

## **Pub Interactions in Southwestern Nigeria**

**Ganiu Abisoye Bamgbose**

Lecturer

Department of Mass Media and Writing, Pan-Atlantic University, Lagos, Nigeria  
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria  
Email: [ganibamgbose@gmail.com](mailto:ganibamgbose@gmail.com)

**Temitope Michael Ajayi**

Lecturer

Department of Linguistics and African Languages  
University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria  
Email: [michealtemitope@yahoo.com](mailto:michealtemitope@yahoo.com)

**Submitted: December 18, 2018/ Accepted: July 14, 2019/ Published: December 30, 2019**

---

### **Abstract**

Studies in the area of discourse analysis in Nigeria have explored so many aspects of human life. However, existing studies have glossed over the nature of discussions in pubs. Sourcing data from selected pubs in three southwestern states of Nigeria, this study investigates the nature of interactions in pubs, using register and common ground theoretical framework. Analysing a total of nine (9) excerpts, the study shows that women/ladies, football and politics are three common topics in the discourse in southwestern pubs. The means of conversing is always spoken and this makes for the spontaneous flow of the discussions. Discussions are usually casual despite the fact that affective involvement is usually high. The affective involvement is usually due to the passion people have for the topics identified. Power relation is usually equal and, in few cases where it is not, common ground's coordinating devices like convention, precedence and manifest are utilised to sustain cordiality and avoid domination or intimidation. The study concludes that language use in pubs has its peculiarity and uniqueness and therefore deserves linguistic enquiry.

**Keywords:** pubs, register, common ground, coordinating devices, southwestern Nigeria

---

### **Introduction**

Pubs in Nigeria are called beer parlours. Like in other parts of the world, they are relaxation centres where people visit to drink and meet with their friends. Most pubs serve mainly alcoholic drinks. In Nigeria, one can safely say there are two major dispositions towards pubs: those who see them as a good place to hang

out and for relaxation and refreshments, and those who on the grounds of religion or morality frown on these places. To this latter group, these places are not meant for people who have dignity. In fact, this notion was once experienced by one of the authors of this paper. As a ‘born again’ Christian, he<sup>1</sup> visited two friends that he had not seen in a long time. In the course of their interaction, one of them offered to entertain them (the trio) and then suggested that they visited a nearby pub for drinks and pepper soup. He was a bit reluctant because he felt such a place was not meant for decent fellows let alone a born again Christian. On the contrary, a personal encounter with people in this former group has shown that, beyond relaxation and refreshments, testimonies of great experiences, help and connections are formed from the interactions that take place in these public places. While it is not the focus of this paper to take a position as to whether it is decent to visit pubs or not, it is considered expedient to investigate language use in this domain. This is with the aim of understanding the nature of the discourse in this domain of language use, a phenomenon that has been overtly glossed over in scholarship, especially in linguistic studies. Even the few studies on pubs have left the discourse of pubs unexamined.

### **Situating the current study**

The very little attention paid to pub-related scholarship, especially in Nigeria, explains why there is scanty literature on the phenomenon. Some of the extant studies in this regard include Dumbili (2013), Ojedokun and Ademuson (2014), Bada (2014), Dumbili (2015), Lamidi (2016), Dumbili and Henderson (2017), Dumbili and Williams (2017), and Ayodele et al (2018). Dumbili (2013) attempts an exploration of the factors responsible for the changing pattern of alcohol consumption in Nigeria, particularly as it relates to the ‘new trend of excessive alcohol consumption habit’ noticed among Nigerians. He observes that there is a fundamental shift in the drinking orientation of many Nigerians, as the complex socio-cultural role alcohol played in the primordial African (and Nigerian) traditional society has taken a new dimension. He notes that disintegration of traditional values, non regulation, advertising, among others are key factors responsible for the changing patterns of alcohol consumption among Nigerians.

