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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Bald on Record**: A politeness strategy that does not redress the threat of the Face Threatening Acts (FTAs).

**Dispute**: A disagreement or state of tension between two or more parties.

**Face**: The public self-image that a person portrays during a social interaction. Used in this sense, the term will always start with a capital letter.

**Face Threatening Acts**: An utterance that causes a threat to positive and negative face of the hearer.

**Negative politeness**: A strategy used to show that the speaker respects the hearer’s needs from imposition.

**Off record**: Politeness strategy that employs indirectness to be less imposing. The hearer is left to infer what the speaker wants.

**Politeness**: A battery of social skills that help interlocutors feel affirmed in a social interaction.

**Positive politeness**: A strategy that recognizes the relational needs of speaker and hearer. The speaker and hearer approve of each other’s needs.

**Power**: A person’s influence in a communicative situation based on age sex, material, political -position.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND NOTATIONS

S ------------ Speaker
H------------ Hearer
P------------ Power
FTA---------- Face Threatening Act
B.O.R-------- Bald on record
CSTM-------- Customer
SHATT------- Shop attendant
A------------ Speaker A
B ----------- Speaker B
C------------ Speaker C
D------------ Speaker D

NOTATIONS (TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS)

Adopted from Sack, Schegloff and Jefferson’s (1974)

[ ] ‘brackets’ indicate overlapping speech or simultaneous talk.

( ) Indicates translation in English

( . ) Indicates a short pause.

_____ ‘dash’ indicates an abrupt cut off.

A B C D Indicates participants in the conversation.

( - ) Indicates a longer pause.
ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a study focusing on the nature of talk in Ekegusii. It specifically analyzed the forms of politeness in Ekegusii, examining how Ekegusii varies depending on power relations and the context of usage. Samples of spoken Ekegusii, collected from at least four contexts were tape recorded, transcribed and analyzed in order to meet the following objectives: To identify the turns from the spoken excerpts, to describe the forms of politeness in the spoken excerpts, and to assess the effect of age and role relations of participants on the use of politeness in Ekegusii. The study was motivated by the fact that there exist scanty studies on the forms of politeness in African languages, specifically in Ekegusii. The study used as its data spoken Ekegusii excerpts drawn from a variety of contexts namely, meetings to resolve disputes, across the shop counter, work and the street contexts. The target sample included individuals with perceived power differences such as father and child, husband and wife, young brother and elder brother; the young and the old; and also those with differing role relations. The location for the research was Kisii County, Sameta District, Sameta Division. Data were collected using tape recording and participant observation. A content analysis of the data was done employing both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis, basing on Brown and Levinson’s (1978) Politeness theory; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, (1974) Conversational Analysis theory; and Grice’s (1975) Cooperative Principle. It is hoped that the findings of this study will help teachers, counselors, and peace mediators in applying the concept of politeness in various real-life situations. It is also hoped that this research will help preserve our indigenous languages and also be an important contribution to the pool of knowledge on the importance of face in any interaction in our African languages.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with the background to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, rationale for the study and the scope of the research. A summary of the chapter concludes the various sections.

1.1 Background to the study

Communities are diverse and so are their communicative repertoires. The way people talk to one another – how they hold conversations, tell stories, make jokes, argue or tease one another will vary in different cultural contexts. During an interaction, speakers will choose expressions that will vary on a politeness scale and speakers can be more or less polite depending on the situation. It has been argued, for example, that being polite is attributable not only to language on the basis of inherent properties of expressions, but also to speakers in specific speech situations. To address each other, speakers have to choose terms that are indicative of and define power and social relationships.

For an interaction to be successful, co-operation is needed amongst the participants to maintain each other’s self-esteem, what has been called Face, through the use of politeness strategies. The notion ‘Face’ is from Goffman’s (1967) work in which he defines Face as the positive social value a person claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Goffman adds that individuals try to make a good showing of each other during a
social interaction. Building on Goffman’s work on face, (Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987) go ahead to classify Face into two notions which are positive and negative face. Positive face is defined as the want of every adult member that his/her wants be desirable to at least some others. Utterances like ‘you have a beautiful car’ represent a boost to a hearer’s positive face in the fact that his /her goods are appreciated.

