



A Survey of Nigerian Internet English

Bernadette Ogbonna^{[a],*}

^[a]School of Media and Communication, Pan-Atlantic University, Lagos, Nigeria.

* Corresponding author.

Received 12 December 2024; accepted 26 January 2025

Published online 26 February 2025

Abstract

This study offers a survey of Nigerian Internet English. Nigerian Internet English is in focus due to its multi-genre character. Specifically, the study aims to establish the status of this multi-category, multi-genus, variety of English. From a review of existing literature on the genre, this study poses a pertinent question thus: Is Nigerian Internet English a variety of Nigerian English? Deploying data from secondary sources of existing literature, this study aims to empirically demonstrate the principal language component of Nigerian Internet English and to establish its linguistic relationship with Nigerian English variety. The study is situated within variation linguistics and relevant theoretical concepts are evoked to illuminate the discussion. Specifically, the theoretical concept of common core is deployed to establish the language components of Nigerian Internet English. The study finds that the common core features of Nigerian English are fully attested in Nigerian Internet English. From the review of literature, the study distills a thesis thus: Nigerian English is a principal component of Nigerian Internet English and Nigerian Internet English is a variety of Nigerian English.

Key words: Nigerian Internet English; Nigerian English; Common core features; Principal language component

Ogbonna, B. (2025). A Survey of Nigerian Internet English. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 30(1), 66-79. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/13723>
 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/13723>

1. INTRODUCTION

Nigerian Internet English

Nigerian Internet English, the variety of English used in the Nigerian cyberspace today, is a sub-variety / local / national variety of the world Internet English - an emerging variety of the English language today studied in contemporary English linguistics. This global English variety, existing only in the written mode, has been labeled “Internet English” by Crystal (2005). Internet English is investigated in the emerging linguistic field of “netlinguistics” proposed by Posteguillo (2002), “internet Linguistics” offered by Crystal (2005), “web linguistics” suggested by Bergh & Zanchetta (2008), “linguistic studies on social media (LSSM)” posited by Sun, Wang & Feng (2021) or “online English” coined by Baron (2008) and characteristically used by Mbarachi (2015, 2018). The Nigerian, local, sub-variety of the world Internet English is in focus in this paper.

Being a language local sub-variety used in the cyberdomain, Nigerian online English is made up of multiple cybergenres. Its genres: blogs, emails, Facebook, IM/ chat, Instagram, Internet Relay Chat (IRC), Nairaland forum, Naijapals platform, SMS, Twitter and Facebook pages of some Nigerian newspapers, Yahoo chat, and other synchronous and asynchronous sub-genres of the Nigerian cyberdomain, have been profusely examined with the aim to characterise and describe the language used therein.

Now in the 3rd decade of scholarship on it, Nigerian Internet English commands a robust literature. This genre has been described from various linguistic perspectives. Some of the descriptions illuminate the computer-actuated features of the medium and aver it to be a variety of the world Internet English. Yet other accounts illustrate the medium as a variety of Nigerian English, relying on the presence of attested features of Nigerian English found in it. The present study scans the body of existing

literature on Nigerian Internet English with the aim to distill therefrom, its dominant language component. Specifically, the study aims to answer the question: What is the principal language component of Nigerian Internet English, with its multi genre character?

This study is situated within variation linguistics and relevant theoretical concepts and methodologies are evoked to elucidate the perception under interrogation.

In section two the review of literature is presented; in section three the methodology adopted is discussed; in section four the data are presented and in section five the conclusion is stated.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Evolution of Scholarship on Nigerian Internet English

The evolution of scholarship on Nigerian Internet English developed spontaneously, from the debut of the Internet and the social media in Nigeria in 2001. Nigerian linguists observed in Nigerian social media communications, a new kind of English writing which differed markedly from the conventional English writing, and thus commenced scholarly investigations into it. On its inception in Nigeria, research in Internet English developed steadily and progressively and now boasts of a robust literature of data-driven studies and library research output.

2.2 An Overview of Studies on Nigerian Internet English

An overview of the literature on Nigerian Internet English is presented in this section. The review of studies does not claim to be exhaustive; it is only a sample of the body of literature that currently exists on the genre. The studies reviewed are those that have received the most frequent citations and are accessible online. From the body of existing literature on Nigerian Internet English, this study distills three broad perspectives / orientations in the description of the genre. They are

- studies that describe computer-actuated features of the genre and specify it to be a variety of world Internet / online English
- studies that describe various linguistic features of the genre
- studies that observe features of Nigerian English in Nigerian Internet English and designate it a variety of Nigerian English

The review of literature presented here is organised around these three categories of studies on Nigerian Internet English.

2.2.a. Studies That Describe Computer-Actuated Features of Nigerian Internet English and Specify It to Be a Variety of World Internet English

Taiwo (2008) explores the forms and functions of SM texts messages written by Nigerian students. Findings

show “contractions, shortenings, ing-clippings and other forms of clipping, initialisms, acronyms, letter/number homophones, misspellings, nonconventional spellings, and accent stylization” (p.975). Shoki & Oni (2008) examines the semiotic features in the SMS communications of Nigerian university students. Findings reveal “universal non-linguistic signs such as emotive icons (emoticons), emotive texts (emotexts), and iconic linguistic signs such as abronyms (multifarious shortenings)” (pp. 21 - 22). Feuba (2009) offers an “inventory of the linguistic and cultural specificities that have forged mobile phone SMS (short message service) culture in Cameroon and Nigeria, with the aim to show the similitude as well as differences that exist between text messages in both countries” (p.25). Findings show similarities in the linguistic features of SMS texts in both word countries to be “reduction, truncation, letter/number homophones, phonetic respelling, accent stylisations, omission of punctuation, “G” clipping, lack of word inter spacing, use of onomatopoeic expressions/exclamations as well as complex capitalisations” (pp.25 & 39) The present study is concerned with the inventory of linguistic features from Nigeria. Lamidi (2012) investigates the language used in Nairaland. Findings show features of internet English such as shortening of words, use of symbols such as @) and & in place of words, abbreviations and sound based coinages such as LOL. Uyanne (2012) describes the language of Nigerian Short Message Service (SMS) texts as “a variety of written English with a simple sentence structure marked with shortening of words”, “emphasising written sounds in its lexical and syntactic variants and retaining both written and spoken attributes” (p.107). Adebilieje (2014) is an examination of the morphosyntactic structure of text messages exchanged by Nigerian university students. Findings show that morphemes in the text messages are derived from symbols, pictures, phonics (p.1). Odey, Ndobbo & Endong (2014) assesses the effects of SMS texting on the academic writing of Nigerian university students. Findings show that the students “transfer SMS language such as vowel deletion, graphemes, alphanumeric homophony, punctuation ‘errors’ and initialisations into their academic writing” (p.83). Endong & Essoh (2015) explores orality features in SMS texts composed by Nigerians. The principal orality features found are graphemes, vowel deletions, initialisations, onomatopoeic expressions, and truncation among others. Mbarachi & Okoro (2016) investigates discourse features in two Nigerian online newspapers -*Vanguard newspapers* online and *The Punch newspapers* online. They find features of Internet English: shortening devices and verbal language (p.44). Udofot & Mbarachi (2016) offers a broad survey of computer-actuated language change in some Nigerian digital communication platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, *Punch newspapers* online and Nairaland forum. The features of Internet