Ojedokun and Ademuson (2014) is a sociological exploration of the motivation for engaging in beer parlour business by married women as well as possible challenges confronting them. These scholars observe that, while the need

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the researchers

for self actualisation and empowerment is a major reason for married women's engagement in beer parlour business in Nigeria, negative perception by some members of the public is a serious challenge faced by these women. Similarly, studies such as Dumbili and Henderson (2017), Dumbili and Williams (2017), Dumbili (2015) and Bada and Adebisi (2014) have largely focused on the gendered alcohol consumption behaviour of Nigerians, with particular emphasis on the drinking behaviour of women in Nigeria, and young adults' drinking habit in Nigeria. Largely, these studies emphasise the fact that gender plays a significant role in the alcohol consumption behaviour of Nigerians. Lamidi (2016) examines how humour is pragmatically deployed in the 'beer parlour politics' section of the *Nairaland*<sup>2</sup> forum with particular focus on the linguistic devices employed by participants to instantiate humour on the platform. Ayodele *et al.* (2018), from a socio-psychological perspective, opine that operation of pubs and beer parlours is a strong factor that accounts for high rate of crime and criminality in Lagos State, Nigeria, for instance.

However, as pointed out earlier, none of these aforementioned studies has attempted an exploration of the nature of pub discourse. This paper, thus, is an essential intervention in this regard.

## Theoretical Orientation

This study adopts, as its theoretical framework, register and common ground theories. While register caters for the semantic aspect of the data following the submission of Mathiessen (1993) that register is primarily a semantic concept, common ground theory caters for the contextual clues that are found in the data.

Odeunmi (2007) sees register as "a broad concept that covers all forms and kinds of communication in terms of the linguistic forms used, the activities performed, the participants and their roles in the communication, the medium of communication, and the interconnectivity between one linguistic form and another". The term register can be discussed from two perspectives: broad and narrow labels. From the broad perspective, register means the words that are used in a particular field. In this sense, register will mean jargon. From the narrow perspective, we are looking at the use of register from a linguistic angle; especially among functional linguists. Register in this specific regard is "a sort of social genre of linguistic usage" (Stockwell, 2002, p. 7). Register here is sometimes described as a sociolect, for example, the language of a newspaper article. It is in this narrow sense of register as a sociolect (language use in the society) that this study aims at exploring the language of pubs in southwestern Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup> A popular online socio-political platform on which Nigerians, particularly youths discuss socio-political issues.

Halliday (1978) deals extensively with the three dimensions of register: field, mode and tenor. Field, according to him, refers to the “on-going activity and the particular purpose that the use of language is serving within the context of that activity” (Halliday, 1978, p. 62). The words employed depict the activity that is being carried out. It is concerned with the choice of words employed; whether it is technical or not. The field of discourse includes the topic and the interactants. Eggins (1994, p. 52) considers mode as “the role language is playing in the interaction”. Mode concerns “what it is that the participants (of a transaction) are expecting language to do for them in that situation” (Hasan and Halliday, 1985, p. 12). It is also concerned with the medium of communication, whether spoken or written. Halliday (1978) views mode as covering Dell Hyme’s channel, key and genre (Odebunmi 2006). Channel has to do with the medium through which the message intended to be disseminated is passed across. It can be through signal, smoke, writing, speech, etc. The key is concerned with the tone and manner with which something is uttered or written, that is, whether the message is persuasive or dissuasive. Genre refers to the type of event that is taking place, such as lecture, poem, letter, sermon, etc.

Tenor has to do with who are taking part in the transaction as well as the nature of the participants, their status and roles (Hasan and Halliday, 1985, p. 12). It deals with the role and status relationships between interlocutors in a situation. The tenor of discourse can be examined from the perspectives of three continua as identified by Polyton (1985) which are: power, affective involvement, and contact (Odebunmi 2006). Power deals with the distribution of influence between the interactants. It can be symmetrical or asymmetrical. Affective involvement is concerned with whether the interactants have high or low emotional involvement and committed in a situation. Contact refers to whether the role being played by the interactants causes them to have frequent contacts or not (Eggins 1994). These three aspects of register are used to establish how meaning is generated and how relationships are sustained in pub discourse.

