation towards a given theme. In the text, Uche tactfully guides the conversation to a point that enables him to modestly make his request for financial assistance from Eze without losing face, and Eze, on his own part, strategically steered the conversation to a point where he is able to reprimand Uche for his bad habits without hurting his negative face. Generally, it is observed that a participant can at will, change the topic of a conversation at any point of in the conversation without this being felt to be linguistically of or communicatively inappropriate. In a conversation, it is rarely possible for one to predict when and how it, will send or how it would develop within a period.

Another significant stylistic feature of natural conversation displayed in this conversation, one that has clearly located it in its socio- cultural and sociolinguistic context is the flexibility of language use. This conversation displays significant incidence of code mixing of standard English, the Igbo language and the Nigerian Pidgin. This mixing of different languages and codes as well as the use of in- group slangy expressions are used partially for humorous effect and to indicate familiarity or intimacy. There is a marked inter-sentential and intra-sentential mixing of the *Igbo* language, the Nigerian Pidgin and the Standard English in line: 1- *Nwanne* (brother); 2-*how far guy*, 4- *udo*, (peace);28- *Nna* (father), etc. There is also a preponderant use of the Nigerian pidgin in lines: 3- *I dey . How your end*? Line 6 - *Gist me*; Line 7 *- Ol boy, you mean you were not there…,* line 23 - *Ol boy eh! If you enter the church Eh!* and line 32 -*No wahala*. There is also a preponderant use of popular Nigerian English usage (Nigerianisms). Instances of this occur in such utterances as:

Eze: *He also delivered a speech and said that those who ate government money* …(misappropriated or embezzled government fund) should be ready to account for it (line: 11)

Uche: *Nnaa! I am in dire need of money can you borrow (lend) me some money*? (line 28).

This unguided mixture of languages and codes derives from the nature of extreme informality of conversation. It is significant to note that in informal conversation, any kind of language can occur without its being considered inappropriate or out of place. In fact this feature of Code switching and code-mixing and the permissibility of distinctive Nigerian English idioms can be considered as one of the major characteristics of Nigerian English conversation.

Another general feature of natural conversation, which is not much in evidence in this study, is the feature of normal non-fluency. This occurs when Uche used it to hedge his opinion on a comment made by Eze :

Hmm! Hmm! That guy deserves whatever he gets (line,16). Crystal and Davy (1969: 104) suggest that hesitancy in language use is strongly influenced by periods of creative thinking-the more one is thinking what to say, the more likely hesitation features is to appear. They further suggest that hesitation phenomena are of primary significance in determining the acceptability or otherwise of conversation as a participant who displays perfect fluency in the spoken variety may be frowned upon and more often than not, may be labeled 'a smooth talker" Therefore the occurrence of these feature in conversation is normal and should not be pejoratively regarded as an error.

At the phonological level, not much is revealed in the data. What is readily noticeable in this respect is the use of vocatives in the form of exclamatory expressions of emotions of surprise and excitement. This is evident in line 1-*1 greet O*'; line 6- *Heard what*; line 7- *O1 boy*? Line 10- *Is that so* and line 23- *O1 boy eh.* .

Crystal and Davy (1969) observe that the depth of emotion that is expressed by participants in a conversation depends on the personal relationship between the participants and that the linguistic means of expressing such expressions is a function of the non- segmental features.

Another noticeable feature in display in this conversation is the absence of end-of-utterance pauses which is due to rapid taking up of cues by the participants. This contributes to the feature of extreme informality of this conversation.

At the syntactic level, there is a marked use of short and simple sentences not separated by any kind of pause, especially at the beginning of the conversation. We also observe that the sentences become longer and more complex as topics are introduced and developed and shorten again at the resolution of the topics and arguments at the end of the conversation.

Related to this is the frequency of minor sentences especially as response utterances as used by Uche, (line-4) *Udo;* Eze (Line- 9) *yes now.*

It is this high proportion of short and simple sentences and minor sentences, along with the loosely coordinated structures that has bestowed on conversation its purported characteristics of disjointedness.

Another notable feature at the syntactic level, is the high proportion of interrogative sentences which rhetorically, do not always function as questions as in Eze's use of : *Have you heard*? – line 5; *where else*, line 9, etc.

At the lexical level, this conversation displays a preponderance of simple words and a general avoidance of specialized vocabulary. There is also a high-proportion of colloquialism, clitches, and in- group markers in the conversation .Uche's use of *guy* in line 2 and Eze's use of *no wahala* in line 33 are just a few illustrations of this. Uche's use of *OON* in line 14 illustrates the use of abbreviations familiar to both participants. The use vocabulary in this conversation generally, reflects the common background of the participants.