English they find are “respelling/ shortening of words, alphanumeric features, the use of emoticons and smileys, the use of acronyms and initialisms” (pp.782 -783). Udoh & Usoro (2016) examines the “codes” exchanged by undergraduates in their internet communications (p.128). Findings show the predominant use of Internet based codes. “Codes” here refers to abbreviations, shortening of words, respellings, word- letter homophones and sound-based coinages of words. Olojede, Ebim & Abioye (2018) evaluates the stylistic features of Facebook pages of Nigerian undergraduate students. Findings show a “socialised language” (p.1) of the social media, the deviant use of punctuation marks, special characters, unconventional spellings, and contracted words. Nwala & Tamunobelem (2019) examines the language used by Nigerians on Facebook. Findings show copious use of cyberslang, acronyms, morphological shortenings, initialisms, contractions and neologisms (p.176). Ubong & Udofia (2020) explores computer-actuated language change in the WhatsApp communications of Nigerian undergraduates. They observe codeswitching, abbreviations, acronyms, the absence of punctuation, slangs / stylised spellings (pp.191-197). Ugoala (2020) examines the textual features of memes used in three Nigerian social media platforms: Instagram, Nairaland and Pinterest. Findings show “new online features such as cramped linguistic structures, the use of the particle ‘be like’ and omission of subject in sentences” (p.36). Akujobi & Eze (2021) is an investigation of e-discourse features in undergraduates’ Facebook and Whatsapp communications. Findings show “the salient features” of e-discourse communication among Nigerian undergraduates to be “shortenings, clippings, initial clipping or aphaeresis, final clipping or apocope, medial clipping or syncope, phonetic/non-conventional\ non-standard spellings, word-letter replacements, word-number or digit substitutions (logograms), word combinations (accent stylisations), initialisms” (pp.228 -234). Simon & Udom (2021) examines the use of multimodal and multisemiotic resources to enact identities in *This Day* and *Daily Trust newspapers’* Facebook pages. Findings show the salient features of Nigerian Internet English to be: an amalgamation of letter homophones, shortening devices, the use of initials, acronyms, and “the presence of spoken mode features...” (p.11). Ibra Him (2024) explores the language of texting in Nigeria and finds a linguistic style characterised by abbreviations, acronyms, and a fusion of English with local languages” (p.1).

The studies reviewed above are from the local literature on computer-actuated features of Nigerian Internet English. Findings from this category of the literature are recapitulated as acronyms, abbreviations / shortening of words (letter - number homophones, the use of symbols in place of words, respelling / non-conventional spellings, vowel deletion); the use of sound based coinages /

onomatopoeic expressions, word combinations); the use of emotive icons, orality features / written speech, the absence of punctuation marks and the omission of subject in sentences. These findings have also been noted in the transnational literature on the global Internet English and so a broad overview of the transnational literature on Internet English is presented below to evince the findings therefrom and reiterate the similarities with the findings in the local literature.

2.2.b. Transnational Literature on Computer-Mediated Features of Internet English

Again, as stated above on the local literature on Internet English, the review of the transnational literature is not exhaustive; it is only a sample of existing transnational literature on the genre.

Sun (2010) studies the linguistic features of Internet English in China, with focus on word-formation and lexicon (p.1). Deploying data collected from emails, discussion groups, chatrooms and www pages of Chinese internet users, findings show “abbreviations, clippings, acronyms, combination of letters and numbers, blendings, compoundings, derivations and the use of symbols” (pp.99-101). Klimova (2011) explores the changes that ICT has made on written English in the Czech Republic. Data collected from Facebook posts, chat groups, emails and e-learning materials show a language that is “less formal than written Standard English, less structured, more abbreviated, less punctuated, is animated through the use of multimedia, and more dialogic - a feature he describes as ‘written speech’” (p.85), Klimova also notes that e-learning materials “deploy a simpler syntax and shorter sentences” than their counterpart print learning materials (p.87). Lyddy, Farina, Farrell, & O’Neil (2014) analyses the language used in text messages in Ireland. Findings show “missed capitalisation, accent stylisation (a word is spelled as it is pronounced), letter/number homophones, missed punctuation, contractions, phonetic/nonconventional spelling, clipping/omission of g and other final letters in words, onomatopoeic exclamations (non-word sound based exclamations), misspellings and semantically unrecoverable words” (p.551). AbuSa’aleek (2015) “attempts a comprehensive picture of the salient features of electronic discourse as a new variety of language” (p.135). With data collected from university students in Saudi Arabia (p.137), findings show “a variety of discourse features such as shortenings, clippings and contractions, unconventional spellings, word-letter replacement”. Mustafa, Kandasamy & Yasin (2015) investigates the most common word formation processes among Malaysian Facebook users (p.261). Findings show abbreviations (clippings, acronyms and combinations of letters), blending and the use of emoticons in everyday communication on Facebook (p.261). Mwithi, Ndambuki & Nabea (2016) is an analysis of the linguistic features of Facebook in Kenya. Data show: “non-standard

orthography which comprises phonetic spellings, colloquial spellings which the researchers describe as omission of consonants at word initial and final positions, reduction or omission of vowels, code-switching and prosodic spelling” (pp.68-75). Fernianos (2020) examines the language of texting in Lebanon. Findings show unconventional spelling through the use of contractions, weakly structured sentences, frequent use of deictic references, ellipsis, and discourse markers (p.63). Asare, Plahar, Pantah & Adansil (2021) investigates “the impact of social media on the formal writings of Ghanaian students” (p.45). Findings evince a wide range of social media lingo including “clipping, abbreviations, alphanumeric homophony, vowel deletion, grapheme and slang terms in their formal writing tasks” (p.45). Zaiets, Zadorizhna, Ilchenko, Sablina, Udovichenko & Zahorodnia (2021) investigates the electronic discourse of university students in America and the UK, with the aim to “establish its dominant linguistic features” (p.1). Findings show “the extensive use of affixation, word compounding, omission of articles in headings, abbreviations, replacement of letter words with number words, emoticons, the use of special characters and “deliberate agrammatism” if a word is too long (p.14).

The findings in the transnational literature are the same that have been reported in the local, Nigerian literature. Based on the similarities and homogeneity of the findings in the local and transnational literatures on Internet English, the present study avers computer-mediated features of Internet English to be the common core features of this English variety and are found in all varieties of the global Internet English.

2.2.c. The Concept of Common Core

At this point it is expedient to discuss the concept of ‘common core’ or ‘common core features’. Common core features is a theoretical concept in variation linguistics which is evoked by scholars of variation linguistics to establish a linguistic code as a variety of a language. The present study invokes the concept of common core features to designate Nigerian Internet English a variety of Nigerian English.

Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik (1972) avers that the ‘common core’ “dominates all the varieties (of English)” (p.14). It defines the concept ‘common core’ thus “... however esoteric or remote a variety may be, it has running through it, a set of grammatical and other characteristics that are present in all other varieties” (p.14). Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik concede that the ‘common core’ constitutes the major part of any variety of English (p.29) and in *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, they present the common core of English grammar, to differentiate it from the various regional, social, educational, functional and interference varieties of the language.

McArthur (1987) defines “core” by positing a core variety of “World Standard English” which he explains by contrasting it with the range of geographical Englishes used around the world.

In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (1995), Crystal defines ‘common core’ as “the range of linguistic features which would be used by all speakers, regardless of their regional or social background” (p.450).

Nelson (2006) defines ‘common core’ as the “set of features and characteristics which all varieties (of a language) have in common” and he expounds on the concept by contrasting it with “periphery” which he defines as “those features which are unique to individual varieties, and are not shared with any other variety”. From Nelson’s definition, common core features are the identifying features of a language. Nelson demonstrates the common core features of English with the lexis of various geographical varieties.

A synthesis of the definitions provided above on ‘common core’ elucidates common core features as the identifying elements / features of the varieties of a language. To illustrate, the common core features of English are found in all aspects of its linguistic structure and manifest in all its varieties. They are: syntax (SVO sentence structure) and fixed word order, morphology (inflections of grammatical categories), and phonology (double voicedness).

From the foregoing therefore, this study declares that the common core features of world Internet English are its computer-mediated features. The study makes this declaration on the strength of computer-actuated features of Internet English being found in all local and regional varieties of the code. The same computer-actuated features are found in Nigerian Internet English (section 2.2.a.). The presence of the common core features of world Internet English in Nigerian Internet English establishes Nigerian Internet English as a variety of the world Internet English.