Enfield (2008) defines “common ground” as a resource that speakers exploit in inviting and deriving pragmatic inference, as a way to cut costs of speech production by leaving much to be inferred by the listener. The common ground theory of communication is a concept proposed by Clark and Brennan (1991). The theory refers to “mutual knowledge, mutual beliefs, and mutual assumptions” that are believed to be essential for successful communication between people. Central to the theory of common ground is its emphasis on the context of language. Clark finds, for example, that all people take as common ground aspects of human nature such as physical senses, communal lexicons (i.e., sets of word conventions

in individual communities), and cultural facts, norms, and procedures. Clark (1996) argues that face-to-face communication, rather than written language, should be the basis of a theory of language. Common ground, like all other theories, has its tenets, ranging from grounding, to cost of grounding, constraints on grounding, coordinating devices, etc. Relevant to this present study is coordinating devices. Coordinating devices are rationale for mutual expectations that make partners believe that they will converge on the same joint action (Clark 1996). The relationship between coordination and the common ground is two-fold. On the one hand, the process of coordination can be described as updating this common ground through the addition of new information (in the form of coordination devices). On the other hand, coordination devices are nothing more than a shared basis meant to enable the coordination of participatory action that would eventually contribute to joint actions. The coordination devices are explicit agreement, the conventions, precedent and the manifest. They are briefly discussed below:

- Explicit agreements are occurrences of dialogues in which parties explicitly communicate their own intentions. If two persons, for instance, want to meet at a certain place, they often solve that problem by talking to each other and agreeing on the place and the time.
- Conventions range from rules and regulations to less formal codes of appropriate conduct. Conventions can also be more “local” and less bound to the community; for instance, three persons who want to meet for lunch every Tuesday (a joint action) can agree on meeting at a certain place at 12:15. They then each go there at that time every Tuesday (their participatory action). In this case, going to the meeting place is not a habit but a convention that has been set by participants of the joint activity. According to Clark (1996), this is because “that is what they mutually expect each other to do, based on the regularity in their recent behaviour.” As we see in this example, an explicit agreement can evolve into a convention if it is established as the agreed solution to a recurrent problem. For the purpose of this study, we shall be accounting for elements of Yoruba cultural convention in the data since the study is situated in southwestern Nigeria, a region occupied mainly by the Yoruba.
- Precedent applies to norms and expectations developed within the on-going experience of the joint activity. If we remember that our friend Kunle was in a place on Friday afternoon of a previous

week, we may anticipate that he will be there this week. Unlike the convention of meeting every Tuesday at 12:15, precedents do not rest on mutual agreement about an action, they are just anticipations based on the previous experiences of participants.

- Manifest is also called “perceptual salience”: it captures situations in which the environment (or the available information) makes the next move obvious within the many actions that could clearly be chosen. During a surgery operation, for example, pointing at a certain element of anatomy can make it obvious to all those involved what to do next.

## **Methodology and Data Discussion**

Following the arguments of Bernard (1994) and deMunck and Sobo (1998), this study employed an ethnographic method of data collection, particularly participant and non-participant observation techniques. This method has been described as the most reliable means of collecting natural sociolinguistic data that reflect the true language behaviour/practice of research participants. The data for this study comprised ten interactions among pub customers in ten randomly sampled pubs in three southwestern Nigerian states: Lagos, Ogun and Oyo between 2015 and 2017, three of which involved the researchers as pub customers. The interactions were observed and detailed in a field note. During data elicitation, particular attention was paid to the linguistic and paralinguistic clues deployed by the participants. Participants in the data are labelled as speakers: speaker 1, speaker 2 and so on. The analysis followed a pattern of discussing the three components of register as found in each excerpt (interaction) by carefully identifying and engaging the linguistic and nonlinguistic elements in each excerpt and then further discussed the contextual factors in the excerpts in line with the analytical tools of common ground. The discursive interactions were transcribed and presented in the forms they were uttered with the glosses presented in parentheses after each excerpt in order to avoid the loss of the relevant contexts that are embedded in the participants’ mode of communication.