CONCLUSION

In this study, it has been argued that informal conversation has its own linguistic, stylistic and discourse features different from institutional, formal and written discourse and that it deserves the attention of language scholars. The study is concerned specifically with features of Nigerian English conversation in relation to general features of conversational English. Our analyses have dearly shown that such features as: the use of phatic communion to open conversations, the use in- group markers/ Shang; inexplicitness of expressions; randomness of subject matter, code.- Switching, or language interlarding, the use of simple words and phraseology, clichés, etc, cohere in high proportion in this conversation. The occurrence of these features which have all been identified as general characteristic features of conversational English, in this conversation, has clearly shown that Nigerian English conversation closely approximate the standard English conversation in terms of its interactive, rhetorical, linguistic and natural qualities of language in conversation. In specific terms, Nigerian English conversation, apart from the common core- features which it shares with conversation English generally, also has the features of the use of Nigerian English idioms.

REFERENCES

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978): Universals in Language Usage :Politeness Phenomena. In Goody, E. N. (Ed) *Questions and politeness* . Cambridge: Cambridge university press 56-289.

Coulthard. R. M. (1985). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Harlow: Longman.

Crystal D. and Davy D. (1969) *Investigating English style*. Harlow: longman group Ltd.

Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic criticism and critical practice: Ways of analysing texts*. London: oxford University press .

Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Laver, J. (1975). Communicative Functions of Phatic Communion. In Simpson, P. *Language through literature: An introduction* London: Rutledge

Levinson. S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Liddicoat, A. J. (20070 *An introduction to conversation analysis*. Longman: Continuum.

Sacks, H. (1971). *Mimeo lecture notes*. In Coulthard, M. 1985-

Sacks, H. Schegloff, E. A. and Jefferson. G. (1974 A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn- Taking for Conversation. *Language* 50 . 696-735.

Sinclair, J.M. and Coulthard, M, (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse*.

Thorne, J. P. (1981). Generative grammar and Stylistic Analysis. In Freeman, D. C. (Ed) *Essays in modern stylistics*. New York Methuen. 44-52

Wardhaugh, R. (1985). *How conversation works*. Oxford: Blackwell.

APPENDIX

Setting- At a hotel bar.

1. Eze: nwanne, I greet O!

2. Uche: How Far Guy?

3. Eze: I dey . How your end?

4. Uche: udo

5. Eze: Have you heard?

6. Uche: Heard What? Gist me please.

7. Eze: Old Boy, You mean you were not there- on Sunday.

8. Uche: You mean at Osborn La Palm Hotels

9. Eze: Yes, Now where else?

   When Dave was declared.

   As soon as it was announced,

   The hotel manager ordered all of us to take our brand of beer free of charge.

10. Uche: Is that so, that's good.

11. Eze: He also delivered a speech and said that those who ate government money should be ready to account for it.

12. Uche: That is good news.

13. Eze: People say that chinedu will be the first victim.

14. Uche: Is it the OON?

15. Eze: Yes now, are you a visitor in this town?

16. Uche: Hmm! Hmm! That Guy deserves whatever he gets.

17. Eze: He Has really dealt with people of this state.

18. Uche: Now, he will be made to pay.

19. Eze: My Only concern is for Dave to reduce the school fees and give Abakaliki capital territory a face- lift.

20. Uche: My own is for him to fix our Roads.

21. Eze: Do you Know the church he attends?

22. Uche: They say he attends Christ Embassy Church.

23. Eze: OI Boy Eh ! if you enter the church eh You'll think you   are already in heaven,

24. Uche: And they say he built it almost single- handedly

25. Eze : That is Dave for you, a man of taste and quality.

26. Uche: My guy! I Know you must have made some money during the last election?

27. Eze: Why do you ask?

28. Uche: Nnaa, I Am in dire need of money. Can you burrow me some money?

29. Eze: What do you need same money for?

30. Uche: I need at least 40K to fix My father's abandoned vehicle for mobility sake.

31. Eze: Yea mobility is really a necessity, without it man is grounded.

32. I can only afford to give you N 20k.

33. Uche: No wahala, I ' ll look elsewhere to make it up. Thank you very much

34. Eze: Don't mention, but there is this thing I have been thinking I should tell you.

35. Uche: What is it?

36. Eze: When will you quit these ugly habits of smoking, clubbing and womanizing?

37. Uche: Is that because I have asked you for fianancial assistance?

38. Eze: Don't be offended, it is being on my mind for a some time now.

39. Uche: Ok ! I have heard you, I'lli think about it.

40. Eze: I think we should be going, it's 10 already.

41. Uche: Yes, it is really night.

42. Eze: I am going, call me tomorrow for the money.

43. Uche: See you tomorrow, good night.

44. Eze: Good night.