2.2.d. Studies That Describe Linguistic Features of Nigerian Internet English

Feuba (2009) investigates the similarities in the linguistic features of SMS texts produced by Cameroonian and Nigerian internet users. Findings show letter/number homophones, non-conventional spellings, accent stylisations, omission of punctuation marks, lack of word inter spacing, use of onomatopoeic expressions / exclamations as well as complex capitalisations (p.25). Chilwa & Adegoke (2013) examines the pragmatic acts deployed by Nigerians on Twitter, in their comments on the bombings in the country in 2013. They find the deployment of pragmatic acts of blaming and denouncing Islam and the terrorists, acts of supporting and identifying with Islam and the terrorists and blaming the western world, and neutral acts of dissociation from the events (pp.90 - 100). Chilwa (2013) investigates

language use on Nairaland and Naijapals platforms - two Nigerian online hosting sites. Findings show features of Internet mediated writing such as coinages, spelling manipulations, rebus writing and abbreviations (p.57). Nweze (2013) analyses the morphosyntactic structure of SMS texts exchanged by Nigerian university students. Findings show “movement of constituents from one slot to the other”, “deletions and omissions of subject/agent, object, determiner, the to-infinitive” and violations of English word-order (p.84). Babalola & Onanuga (2015) compares the discursive features found in SMS texts written by Digital Natives (students) with those written by Digital Immigrants (teachers). Findings show “code-switching and the nativisation of linguistic elements such as acronyms” used by both digital populations (p.15). Idehen & Taiwo (2016) evaluates sentence structure and function in Nairaland Forum. Findings show “a predominance of declarative and interrogative sentences of a simple, basic structure, more than structurally complex constructions” (p.87). Findings also show the use of clear and formal language on the platform. Uba, Adebukunola & Chimuanya (2017) investigates the phonological structure of WhatsApp messages exchanged by Nigerians. Findings show “accent stylisation, phoneme substitution, blending, consonantisation, numerophony and phonetic respelling” as the phonological features of Whatsapp communication of Nigerians (p.285). Olaluwoye (2021) investigates the surface features of code-switching and code-mixing on Facebook and finds five forms of this sociolinguistic feature: “simplified lexicon and sentences, non-adherence to the use of tones/diacritics, inconsistencies of spellings and words, unnecessary lengthening of letters, and tolerance of surface errors” (p.1). Egbe (2022) explores the discursive strategies deployed on Whatsapp platforms by protesters during the #EndSars protests in Nigeria. It identifies referential/nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivisation, and intensification/mitigation as discursive strategies in the #EndSars discourse (p.576). Udodom & Wekpa (2022) examines the structure of the nominal group in Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram and Twitter. Findings show the noun group in those cyberdomains “occurs as syntactic chunks of clauses and elliptical clauses; is structured like a full clause and performs the functions of a full clause” (p.129). Maledo & Edobor (2023) analyses the morphological processes in slangs used on NaijaRoom of Gossip WhatsApp Group. Findings show that the predominant morphological process in slang making is borrowing from English and indigenous languages with its attendant semantic extension (p.110). Ibra Him (2024) notes “an evolved linguistic style characterised by a digital shorthand, abbreviations and acronyms” (p.1) in the text messages of Nigerians.

The findings on the linguistic features of Nigerian Internet English are summarised thus: letter-number

homophones, non-conventional spellings, accent stylisations, omission of punctuation marks, use of onomatopoeic expressions / exclamations and complex capitalisations are general linguistic features of the medium. The morphosyntactic features of the medium occur as omission of subject/agent, object, determiner, the to-infinitive and violations of English word-order. Discursive features of the medium are code-switching and the nativisation of linguistic elements, acronyms and referential/nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivisation, and intensification/mitigation. Syntactic features of the medium are a predominance of simple, basic structures of declarative and interrogative sentences. Phonological features are accent stylisation, phoneme substitution, blending, consonantisation, numerophony and phonetic respelling. Surface features are simplified lexicon and sentences, non-adherence to the use of tones/diacritics, inconsistencies of spellings and words, unnecessary lengthening of letters, and tolerance of surface errors. Nouns in Nigerian Internet English occur in the form of syntactic chunks of clauses and elliptical clauses, are structured like full clauses and perform the functions of full clauses. The morphological structure of the medium is a predominance of borrowing from English and indigenous languages and semantic extensions.

This study notes that the linguistic features of Nigerian Internet English are the same features that have been reported in the literature as the computer-actuated features of the medium and also of the world Internet English. From this observation, the study argues that the linguistic features of Internet English are its computer-actuated features. The converse statement is also true: the computer-mediated features of the medium are its linguistic features. This study avers this derives from the exclusively written mode of the medium. Existing only in the written mode, Internet English manifests only mechanical, computer-actuated features as its linguistic features.

2.2.e. Studies That Specify Nigerian Internet English to Be a Variety of Nigerian English

Studies have explored Nigerian Internet English with the aim to identify features of Nigerian English in it. These studies specify Nigerian Internet English to be a variety of Nigerian English based on their observation of Nigerian English features in it.

Chiluwa (2008a) seeks to establish the features of Nigerian English found in SMS text messages written by Nigerians (p.39). Findings show samples of Nigerian English in the texts as lexical items, coinages or borrowings that reflect the Nigerian socio-cultural context. Chiluwa (2008b) assesses the way SMS text-messaging is deployed as speech-acts, to construct Christian values and beliefs by Christians in Nigeria. Chiluwa describes the language of SMS text-messaging in Nigeria as a distinct variety of English that is “situationally

distinct and context sensitive” (p.11). This study construes the phrase “situationally distinct and context sensitive” to refer to features of Nigerian English. Chilwa (2010) reviews features of Nigerian English in informal emails written by Nigerians (p.40). Findings show features of non-standard Nigerian English such as misuse of words, grammatical inconsistencies and features of Standard Nigerian English such as phonetic spelling (p.59). Lamidi (2012) investigates language use on Nairaland, a Nigerian interactive website, with the aim to identify features of Nigerian English on the platform. Findings show Nigerian English lexis, grammar, phonology, semantics and pragmatics (p.97). Ezenwa-Ohaeto (2012) examines the “fusion of languages” (p.196) in text messages constructed by undergraduates. Findings show code-mixing of English, Nigerian Pidgin and Nigerian indigenous languages. Mbah & Ogbonna (2012) examines “local colouration” in the text messages constructed by Nigerian university students. Findings show “Nigerian specific innovative expressions that manifest local colouration of Nigerian socio-linguistic and cultural context” (p.82). The present study interprets “Nigerian specific innovative expressions that manifest local colouration of Nigerian socio-linguistic and cultural context” to denote Nigerian English features. Chilwa (2013) investigates language use on the Nairaland and Naijapals platforms - two Nigerian online hosting sites. Findings reveal features of three varieties of Nigerian English on the two platforms: the acrolect (high), mesolect (middle), and basilect (low) varieties (p.55). Opebi & Oluwasola (2013) examines discursive features in text messages written by Nigerians, with the aim to distill features of second language use in the texts. Findings show “a fusion of local languages and English in the texts” (p.131). The present study avers “a fusion of local languages and English” has been attested in Jowitt (1991) and Schmied (2015), and other studies that assert Nigerian English to be a combination of Nigerian indigenous languages and English. Mbarachi (2015) examines language use by Nigerians on the internet. With data collected from Facebook and Twitter, web post data from Nigerian *Punch online newspaper* readers’ comments and Nairaland forum, emails and IM/Chats, findings show that Nigerian online English contains features of Nigerian English: code-switching/mixing with Nigerian Pidgin. Schmied (2015) explores Nigerian English features in Nigerian Internet English, arguing that the two are “special cases of related genres” (p.190). With data collected from *Punchnewspapers online*, *The Nation newspapers online*, *ngnewspapers online* and Nairaland forum, findings show data that have been established as Nigerian English usages such as unusual plurals - the pluralisation of non-count nouns and culture-specific lexemes (pp.191-192). The summary of Schmied (2015) is that Nigerian English is the dominant