## **Data Analysis**

This section focuses on the analysis of the observed interactions. The dominant language in the conversations/interactions is Pidgin English. This is because Pidgin English is the lingua franca that unifies the Nigerian heterogeneous community especially in informal contexts such as pubs. A background is given for each of the excerpts for a clearer understanding of the analysis that follows.

## Excerpt 1

The excerpt below centres on the controversy that ensued between two football enthusiasts in a pub over the performance of a player, Benzema.

Speaker 1: This Benzema na useless player. I no know why dem never sell am troway (Benzema is a useless player. I don't know why he hasn't been sold out)

Speaker 2: Sell who? Sell Benzema? Guy you know ball at all? Nawa for you o (Sell who? Benzema? Are you sure you know about football?)

Speaker 1: Guy abeg I no follow you talk o. I no want insult because we dey look ball together o, abeg (I wasn't talking to you pls. I wouldn't tolerate insult because we're watching match together)

Speaker 2: oya no vex (ok I'm sorry)

The field of discourse in this excerpt is football. This subject matter is made clear through certain vocabulary and lexical collocation as deployed by the participants. Common nouns like *player* and *football* and the proper noun Benzema (a French footballer who plies his trade in Real Madrid) make the topic of discourse clear. Collocations like *useless players*, *sell out*, *know football* make the argument of the discourse clear. At the level of mode, the excerpt is spoken and is therefore marked by spontaneity and immediacy. This makes the exchange succinct as the speakers are both physically present at the setting. For the tenor, the discourse is a fan-to-fan relationship. Power relation is both symmetrical and asymmetrical, as each fan can freely express his or her opinion about a fan or a team but also resorts to cultural expectations when confrontations arise, especially between persons with clear age differences. Affective involvement can be said to be high as each fan tends to be keen on his view about the player being discussed. Convention, as one of the coordination devices of common ground, seems to resolve this equal power of all fans watching football together as one of the fans quickly resorts to the African or precisely Yoruba cultural convention where age differences must be considered, irrespective of closeness or intimacy. Speaker 2, sharing the same (Yoruba) socio-ideological notion of showing deference to superior interlocutors in interpersonal interactions, immediately adheres to this cultural convention by tendering apology, knowing he had earlier flouted the norm.

## Excerpt 2

The interaction in the excerpt below involves people who do not have previous relationship or intimacy and the topic centres on the Nigerian politics immediately after the 2015 presidential election which brought Muhammodu Buhari into power as the president of Nigeria.

Speaker 1: Buhari, Buhari, Buhari, the Buhari has come now. There is no money to eat. Even in Jonathan's time, things were not this hard

Speaker 2: My brother let me tell you something. If a country will develop, one thing we must do is to control the economy. See I was not so young during IBB's era, probably you were (voices were heard laughing) but seriously that's not the point. The point is there was money in circulation during IBB's era but the country was almost ruined economically. So I'll advise we just give Buhari sometime.