Negative face on the other hand refers to the desire of every adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others. A speaker for instance respects a hearer’s negative face by using polite expressions like ‘could you, excuse me, please’ before their utterances.

The concept of positive and negative politeness derives from two notions of Face. In positive politeness, considerations for both the speaker’s and hearers positive face wants are considered. The sphere of redress includes claims to reciprocity of obligations, presuppositions of shared knowledge and wants. There is a tendency for some exaggeration in positive politeness.

Additionally, positive politeness is found in expressive speech acts and is motivated by the speaker’s desire to maximize the praise of his/her hearer. In Negative Politeness on the other hand, the interest is on the hearer and so the speaker performs acts that are less imposing on the hearer. Here, an FTA is actually made on record but it is redressed to minimize its imposition on the hearer. For instance, a speaker could request for a favour in the manner, ‘Could
you please carry these goods for me?’ implying that the speaker recognizes the 
hearer’s freedom from imposition by prefixing the polite expression ‘could you’ 
before the actual request. Therefore, negative politeness is associated primarily 
with directive speech acts and variation in the degree of imposition.

Despite the requirements for face threat mitigation strategies during interactions, 
there are, however, situations in which the good show may not apply, especially if 
people are involved in an argument, a negotiation, if one was issuing a directive, 
or making a request for a favour. It is however important to note that even in these 
situations, face considerations are not completely ignored. In such interactions, 
participants adopt politeness strategies, which are mechanisms that mitigate the 
effects of potential face threatening acts. They are associated with the degree of 
explicitness and directness of speech acts and the choice of speech act verb, which 
modulate the difference in social distance and relative power of the participants.

In this regard, successful interactions are those in which participants employ 
positive forms of politeness in their day to day interactions, whereas unsuccessful 
interactions- those that lead to conflict escalation and deterioration of relations are 
likely those that emphasize independence over approval, resulting in negative 
long-term outcomes.

It has been observed that there are universals in forms of politeness in many 
cultures yet these universals detail different politeness strategies. Michael Haugh 
in a review of Watt’s book ‘Politeness in language’ observes that the concept of
politeness cannot be defined across ‘cultural spaces’. Politeness differs from
culture to culture and that it is the social norms that stipulate what is appropriate
for a specific interactional situation. That cultures are diverse is a fact and is
therefore motivation enough to study each language within the speaking practices
of its people.

Ekegusii is a language spoken by the Abagusii people of western Kenya, Nyanza
province in the now Kisii and Nyamira counties. The language is commonly
known as Ekegusii/ekeγusii/ (Camenga 2002, Mose 2010). Like many Bantu
communities, the Abagusii are culturally patriarchal. Men tend to dominate all
cultural practices including who speaks first, when and to whom. It is interesting
to note that in one of the domains namely dispute resolution, there were protests
from a man questioning why a wife to one of the complainants in a dispute was
allowed to speak even after her husband had spoken. A brief excerpt is
highlighted for illustration. More detail is given in chapter 4. She is herein
identified as speaker X.

X: Nabakwaniri, mbuya more? Omochando oyo orero
Timbwati amange ndakwane : I greet you, are you okay?
Natebeti omotureti amang’ana ayio : I don’t have much to say
Rakini tana koyagamba : I reported the present dispute to the
Amang’ana namange akoreta : clan elder but she didn’t solve it.
There are many issues that culminate to the present dispute. Amang’ana narro ya amadeni Ne echiombe chia abaiseke Riswari riane neri aye omotureti Bono riswari riane neri: Naki rero aro gwachera kogamba amang’ana aya yoboremo?

After explaining her case concerning the present dispute about land, another speaker, a man, takes over the conversation and expresses his disapproval at having one’s wife speak after her husband has spoken. The short excerpt illustrates the patriarchal nature of Ekegusii. The male speaker is identified as Y whereas the clan elder is identified as Z.