content of Nigerian Internet English. Mbarachi & Okoro (2016) is an investigation of the discourse features in two Nigerian online newspapers - *Vanguard newspapers online* and *The Punch newspapers online*. Findings show Nigerian culture specific words / loan words (pp.44 & 49). Inyima (2018) investigates the language of the Nigerian social media as an emerging variety of Nigerian English. With data collected from the WhatsApp chats of Nigerian university students, findings show “a written online ESL variety of Nigerian English” (p.13). Inyima avers that Nigerian online English is a written variety of Nigerian English. Josiah & Mbarachi (2018) examines the language Nigerians deploy in emails and instant messaging chats with the aim to evince any differences in the language deployed in the two media. Findings show internet codes in the two media, but in differing degrees. Emails evince fewer internet codes and a more formal tone than instant messaging texts which exhibit a mixture of Nigerian English, Nigerian Pidgin and Nigerian indigenous languages. Taiwo & Donteale (2020) investigates the discursive functions of coinages and abbreviations in Nairaland forum, a popular Nigerian social media discussion platform. Findings show lexical blends, derived neologisms, slangs and acronyms. Taiwo and Donteale submit that these are potential linguistic features of Nigerian English. Ugoala (2020) examines the textual features of memes used in three Nigerian social media platforms: Instagram, Nairaland and Pinterest. Findings show “attested features of Nigerian English such as its common core features: idioms, pronouns without antecedents, object in subject position, the dynamic use of stative verbs and the deviant use of prepositions” (p.36). Simon & Udom (2021) find loan-words from Nigerian socio-cultural environment, culture-specific speech habits and features of Nigerian English Phonology in *This Day* and *Daily Trust* Newspapers Facebook pages. The loan-words they find are attested lexical components of Nigerian English. Amadi, Nwachukwu & Samuel (2023) observe lexical items from Nigerian indigenous languages on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and WhatsApp communication pages of young Nigerians. The intrusion of lexical items from Nigerian local languages is an attested feature of Nigerian English variety. Ibra Him (2024) construes Nigerian online English to be modern Nigerian English and, exploring the “significant impact of texting on Nigerian English” (p.1), asserts “texting has reshaped modern Nigerian English”. Ibra Him finds a fusion of English with indigenous Nigerian languages in the text messages of Nigerians as features of Nigerian English.

Nigerian English features which have been observed in Nigerian Internet English are recapitulated as lexical items, coinages and borrowings that reflect the Nigerian socio-cultural context; situationally distinct and context sensitive usages; non-standard Nigerian English such

as misuse of words, grammatical inconsistencies and features of Standard Nigerian English such as phonetic spelling; Nigerian English lexis, grammar, phonology, semantics and pragmatics; Nigerian specific innovative expressions that manifest local colouration of Nigerian socio-linguistic and cultural context; features of three varieties of Nigerian English: the acrolect (high), mesolect (middle), and basilect (low) varieties; a fusion of local languages and English in the texts; code-switching/mixing with Nigerian Pidgin; the pluralisation of non-count nouns and culture-specific lexemes; culture specific words / loan words; a written variety of Nigerian English; lexical blends, derived neologisms, slangs; common core features of Nigerian English regional and social varieties: idioms, pronouns without antecedents, object in subject position, the dynamic use of stative verbs and the deviant use of prepositions; loan-words from Nigerian socio-cultural environment, culture-specific words and features of Nigerian English Phonology.

2.2.f. An Overview of Nigerian English

It is expedient at this point, to review the literature on Nigerian English for the reason that it is in focus in this study. This study aims to establish the linguistic relationship between Nigerian English variety and Nigerian Internet English, and so it is pragmatic to review the literature on the variety.

Nigerian English is a variety of the world English used in Nigeria today. Being a variety of the world English language, Nigerian English shares common core features with native English varieties and is distinguished by indexical markers which identify it as a local, native variety. Nigerian English belongs to the group of New Englishes, a sociolinguistic label introduced into the literature by Pride (1982) and Plat, Weber & Ho (1984), World Englishes, advanced by Kachru (1984, 1992) and nativised English articulated in Schneider (1984). These sociolinguistic labels derive from the status of Nigerian English as a post-colonial, English as a second language (ESL) variety and in this regard McArthur (1998) has described English in Nigeria as a colonial and post-colonial second language.

The number of users of Nigerian English has not been established. The 2006 Nigerian national census (the last census till date) puts the country's population at 250 million people. This however, cannot be sad to be the number of people who use Nigerian English because, out of this number, there are people who do not use English at all.

Scholarship on Nigerian English evolved in coordinated and orchestrated modus, from the publication of an edited book in 1979, *Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria*, of papers and proceedings of a conference held in 1977 at the Institute of Education of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. With the publication of *Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria*, scholarship in Nigerian English advanced rapidly and now boasts of a

robust literature produced by vibrant scholars.

2.2. g. The Linguistic Structure of Nigerian English

Nigerian English has been rigorously delineated and its linguistic features meticulously described. A sample of the literature on the variety is presented here.

As with the formal descriptions of language varieties, the description of Nigerian English began with the differentiation of its spoken varieties. The earliest recorded account of varieties differentiation in Nigerian English is presented in Brosnahan (1958). In that account, Brosnahan identifies four spoken varieties of English in southern Nigeria, differentiated along socio-economic / educational status parameters. Similar to Brosnahan (1958), Banjo (1971) classifies spoken Nigerian English into four varieties thus: "... the first variety is the almost wholesale transference of the phonological, syntactic and lexical features of the Mother tongue; the syntax of the second variety is fairly close to that of standard British English but there are usually strongly marked phonological and lexical peculiarities; the third variety is close to standard British English both in syntax and semantics and phonologically has RP deep structures and Nigerian surface features; the fourth variety is spoken by people who, though Nigerian, are native-speakers, either by virtue of having a parent who is a native-speaker, or by virtue of having been brought up in England" (pp.169 -170). Jibril (1982) differentiates three phonological varieties of Nigerian English based on the socio-economic status of speakers. The varieties are Standard Nigerian English, Popular Nigerian English and RP (Received Pronunciation) and Awonusi (1985) also identifies three levels of phonological structure also based on socio-economic status of speakers: the basilect, the mesolect and the acrolect.

Adegbija (1989) identifies the lexico-semantic processes in Nigerian English and the resultant linguistic products as: hybridisation (combination of a word or sense of a word in English with that in the indigenous language, (e.g., yellow fever for a traffic warden); direct translation/transliteration of the indigenous language lexical term into English; semantic extensions and culture bound expressions (pp.165 - 177). Bamiro (1994) adds to Adegbija's description - coinages (e.g.s., national cake, long legs, go slow / hold up, big man, half-current); transliteration equivalents (e.g.s., He entered the motor going to Lagos); loan-shifts; semantic under-differentiation; reduplication and redundancy; ellipsis, clipping (pp.47 - 60).

Offering a survey of Nigerian English usage, Jowitt (1991) begins by delineating the varieties of Nigerian English into Standard forms and Popular Nigerian English PNE forms, and argues that "the usage of every Nigerian user is a mixture of both varieties" (p.47). Jowitt further provides a glossary of PNE lexis, syntax and morphology, and phonology.

Igboanusi (2006) describes the syntactic processes in Nigerian English as subjectless sentences: “Is very fair”; “Is about three hours or more”. (Lexical) reduplication: “fast fast”, “sharp sharp”. Double subjects: “Me I don’t have mercy”; “This your head is not correct”. Pidgin-influenced structures: “We work farm”; “I have maize and yam, *finish*”. Discourse particles (for emphasis): “You know Kemi *now*.”; “I live in Port Harcourt *now*”. Verbless sentences: “How?” in place of “How are you?” and substitution of British English idioms with Nigerian usages: “two sides of the coin” for British English “two sides of a coin” (pp.393 - 401).

Describing the morphosyntactic structure of Nigerian English, Alo & Mesthrie (2004) identify the “occasional use of unmarked verb forms for both the present and simple past tenses, the occasional double-marking of the simple past in negatives and interrogatives, and the lack of distinction between stative and non-stative verbs (p.325). The progressive use of stative verbs in Nigerian English has also been noted in Gut & Fuchs (2013). Taiwo (2013) presents some morphosyntactic features of Nigerian English thus: the use of reflexive pronouns in place of personal pronouns (the use of myself in place of me; yourself in place of you); the regularisation of plural formation: the insertion of the -s plural inflection to irregular plurals (e.g., childrens); the pluralisation of non-count nouns: stationeries, equipments, luggages; the omission of ‘to’ before infinitives (pp.411- 413).