Speaker 1: Ok sir o

Speaker 3: Hunger should sha not kill us (All laughed out)

The field of this excerpt is politics. The lexical choices show that the discussion centres on the Nigerian political situation. Proper and common nouns like *Buhari*, *Jonathan*, *IBB*, *country*, *economy* all point to this field of discourse. Other phrases, syntagmatic relations and collocations such as: *control the economy*, *money in circulation*, *ruined economically*, point to a more specific aspect of the polity being discussed, which is the economic state of the country. The mode is spoken and it makes for a free flow discourse. The tenor is one between formal and informal. This is because although the setting is informal, the topic of discourse is one that is serious as it affects the life of all the discourse participants. Power in this discussion can be said to be unequal as there is a deliberate attempt by speaker 2 to show this age difference. This is achieved through the coordinating device of precedence with which speaker 2 makes reference to a past administration humorously with the belief that speaker 1 knows little or nothing about this past administration. However, this unequal power relationship is meted out through the use of 'my brother' by speaker 1 which serves as a cultural attempt to create familiarity with speaker 2. It is most likely the case that speaker 2 gains the attention of speaker 1 through this cultural affiliation of siblinghood.

## Excerpt 3

The excerpt is about a casual discussion on the way women dress and its psychological effect on men. The topic ensued at the instance of a lady who passed



in front of three friends who were having a chat. The three participants in the discourse jokingly contributed their turns to the topic.

Speaker 1: Chimooooo, these babes no go kill person with these leggings wey dem dey wear (Oh God, these ladies won't kill me with **these leggings** they wear)

Speaker 2: My brother, I think say na only me the thing dey disturb o. (My brother, I thought I alone get affected by the sight of it)

Speaker 3: My own be say the moment I see any woman yansh inside da tin, chai, even if I dey write exam, I must fail da paper ( For me, once I see a lady's buttocks inside it, Oh, even if I were writing an exam, I sure will fail that paper)

The field of this excerpt is chitchat about ladies. A lady who was wearing a pair of leggings passed by three young men who were involved in a conversation and she caught their attention. The first speaker exclaimed at the sight of the lady's buttocks and others cued into the gist. Lexical items like *babes*, *leggings*, *women* point at the focus of the discourse. The mode is spoken and interpersonal as the participants come into the discussion spontaneously. The tenor is casual and power relation was equal among the participants because they were friends and contemporaries and the three contributed freely and spontaneously to the discussion. The coordinating devices of manifest and convention were employed in the excerpt as seen in the deployment of certain words. The exclamatory discourse marker *Chimooo* which literally means God in Ibo (a language spoken by Eastern Nigerians) and typically used to express surprise is used by speaker 1 to make manifest a topic which immediately caught the attention of his other friends and an interaction ensued immediately. Convention surfaced in the use of *brother* by speaker 2 as a discursive strategy for creating rapport or chitchat out of speaker 1's comment.

#### Excerpt 4

The excerpt centres on known political commentators in Nigeria, Femi Fani-Kayode, who was also a minister in the Jonathan led administration which preceded the Buhari led administration and Nnamdi Kanu, leader of a group of agitators for the secession of the Ibo people of Nigeria. Speakers 1 and 2 in the excerpt know each other while speaker 3 has separately come to the pub.

Speaker 1: Kunle, have you seen today's paper?

Speaker 2: No. Any catchy news?

Speaker 1: This Fani Kayode of a guy will not shut his mouth until he lands in jail.

Speaker 3: Waoh! What a coincidence. Exactly what I was saying to my wife this morning when I was listening to news. If not that he's even a bastard Yoruba child, should someone of his age even talk to an elderly man like Buhari that way?

Speakers 1&2: Abi o

Speaker 1: Anyway, he will join his noisy friend Kanu soon.

The names mentioned in the discourse show it is a discussion on Nigerian politics. Femi Fani-Kayode, Buhari and Nnamdi Kanu are all contemporary Nigerian political actors. Apparently, the discussion centres on Femi Fani-Kayode who was a key player in Nigerian politics during President Goodluck Jonathan's administration. The mode is spoken and it is marked by spatial/interpersonal distance, especially when one understands that speakers 1 and 2 have a relationship before the discourse and speaker 3 is a different person who is not known to speakers 1 and 2 prior to the interaction. The tenor can also be said to be casual as the participants do not seem to be so connected to the topic of the discourse. On this ground, affective involvement can be said to be low. Convention helps to make sense of speaker 3's reference to age as the Yoruba culture frowns at a younger person confronting an elderly person as done by Fani Kayode, in the news being discussed by these men. It is a precedent among the discussants that Fani Kayode was at the time of this discourse a chieftain in the then ruling political party in Nigeria, Peoples Democratic Party (PDP), and he had on several occasions castigated Muhammodu Buhari, who was at that time the presidential flag bearer of the opposition party as a form of propaganda and loyalty to his party, All Progressives Congress (APC). Fani Kayode was, however, seen to have flouted the Yoruba cultural convention which demands giving respect to elders irrespective of political allegiance. Precedence also helps to understand the reference to Kanu who, at the time, had been jailed by the Federal Government of Nigeria for his anti-government activities which border on the secession of the eastern part of the country under the umbrella of Republic of Biafra. The reference to Kanu clearly shows that all of the speakers know about his imprisonment.

### **Excerpt 5**

The interaction in this excerpt takes place between two football fans during a match. Evidently one of the speakers is a supporter of Chelsea Football Club while the other is not.

Speaker 1: For Heaven's sake, what's the problem with Mourinho, shee e no fit comot Terry ni? Abi which kind wahala be this now

(For Heaven's sake what's the problem with Mourinho, can't he substitute Terry? Or what kind of problem is this?)

Speaker 2: Una never see anything. Make una do as una dey do na. Una kuku get money (You guys haven't seen anything yet. You should better do as usual. Good you have money)

Speaker 1: Before nko, if he manage finish this season, make e just pass field dey go Portugal after last match (Definitely, if he survives as a coach for the rest of this season, he should just travel to Portugal from Stadium after the last match.)

The field of discourse is football as indicated by words like *Mourinho* (a former coach of Chelsea Football Club who now coaches Manchester United), *Terry*, *match* and *stadium*. The interaction shows that a football match is going on and perhaps a particular player is not playing so well as expected. The mode is oral and it aids the spontaneity of the discourse. The tenor is a fan versus fan gist with equal power and a high affective involvement as seen in the utterance of speaker 1 who passionately condemns Mourinho's decision not to substitute one of the players, Terry. The high affective involvement is seen in the use of the word *problem* and its Yoruba equivalent, *wahala* which indicates the writer's interest in the team and his fear that the team might lose the match if the coach does not make a substitution. The common ground shared by the two speakers makes it easy for speaker 1 to know that the usual thing speaker 2 is referring to is Chelsea's regular habit of sacking coaches. This common ground also helps the interpretation of Portugal as speaker 1 knows and also knows that the other speaker knows that Mourinho's hometown is Portugal.

### Excerpt 6

The excerpt is an exchange between two lovers of beers who try to portray their choices as the best kind of beer in town.

Speaker 1: Oh boy nothing like Shine Shine bobo (Oh boy, there's nothing like shine shine <sup>3</sup>bobo)

Speaker 2: Dey deceive yourself, na watin go let you dey piss up and down you like abi? Drink stout make you know say you be man. (You're deceiving yourself. So you like what will make you urinate frequently? Drink stout and feel like a man)

Speaker 1: Oya no vex na. Make everybody answer him papa surname (both men laughed) Please don't be angry, let everybody bear their surnames.

<sup>3</sup> The expression is often used to refer to Star Lager Beer in the Nigerian context.

The discussion reveals the field as being one that centres on alcohol; with names like *shine shine bobo* (Star Beer), stout, beer and drink. The argument revolves around beer preference. This is seen in the speakers' turns as they try to justify their brand with the former asserting that there is no beer like stout and the latter nullifying the claim on the ground that the former's choice causes constant urination. The mode is oral and highly interpersonal; this makes the discussion lively. The tenor is that of a beer lover versus another beer lover who in a jovial and highly spirited manner show support for their preferred brands of beer. There is an equal power relation as both end up happily sticking to their preferred brands of beer. Common ground makes for a successful communication as Star beer is referred to as *shine shine bobo*, a conventional name given to the beer in the Nigerian context.