Ugorji (2010) offers a “patterning of Nigerian English phonology” thus: “the tendency to disfavor consonant clusters in coda positions and the substituting of interdentals” (p.134). Deploying the observed phonological patterns to delineate Nigerian English varieties, Ugorji avers “glide formation may convert high vowels to their corresponding consonants and may consequently adjust syllable count in two varieties of Nigerian (basilect and mesolect usage) especially” (p.136). Udofot (2022) provides a description of the phonology of Nigerian English. On the segmental features of the variety, Udofot notes “fewer vowels and consonants, final consonants non-release, the simplification of consonant clusters and monophthongisation of diphthongs and triphthongs” (p.1). Findings on the suprasegmental features show “a proliferation of stressed syllables resulting from non-reduction of vowels” (p.1). The intonation features of Nigerian English, from Udofot’s account are “unidirectional intonation tones rather than bidirectional ones with the level tones being rarely ever used” (p.1). Describing rhythm in Nigerian English she notes “the rhythm cannot be neatly categorised as either ‘stress-timed’ or ‘syllable-timed’; rather, there is a tendency in one direction or the other since Nigerian English as RP has peaks of prominence in connected speech but the weak syllables of RP speech are stronger in Nigerian English thus there is a tendency towards stress timing” (p.1). On tone in Nigerian English she agrees that “the tonal

structure of Nigerian English is similar to that of other tone languages” (p.1). Udofot argues that the phonological features of Nigerian English differentiate it from other world English varieties.

Finally, Nigerian English boasts of two dictionaries: Igboanusi (2002; 2010) and Blench (2005).

2.2. h. Common Core Features of Nigerian English

Studies have specified the common core features of Nigerian English to be those features that are found in all its varieties (Okoro 1986, 2004; Jowitt 1991). From the literature, the common core features of Nigerian English are Standard English forms and usages, non-Standard English forms and usages, code-mixing of English and Nigerian indigenous languages, local Nigerian idioms and culture-specific labels and terms. Scholars argue that these features manifest in the English repertoire of Nigerians of all social classes and all levels of English competence, and are found in all regional varieties of the code, making them the core of the variety (Okoro 1986, 2004; Jowitt 1991). Some common core features of Nigerian English which have been identified in Nigerian Internet English are the pluralisation of non-count nouns (non-Standard English usages), code mixing of English and indigenous Nigerian languages, local idioms and culture specific words (Chiluwa (2008a, 2008b), Ezenwa-Ohaeto (2012), (Schmied 2015), Ugoala (2020)).

3. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts observational and interpretive methods of investigation. Observational methods were applied in the literature review, in the identification of Nigerian English features in the literature on Nigerian Internet English. The body of existing literature on Nigerian Internet English was scanned and reviewed for features of Nigerian English. Two criteria were applied in the selection of studies for review. The first criterion is free online accessibility. All studies on Nigerian Internet English that are freely accessible online were downloaded and reviewed for discussions and descriptions of features of Nigerian English. Studies on Nigerian Internet English that investigated and reported the presence of linguistic features of Nigerian English were isolated and reviewed. A total of 42 studies were found that described Nigerian English features in Nigerian Internet English. These studies were then reviewed for the attestation of features of Nigerian English. This study relied on existing literature on Nigerian English to determine the linguistic features of that code.

The second criterion for selection of studies for review of Nigerian English features in Nigerian Internet English is frequency of online citation. Studies on Nigerian Internet English that have received the most frequent online citations were additionally isolated and reviewed for their attestation of the presence of linguistic features of Nigerian English.

Interpretive methods were applied in inferring the significance of the observed attested features of Nigerian English in Nigerian Internet English.

4. DATA PRESENTATION

In this section the data are presented; a few representative sample data of each feature category.

Table 1
Computer-Mediated Features of Nigerian English

Comouter-actuuated features of Nigerian Internet English	Data samples and sources therefrom
1. Acronyms / abbreviations / shortening of words (letter / number homophones; the use of symbols in place of words, respelling / non-conventional spellings, vowel deletion	“Dis mth god will TANTALIZE u with His grace; Angels will b on guard 2 give u SWEET SENSATION favour; As Nigeria celebr8 anoda independence, it’s my praya dt God will raiz up Nigerians who wil transform dis gr8 country. I hp u will b availabl cos He’ll come lukin 4 u” (Taiwo 2008:976 & 978) “AFAIK he is not going 2 win the governotorial election. GF, I don’t hav much time now, TTUL.” (Feuba 2009: 30)
2. Sound based coinages / onomatopoeic expressions	“Ewo, hei, chei, haha, woohoo, yeah, yep, yay, eh, who, Max” (Feuba 2009: 32). “Lol!” (Lamidi 2012) “Ahhhhh, deyoouoooo, hehehehe, laffooo” (Josiah & Mbarachi 2018:6)
3. Emotive icons	“☺, facial expressions of smiling, laughing, winking, big grin, waiting, crying, angry, sad” (Shoki & Oni 2008:32 & 33).
Orality features / written speech:	Ellipsis (...)
4. Endearments:	“Sweetest Mi” (Opebi & Oluwasola 2013:127)
expletives:	“haba! tufiakwa!” (Inyima 2018:11)
Gap fillers:	“emm...; hmm..; eee...” (Inyima 2018:11)
5. The absence of punctuation marks	“is the food alright”; “who be t money” (Shoki & Oni 2008:42) “Biko do we have test tomorrow or Tuesday” (Josah & Udofia 2020:191) “Sara are you talking to me”; “Sara wia r u” (Josiah & Udofia 2020:19)
6. The omission of subjects in sentences	“is in April next year”; “Can’t remember” (Feuba 2009: 34); “Saw ur cal”; “Transferred 2 dept of soil science 4 gud” (Nweze 2013:90)

Table 2
Linguistic Features of Nigerian Internet English

Linguistic features of Nigerian Internet English	Data samples and sources
Lack of word interspacing	INMySchoolIamJustLikeASmall EZE. They call me Igwe” (Feuba 2009:32)
Shortenings	“yr~year; wks~weeks, hrs~hours, DIS~This, schl~school, mng~morning” (Opebi & Oluwasola 2013: 126)
Contractions	“Hw’s~how is; ur~your; U~you; R~are; dat~That; tinkin~thinking; z-is; tnks~thanks, cald~called” (Opebi & Oluwasola 2013:126)
Clipping	“lik~like; suces~success; av~have; wil~will; nd~and” (Opebi & Oluwasola 2013:126)
G clipping	goin\going; talkin \talking; comin\coming; smilin\smiling; happnin\happening, unsuspectin\unsuspecting (Akujobi & Eze 2021:231)
1. Letter - number Homophones / non-conventional spellings	“B~be; 2~to; U~you; 10Q~thank you; 2reload~to reload; 2me~to me” (Opebi & Oluwasola 2013:126). “God wil do 4 u wat u can’t do 4 yrslf or on ur own” (Inyima 2018: 13)
Surface structure features:	“hapi; nu” (Opebi & Oluwasola 2013:126)
Accent stylisations	“Av don it (Have done it)”; “Going om na (Going home now)”; “May god elp us (May God help us)” (Uba & Chimuanya 2017:295)
Phonetic Respelling	“rite/ryt = right/write; wud = would; cud/kud = could; shud = should” (Uba & Chimuanya 2017:294). “Hw was ur 9nt?”; “Am 2 al ofu” “Fyn” (Inyima 2018:12)
Omission of punctuation marks	“u shuld be happy they took from it”; “told them my wife got it forme” (Shoki & Oni: 42) “Sarah u sure say dis gal no be ur cousin”; “Sarah are u talking to me” (Josiah & Udofia 2020:195)
Use of onomatopoeic expressions / exclamations	“Ewo, hei, chei, haha, woohoo, yeah, yep, yay, eh and who” (Feuba 2009:32)
Complex capitalisations	“INMySchoolIamJustLikeASmall EZE” (Feuba 2009: 32)