### Excerpt 7

The excerpt is a gossip between two friends on ladies and their love for fun.

Speaker 1: But God know say all these girls sabi like flexing. See babe wey been tell me say she dey go church this afternoon don hear music now tell me say she dey come meet me now now (God knows girls so like outings. A babe that had told me she was going to church heard music and immediately said she is coming over here to meet me.)

Speaker 2: Naso their life be o. Dem no dey ever carry am (That's how their life is. They don't ever miss out of fun.)

Speaker 1: Carry watin? Na 25 unit course, ahahahahahahahahah (Carry what? It's a 25 unit course) (Both men laughed)

Speaker 2: To carry am na extra year.

Again the discourse field here is women or ladies. That is evident with the use of words like *girls*, *babe* and *she*. The talk is about the disposition of ladies towards outings. The interactants delightfully shared their belief that ladies do not, for any reason, miss out of any opportunity of a convivial gathering. The mode is spoken and has high interpersonal flow. The tenor shows a jovial mood and power relation is equal as both parties express their opinions about women with a level of affective involvement. The common ground of the university grading system helped speaker 1 to make sense of speaker 2's expression: they don't ever carry it. This common ground was built on when speaker 1 made an amusing reaction to it and both men laughed. Speaker 2 builds on the common ground of the university grading system by comparing a lady's absence from a social conviviality to having to repeat a session. This unpalatable experience in the life of any student is likened to a lady's emotional state when she misses the opportunity of a social outing.

### Excerpt 8

The excerpt below is an exchange between three young undergraduate students whose institutions are on nationwide strike. They are seen talking about the strike action during their drinking leisure.

Speaker 1: Me I'm tired o. what is this gist about another ASUU strike now. When person wan graduate for this life? (I am tired. When will one get to graduate?)

Speaker 2: Oh boy me no even dey reason that one again. We sha go graduate one day (I have stopped thinking about it. I know we'll graduate someday)

Speaker 3: My children, so it was in our time too. I spent six years on a four-year course back then in Ife. Let's just pray God help this country.

The field of discourse here is education as evident in lexical items like *ASUU* (Academic Staff Union of University), *strike*, *graduate* and *course*. The topic centres on strike in Nigerian universities. The mode is spoken and can be said to be spatial/interpersonal due to the involvement of speaker 3 who is actually distant from speakers 1 and 2. The tenor is somewhat formal because of the topic being discussed. Power relation differs as speaker 3 is evidently older and more experienced than speakers 1 and 2. Affective involvement can be said to be high as all participants in the discourse have personal involvement with the experience being discussed. Speaker 3 adopts a cultural convention as a discursive strategy for contributing to the ongoing discourse. He achieves this by referring to speakers 1 and 2 as his children which is an extended kinship term peculiar to Nigerians. Nigerians conventionally assume that anyone who is old enough to give birth to a person can assume the role of a parent both in their linguistic choices and societal expectations. This justifies Speaker 3's contribution to the discourse which was presented as a succor, in form of a prayer, to the two other speakers as a way of playing a culturally expected fatherly role.

### Excerpt 9

The excerpt is an exchange of pleasantries between relatively distant friends who only get to meet at the pub.

Speaker 1: Bro, how na ( How are you, brother?)

Speaker 2: Heey my brother. Didn't see you sitting o. How is work na?

Speaker 1: We are managing o. How *huzzle* and your people na? (How is work and family)

Speaker 2: We thank God o and my children?

Speaker 1: Dem dey eat eba (They are eating well)

The field of this excerpt is a casual exchange of pleasantries. It is the case that when people meet regularly at social gatherings like pubs, they soon become friends and begin to extend family ties and love to one another. Lexical items like *work*, *your people*, *children* are indications of the casualness of the discourse. The mode of discourse is, of course, spoken and spontaneous. The tenor is familial as seen in the exchange of pleasantries by the participants. The conventional use of words like *brother* and *my children* outside their standard usage makes for a warm rapport between the discourse participants and foregrounds the cultural convention of extended family ties among Nigerians.

### Conclusion

This study has examined language use in pubs in three southwestern states with a view to investigating the patterns of discourse in the interactions which ensue among the convivial participants in the discourse. The study finds that language fulfils a high interactional function in these places as people relax and chat about many topics. Using the instrument of register as a theoretical guide, the study shows that women/ladies, politics and football are three common topics/fields among discussants in pubs in southwestern Nigeria. The mode of discourse is at all times spoken. The oral nature of this kind of discourse often makes for spontaneous and free flow discussions. Tenor reveals that most discussions tend to be casual even when there is high affective involvement. Power relation is mostly equal and in very few instances where there is power inequality, some elements of coordinating devices in common ground were used to maintain cordiality in the discussions. Findings of the paper attest to the fact that language use in pubs can be topical and reveal discourse patterns. Further research can investigate the patterns of discourse in pubs in other climes. In addition, further studies can be conducted on the pragmatics of interpersonal relations in the conversations which ensue during conviviality in pubs.

## References

- Ayodele, J. O., Adeleke, K. H., and Gandonu M. B. (2018). Crime and adolescent drug use in Lagos, Nigeria. *Sociology International Journal*, 2(2):64–73
- Bada, F.O. and Adebisi, D. R. (2014). Alcohol consumption behaviour among secondary school students in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4 (3), 507-510.
- Bernard, H. S. (1994). *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press
- Clark, H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, H. and Brennan, S. (1991). *Grounding in communication*. In L.B. Resnick, J.M. Levine and S.D. Teasley (Eds.) *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 127-149). American Psychological Association: Washington DC.
- deMunck, V. C. and Sobo, Ellisa J. (Eds) (1998). *Using methods in the field: a practical introduction and casebook*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Dumbili, E.W. (2013) Changing patterns of alcohol consumption in Nigeria: an exploration of responsible factors and consequences. *Medical Sociology online*, 7 (1), 20-33.
- Dumbili E. W. (2015). ‘What a man can do, a woman can do better’: gendered alcohol consumption and (de) construction of social identity among young Nigerians. *BMC Public Health*, 15, 167.
- Dumbili, E. W and Henderson, L (2017), Mediating alcohol use in Eastern Nigeria: a qualitative study exploring the role of popular media in young people’s recreational drinking. *Health Education Research*, 32, 279–291.
- Dumbili, E. W. and Williams, C (2017). Awareness of alcohol advertisements and perceived influence on alcohol consumption: a qualitative study of Nigerian university students. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 25(1), 74-82.
- Eggs, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Pinter.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Hassan, R. (1991). *Language, context and text: Aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lamidi, I. M. (2016). Humour markers and their interpretations in the Nairaland virtual community . <https://semanticsarchive.net/archive/mm4ytiwm/lamidihumor.pdf> (Accessed 30 December, 2018).
- Matthiessen, C. (1993). Register in the Round: Diversity in a Unified Theory of R Register Analysis. In M. Ghadessy (Ed.), *Register Analysis* (pp. 221-292). London and New York: Pinter publishers.
- Odebunmi, A. (2006). A Pragmatic reading of Ahmed Yerima's proverbs in Yemoja, Attahiru, and Dry leaves on Ukan trees. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. 3(2), 153-169.
- Odebunmi, A. (2007). Meaning expressions of some English register. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*. Issue 21.
- Ojedokun, U. A. and Ademuson, A. O. (2017). Gender role and vocational experiences of married women beer parlour operators in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Ibadan Journal of Sociology*, 6 (1), 67-84.
- Poyton, C. (1985). *Language and gender: Making the difference*. Geelong.vic: Deakin
- Stockwell, P. (2002). *Sociolinguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.