Linguistic features of Nigerian Internet English		Data samples and sources
2. Morphosyntactic features	Omission of subject/ pronoun	“can’t even pillow fight with your partner” (Ugoala 2020: 45). “Left for Aba yestade” (Nweze 2013:90)
	Omission of subject/agent	“Saw ur cal”; “Sure wil be there 2 conzol u.” “Love the card, tanks.” (Nweze 2013:90)
	Omission of object	“I didn’t forge as planned; the man kum disapoint Na carryova be dat” (Nweze 2013:90)
	Omission of articles	“so you have boyfriend” (Ugoala 2020:45)
3. Speech and Pragmatic acts features	Acts of accusing and blaming the Nigerian government Acts of condemning and denouncing Islam (and violence) Acts of accusing and blaming the West and demanding splitting of the country Acts of supporting and identifying with Boko Haram and Islam Acts of proffering solutions and advice (to Muslims and the government) Acts of neutrality and dissociation (Chiluwa & Adegoke 2013:90)	
	Turn taking	Power engagement and turn taking (Babalola & Onanuga 2015:11)
4. Discursive features	Code switching (English, Nigerian Pidgin and Yoruba)	“Sorry I might come a bit late. Help me explain to him abeg. Thanx. Hmm leave my rice o, else I go roast u chop. Ur num’s not been goin. Ki lo sele?” (Babalola & Onanuga 2015:13)
	Code switching (English and Yoruba)	“Ekaale Sir”; “My Oga Sir” (Babalola & Onanuga 2015: 11)
	Code switching (English and Igbo)	“Happi bday oga ndi Enugu” “Meaning gini @missC” (Inyima 2018: 12) “They call me Igwe” (Feuba 2009:32)
5. Syntactic features	A predominance of simple declarative sentences structures:	“You wont get it!!!!” “the pics u post shows u are not @ peace of mind lol !!!!” (Idehen & Taiwo 2016:83)
	Frequent use of interrogative sentence structures:	“Why Do Nigerians Change Church So Often?” “Why Do Catholics Confess Their Sins to Man?” (Idehen & Taiwo 2016:85)
6. Phonological features	Accent stylisation	bo = but; av = have; dis = this; d = the; dat = that; den = then; fada = father. (Uba, Emmanuel., Feyisitan Adebukunola & Lili Chimuanya 2017: 294)
	Blending of letters and figures	10x = thanks; l8 = late; 9t = night; 10q = thank you; n2 = into; b4 = before; ba3 = battery (Uba, Emmanuel., Feyisitan Adebukunola & Lili Chimuanya 2017: 293)
	Numerophony	4 = for; 2 = to/too; 8 = ate; 2 = to/too; 2night = tonight; lder = wonder; 4ward = forward; 4tune = fortune (Uba, Emmanuel., Feyisitan Adebukunola & Lili Chimuanya 2017: 292)
	Phonetic respelling	rite/ryt = right/write; wud = would; cud/kud = could; shud = should; luv = love; cum = come; buk = book; fon = phone (Uba, Emmanuel., Feyisitan Adebukunola & Lili Chimuanya 2017: 294)
7. Grammatical structure	Noun phrase structure: Predominantly loan words from indigenous languages	“Egusi”; “Suya” (Ugoala 2020:43)
	Compound loan words	“Bad belle”; “Bad belle people” (Ugoala 2020:43)
	Lexical blends and nonce words	“Athiefku = Atiku + thief”; “legisloters = Legislator + looters”; “Jonadaft = Jonathan + daft” (Taiwo & Donteale 2020:7)
	Morphological processes	Acronymy; lexical borrowing; Clipping Semantic Extension; Compounding; Blending/ Borrowing; Coinage; Initialism/ Alphabetism; Reduplication (Maledo & Edobor 2023:116 -123)
	Lexico-grammatical features	Shortenings; Contractions; Clippings; Letter/Number Homophones; Abbreviations; Misspellings; Non-conventional spellings; Accent stylization (Opebi & Oluwasola 2013:126)
	Truncation	“Hw ar u doing api Sunday”; “Am riting Xam now” (Endong & Essoh 2015:43)
	Initialisation	“Plz I wil need ur BK”; “C, will never b ur GF. Ok.” (Endong & Essoh 2015:43)
8. Orality features	Letter homophones	“C u 2morow and plz b there”; “Giv me ur numba” (Endong & Essoh 2015:41)
	Vowel Omission	“nt”, “plz”/ “pls”; “plc” (Endong & Essoh 2015:42 & 43)
	Onomatopoeic words	hahaha... Lafin in Ikwo (Inyima 2018:12); “ewo”, “chei”, “eya”, “hei”, “eh”, “wow” (Endong & Essoh 2015:44)

Table 3
Linguistic Features of Nigerian English Observed in Nigerian Internet English

Linguistic Features of Nigerian English identified in Nigerian Internet English	Data samples and sources
1. Language Mixing / Code mixing: Language mixing: Nigerian Pidgin English and Popular Nigerian English	<p>“This nepa no dey shame sef, they have the gut to make noise about wage increment when Nigerians are complaining that ...” (Taiwo 2010:184)</p> <p>“Marriage in a “bad relationship” that has broken down irretrievably cannot be forced on the other party, no matter how weak Set them free to go their own way. Abi na by force” (Taiwo 2010:184)</p> <p>“Na Waooo 4 U sef, U sabi waka oooooo. I hear say U and Grace comot 4 morning and U came back with Joy.” (Taiwo 2010: 185)</p> <p>“This one weak me” (Taiwo & Donteale 2020:12)</p> <p>“... The point is the evil axis can never prevail with their lies, innuendoes and campaign of calumny. Yeye de smell.” (Simon Udom 2021:10)</p>
1. Language mixing: local Nigerian language (Yoruba) with Popular Nigerian English	<p>“That is nothing more than a nice-sounding cliché ojare. (Taiwo 2010:185)</p> <p>“Abi what do you people think, let’s be practical and logical about this.” (Taiwo 2010:185)</p> <p>“Oga, e ma worry about the laptop blc the person has carried apoti-eri that will make him restless until he returns it.” (Chiluwa 2010:52)</p> <p>“Abegi leave dat matter joor...” (Inyima 2018:11)</p>
Language mixing: local Nigerian language (Igbo) with Popular Nigerian English	<p>“Chei! Obj, how i wish we can do the same here. Obasanjo supposed to be barred from public function, infact he should be put back to his fomer place, Prison.” (Taiwo 2010:185)</p> <p>“Igbo Kwenu! kwezuo Nu! naara itonakomputa.” (Taiwo 2010:186)</p> <p>“Meaning gini?” (Inyima 2018:11)</p> <p>“Just negodu” (Taiwo & Donteale 2020:12)</p>
Language mixing: local Nigerian language (Hausa) with Popular Nigerian English	<p>“... only foolish pple would give a big a heroice welcome, Haba! Naija ...” (Taiwo 2010:185)</p> <p>“... The answer comes in less than a week. SaiObaseki” (Simon Udom 2021:10)</p>
Expletives from indigenous languages	<p>“Haba!; Gbim!; Chai!; Tufiakwa!; Shebi?” (Inyima 2018:9)</p>
Compliments from indigenous languages	<p>“Asanwa”; “Akwanwa” (Inyima 2018:9)</p>
Borrowings that reflect the Nigerian socio-cultural context/ Code-switching and first-language transfer phenomena in email texts / Loan words in email discourse	<p>How’s work and your Obidiya? (Chiluwa 2010:55) “Ore, how are you? how is brotherly too?” (Taiwo 2010:187)</p>
2. A fusion of local languages and English	<p>“Sweetest Mi” (Opebi & Oluwasola 2013:127).</p> <p>“Awamaridi says dat ur enemies will not know de source of ur joy. Oyigiyigi says that ur enemies will not be able to spoil ur life. “Asoromatase says dat he will do as he has spoken concerning you. Alagbara giga says he will empower you to succeed. Arugbo ojo says you will live till good old age.” Opebi & Oluwasola 2013:128)</p> <p>“I thought nai travel go.” “I na emegini since school resumed iji wee feeluo exam?” (Ezenwa-Ohaeto 2012: 199)</p> <p>“Okpo, giinina-atogi? Ubiam dey disturb you, al this credit am usin 2 cal, mak al of una do collection 4 me oh, wat of ebuka babe?” (Ezenwa-Ohaeto 2012:202)</p>
3. Unusual plurals: the pluralisation of non-count nouns	<p>“advice, equipments, machineries, informations, permissions, accomodations, behaviours” (Schmied 2015:191)</p>
4. non-count singular nouns preceded by ‘a’ or ‘an’:	<p>“an information”, “an evidence” (Schmied 2015:191)</p>
5. non-count singular nouns preceded by ‘another’ instead of ‘more’:	<p>“another money”; “another advice” (Schmied 2015: 191)</p>
6. Culture-specific lexemes:	<p>“akara, amala” (Schmied 2015:192, 193, 201, 202, 203)</p>
7. Popular Nigerian English phrases:	<p>“troubled waters, “stomach politics”, “illegal bunckering” (Schmied 2015:192, 198, 199)</p>
8. The reduplication of lexical items:	<p>“Now now”, “very very”, “softly softly” (Udofot & Mbarachi 2016:783)</p> <p>“Very very” (Inyima 2018:10)</p> <p>“las las” (Taiwo & Donteale 2020:12)</p>
9. Peculiar Nigerian idioms and proverbs:	<p>“To separate the whiff from the chaff”; “a stitch in time saves lives”; “he held the knife and yams”; “do not put sand in my garri.” (Udofot & Mbarachi 2016:783)</p>
10. The pragmatic transliteration of Nigerian coinages:	<p>“Take in” (to become pregnant) “been to” (a person who has lived overseas); “sufferhead” (a luckless person or a person who lives a hard, difficult, menial life); “bride price” (money paid by a groom and his family to the family of his intended bride, as required by local custom); “boys quarters” (rooms adjoining to or at the back or corner of a building intended for paid servants of the house owner); “cash madam” (a wealthy woman); “head tie” (hair scarf worn by women); “big man” (a wealthy man or an important personality); “chewing stick” (a piece of stick of a tree, used for cleaning the teeth); “you will see” / “I will show you/ him/ her/ them” (a threat). (Udofot & Mbarachi 2016: 783)</p>

Linguistic Features of Nigerian English identified in Nigerian Internet English	Data samples and sources
11. The replication of British and American greetings for different indigenous situations:	“Sorry” (used even when one is not responsible for the accident, or offered when a person sneezes); “Welcome” (offered to a visitor who approaches a formal office or environment); “Well-done” (offered to a person performing a task); “Sorry for yesterday” (an apology for an offence committed the previous day); “Till tomorrow” (a parting greeting to a person who will be interacted with the following day). (Udofot & Mbarachi 2016:783).
12. The use of multiple titles in addressing a person to reflect his social status:	“Honourable Chief Dr...”; “High Chief ...”; “Chief Engr...”; “Reverend Father Engr...”. (Udofot & Mbarachi 2016:783).
13. Reduplication of modifiers	“Very very” (Inyima 2018:10)
14. Reordering of syntactic elements	“Dis ur message...!”; “4 dis our school” (Inyima 2018: 10)
15. The dynamic / progressive use of stative verbs	“Nigerian women are always respecting their men” (Ugoala 2020:47). “Am not seeing it clearly” (Ugoala 2020:47). “Come Vero Are you not understanding me?” (Ugoala 2020: 47)
16. Loan words from Nigerian indigenous languages	Oga; Abi; Ogogoro; Obas; Mallams; Mumu; Anumpama (Simon & Udom 2021:10)
17. Nigerian English phonology	“Kwaraptian master”; :May Allah ‘helf’ u baba” (Simon & Udom 2021:11)

5. DISCUSSION

From the review of literature and observation of the data therein, this study summarises the following:

- Nigerian Internet English is a variety of the world Internet English. The computer-actuated features of Nigerian Internet English are attested in the world Internet English.

- The computer-mediated features of the world Internet English are its common core features. They are found in all varieties of the world Internet English.

- The computer-mediated features of world Internet English are its linguistic features. Existing only in the written mode, without a speech component, its written / computer-mediated features are its only linguistic features.

- Nigerian Internet English is a variety of Nigerian English. Linguistic features of Nigerian English are copiously attested in Nigerian Internet English. The principal language component of Nigerian Internet English is Nigerian English.

6. CONCLUSION

Relying on existing literature and observation of the data therein, this study avers Nigerian Internet English to be a variety of Nigerian English. This assertion derives from the observation in the literature, the dominance of Nigerian English features over other linguistic features of Nigerian Internet English. Drawing from this observation, this study declares Nigerian English to be a principal component of Nigerian Internet English. The study argues that primary to the features of the world Internet English which are the computer-actuated features of the medium, Nigerian English constitutes the major linguistic component of Nigerian Internet English. The study therefore concludes that Nigerian Internet English is a variety of Nigerian English.

REFERENCES

- Awonusi, O. V. (1985). *Sociolinguistic variation in Nigerian English* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of London.
- Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- AbuSa’aleek, A. O. (2015). Internet linguistics: A linguistic analysis of electronic discourse as a new variety of language. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(1), 135-145. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n1p135>
- Adebileje, A. (2014). Descriptions of register variations in the morpho-syntax of text messaging among Redeemer’s University young students. *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics (JELTAL)*, 2(3), 1-12. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354762437>
- Adebija, E. (1989). Lexico-semantic variation in Nigerian English. *World Englishes*, 8(2), 165-177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1989.tb00652.x>
- Akujobi, O. S., & Eze, B. (2021). A computer-mediated discourse analysis on undergraduates’ Facebook and WhatsApp. *IGWEBUIKE: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 7(2), 228-247. <https://acjol.org/index.php/iaajah/article/view/1281>
- Alo, M. A., & Mesthrie, R. (2004). Nigerian English: Morphology and syntax. In B. Kortmann & E. W. Schneider (Eds.), *A handbook of varieties of English: A multimedia reference tool* (pp. 323-339). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Amadi, E. C., Nwachukwu, O. S., & Samuel, M. K. (2023). New Englishes from the Nigerian languages in social media. *Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Development Studies (SGOJAHDS)*, 6(4), 1-8. <http://www.sgojahds.com>
- Asare, I. A., Plahar, J. D. K., Pantah, A., & Adansi, J. E. (2021). Effects of social media on students’ writing: The case study of Mount Mary College of Education. *SINOMICS Journal*, 1(2), 45-74. <http://www.SINOMICSJOURNAL.COM>

- Babalola, E. T., & Onanuga, P. A. (2015). Finding their feet: Digital immigrants in a natives generation—Contrasting the use of SMS and IM in everyday communication. In T. Rotimi & T. Opeibi (Eds.), *The discourse of digital civic engagement: Perspectives from the developing world* (pp. 117-131). IGI Global. <https://www.academia.edu>
- Bamiro, E. O. (1994). Lexico-semantic variation in Nigerian English. *World Englishes*, 13, 47-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1994.tb00282.x>
- Bergh, G., & Zanchetta, E. (2008). Weblinguistics. In A. Ludeling & M. Kyto (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics: An international handbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 309-327). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chiluwa, I. (2008a). Assessing the Nigerianness of SMS text messages in English. *English Today*, 24(1), 39-44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078408000102>
- Chiluwa, I. (2008b). SMS text-messaging and the Nigerian Christian context: Constructing values and sentiments. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*, 24, 11-20.
- Chiluwa, I. (2010). Nigerian English in informal email messages. *English World-Wide*, 31(1), 40-61. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23370875>
- Chiluwa, I., & Adegoke, A. (2013). Tweetering the Boko Haram uprising in Nigeria: Investigating pragmatic acts in the social media. *Africa Today*, 59(3), 82-102.
- Egbe, G. B. (2022). Englishization and the discursive constructions in social media discourses of the #EndSars protest in Nigeria. *English Journal Literacy UTama*, 7(1), 567-577. <https://doi.org/10.33197/ej lutka.vol7.iss1.2021.2655.4585>
- Endong, F. P. C., & Essoh, N. E. G. (2015). Orality versus literacy in the Nigerian SMS discourse. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 18(33), 33-47.
- Ezenwa-Ohaeto, N. (2012). Fusion of languages in texting: “A gr8 opotuniti 4 yuts.” *AJELLS: Awka Journal of English Language and Literary Studies*, 3(1), 196-206.
- Feninanos, C. F. (2020). Internet language: An investigation into the features of textisms in an ESL/EFL context. *Journal of Arts & Humanities*, 9(2), 63-74. <https://doi.org/10.18533/journal.v9i2.1848>
- Feuba, W. E. (2009). The sociolinguistics of mobile phone SMS usage in Cameroon and Nigeria. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*, 28, 25-41.
- Gut, U., & Fuchs, R. (2013). Progressive aspect in Nigerian English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 41(3), 243-267. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication>
- Ibra Him. (2024). The role of texting in shaping modern Nigerian English. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382866382>
- Idehen, V. Y., & Rotimi, T. (2016). Sentence typologies and civic engagement in Nairaland forum. In T. Rotimi & T. Opeibi (Eds.), *The discourse of digital civic engagement: Perspectives from the developing world* (pp. 75-90). Nova Science.
- Igboanusi, H. (2006). Syntactic innovation processes in Nigerian English. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 42, 393-404.
- Inyima, C. E. (2018). Language in transition: The social-media and emerging ESL variety in Nigeria. *Ebonyi Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 1(2), 1-15.
- Josiah, U. E., & Mbarachi, S. C. (2018). Email and instant message English in Nigeria. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325674910>
- Kachru, B. B. (1982). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (1st ed.). University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press.
- Lamidi, M. T. (2012). A linguistic investigation of Nigerianisms on the Nairaland forum. *Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association (JNESA)*, 15(2), 85-97.
- Lyddy, F., Farina, F., Hanney, J., Farrell, L., & O’Neil, N. K. (2014). An analysis of language in university students’ text messages. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(3), 546-561. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12087>
- Maledo, R. O., & Edobor, H. O. (2023). A morpho-semantic analysis of some Nigerian internet-based slangs. *KIU Interdisciplinary Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 110-126.
- Mbah, B. M. O., & Ejiuwanaka, J. O. (2012). Local colouration in mobile text messages in Nigeria: A sociolinguistic study. *Developing Country Studies*, 2(11), 81-90.
- Mbarachi, C. S. (2015). Internet linguistics: A study of Nigerian online English. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31686153>
- Mbarachi, C. S., & Okoro, N. (2016). Language and technology: Emerging trends in Nigeria’s digital discourse. *Review of Art and Social Sciences*, 5, 44-51.
- McArthur, T. B. (1998). *The English languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mustafa, S. Z. B., Mageswari, K., & Mohamad, S. M. Y. (2015). An analysis of word formation process in everyday communication on Facebook. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(6), 261-274.
- Mwithi, F., Ndambuki, J., & Nabea, W. (2016). Language and technology: Linguistic features of Facebook in Kenya. *Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics*, 26, 67-77.
- Nelson, G. (2006). The core and periphery of world Englishes: A corpus-based exploration. *World Englishes*, 25, 115-129.
- Nweze, I. M. (2013). SMS texting among GSM users in Nigeria: A morpho-syntactic analysis. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(15), 84-91.
- Odey, V. E., Essoh, N. G. E., & Endong, F. P. C. (2014). Effects of SMS texting on the writing skills of university students in Nigeria: Case of the College of Education Akamkpa. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 2(3), 83-96. <https://doi.org/10.15640/ijlc.v2n3a4>
- Olaluwoye, L. (2021). Surface features of code-switching in the Nigerian online community page on Facebook. *AGOGO Journal of Humanities*, 4(26).

- Olojede, A. M., Matthew, A. E., & Adebola, T. A. (2018). Language use on social media: The study of Facebook interactions by Yaba College of Technology undergraduates. *International Journal of Cultural Studies and Technology*, 2(3), 1-16.
- Opeibi, T., & Oluwasola, A. (2013). Innovations and reproductions in second language (L2) new media: A discursive-semiotic study of selected SMS text messages in Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(2), 123-132. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel>
- Platt, J. T., Weber, H., & Ho, M. L. (1984). *The new Englishes*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Posteguillo, S. (2002). Netlinguistics and English for internet purposes. *IBERICA*, 4, 21-38.
- Pride, J. B. (1982). *New Englishes*. Newbury House.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1972). *A grammar of contemporary English*. Seminar Press.
- Schmeid, J. (2015). Internet English in Nigeria: New data—New discourses? In C. Haase & J. Schmied (Eds.), *Research in English language & linguistics* (Vol. 9).
- Schneider, E. W. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, E. W. (2020). *English around the world: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Shoki, G., & Oni, W. (2008). Semiotic analysis of computer-mediated communication in selected instant messages of Nigerian students. *Rivista Italiana di Tecnologia Cultura e Formazione*, 21-47.
- Simon, D., & Udom, C. G. (2021). Language and technology: Nigeria's digital discourse analysis. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 10(6), 8-12.
- Sun, H. (2010). A study of the features of internet English from the linguistic perspective. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 1(7), 98-103.
- Taiwo, R. (2008). Linguistic forms and functions of SMS text messages in Nigeria. In S. Kesley & K. St. Amant (Eds.), *Handbook of research on computer-mediated communication* (Vol. 1, pp. 969-982). Information Science Reference.
- Taiwo, R. (2010). The dynamics of language mixing in Nigerian digital communication. In R. Taiwo (Ed.), *Handbook of research on discourse behavior and digital communication: Language structures and social interaction* (pp. 180-190). Information Science Reference.
- Taiwo, R. (2013a). Emerging trends in English language in the new media: A case study of satire in Nigerian text messages. *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association (JNESA)*, 16(1), 58-73.
- Taiwo, R. (2013b). Morphosyntactic features of Nigerian English. In B. Kortmann (Ed.), *The Mouton world atlas of variation in English (WAVE)* (pp. 411-416). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Taiwo, R., & Donte, D. (2020). Discursive functions of coinages and abbreviations in Nairaland online community. *Covenant Journal of Language Studies (CJLS)*, 8(2).
- Uba, E., Adebukunola, F., & Chimuanya, L. (2017). Phonological analysis of Nigerian instant messaging on WhatsApp. *Papers in English and Linguistics (PEL)*, 18(3-4), 285-302.
- Ubahakwe, E. E. (1979). *Varieties and functions of English language in Nigeria*. African Universities Press.
- Ubong, E. J., & Udofia, I. (2020). Social media English in nonnative environment: A study of WhatsApp discourse in Nigeria. *ASUU Journal of Humanities*, 5(1), 185-211.
- Udo, E., & Usoro, N. (2016). The implications of social media language use—A case study of students from Akwa Ibom State tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *Language and Semiotic Studies*, 2(2), 128-140.
- Udofot, I. M. (2022). Phonetics and phonology of Nigerian English. *AKSU Journal of English*, 4(1), 1-16.
- Udofot, I. M., & Mbarachi, C. S. (2016). Social media English in Nigeria. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)*, 4(2), 775-784.
- Ugoala, B. (2020). Adaptability and linguistic creativity of Nigerian English in internet memes. *International Journal of Integrative Humanism*, 12(2), 36-51.
- Ugorji, C. U. C. (2010). New Englishes in diachronic light: Evidence from Nigerian English phonology. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*, 30, 131-141.
- Uyanne, M. C. (2012). Short message service (SMS) as a variety of written English. *An International Journal of Language, Literature and Gender Studies (AFRREV LALIGENS)*, 1(3), 107-115.
- Zaiets, V., Zadorizhna, N., Ilchenko, I., Udovichenko, S., & Zahorodnia, L. (2021). The dominant features of the internet linguistics. *Revista Entrelenguas*, 7, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v7i00.15954>