Y: Tiga ntebe iga. Ntobwate-- : Let me say this: we have-------

Z: Bono onye kera omonto otagete gokwana : Now if everyone wants to talk, Indi togocha gokora? Bono---- when shall we finish? Now----

Y: Koratiga kwanza. nigo gwachera gokonya abaiso moke aba bao. : Hold on first. You came to assist these uncles of yours.
Omobayeno noroo nakii, oroko

There is a saying that the piece

Rore irongo nigo rogosekerera orore riiko.

of firewood on the ceiling

laughs at the one in the fire

place.

Ndori komanya ng’a mambi narororu

It doesn’t realize that it too,

ndochrome robeku riko

will be on the fire tomorrow

Ase igo tiga tobakonye

we therefore need to assist

ase engencho obokongu ---

this problem can affect us too-

obo nabo naintwe bogotonyora---

Naende rende abagaka, ee ,

And, old men, ah well, we will

finally

ntochrome toruo rakini

leave the earth but please

if I have spoken,

onye nakwana, omongina one .

do not let my wife speak

nere takwana

as well

Speaker ‘Y’ here strongly disputes the idea of a woman airing her views about the

dispute at hand if her husband has spoken. These are the final words he utters

before taking his seat.
A detailed analysis of the data is presented in chapter four.

It is also argued that speakers of Ekegusii do not necessarily observe the rule of one speaker at a time and it is therefore common to find more than one of the participants in a conversation speaking at the same time.

Dialectic wise, Ekegusii is said to be categorized into ‘Rogoro and Maate’ dialects. This study will use as its data, recordings done from the Rogoro dialect.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The importance of politeness in day to day interactions cannot be over-emphasized. In fact everything that is done and said revolves around individuals’ conscious efforts to employ politeness lest the interaction fails due to what will be interpreted as impoliteness. Politeness plays a significant role in all civilized societies since it forms the basis for a respectful interaction between human beings and for successful conversations.

Communicative success is dependent on the right amount of politeness applied at the right time to the right speech act as determined by social norms. There is, however, very little known about how speakers of Kenyan languages achieve politeness when interacting in their first languages. This study therefore hopes to fill this gap. The study investigates the speech of Gusii interlocutors with a view
to determining and describing the nature of turn taking in conversations. Attempts are also made to assess the effect of age and role relations of Gusii speakers on the use of polite expressions.

1.3 Research objectives

The following objectives guided this study:

1. To describe the nature of turn-taking in Ekegusii.

2. To describe the forms of politeness in interactions in Ekegusii.

3. To assess participants effect of age and role relations on the use of polite expressions.

1.4 Research questions

The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the nature of turns in Ekegusii?

2. What forms of politeness occur in the speech of Ekegusii speakers?

3. How do the variables of age and role relations of participants affect the choice of politeness forms in Ekegusii?

1.5 Rationale for the study

The teaching of English is beginning to erode the mother-tongues of most Kenyan indigenous languages. Basic education using indigenous languages is taught in the
first three years and it is the only time that learners get access to their mother-tongues at least in the rural areas. Research on an indigenous language such as Ekegusii highlights the importance attached to it and thus an indicator that we should preserve our indigenous languages. Also, this research would be an important contribution to the pool of knowledge on the importance of face in any interaction in our African languages. Teachers of English would find this research useful in teaching the concept of politeness since they will make parallels.

1.6 Scope of the research

This research was limited to conversational exchanges recorded during meetings to resolve disputes at the village level, when buying goods across a shop counter, in the street during friendly chats, and during work, in Ekegusii language only. The choice of Ekegusii as opposed to other local languages was informed by the nativist perspective as propounded by (Labov, 1967; Spradley, 1979; Chomsky, 1977, 1986) who observe that the member of society is the repository of cultural knowledge and can easily tap the knowledge introspectively to validate, enrich and expedite the task of ethnographic description.

The respondents were adult speakers aged between eighteen and sixty years drawn from Kisii-county, Sameta District, Sameta Division only. The choice of Kisii county and specifically Sameta Division was influenced by the fact that it would be relied upon to provide enough respondents to cover the various domains targeted for data collection. The need to study conversational exchanges as
opposed to phonology, grammar or any other texts was based on the understanding that spoken texts are spontaneous and tend to yield natural data that reflects a people’s way of thinking and interacting.

1.7 Summary of chapter

This chapter has outlined the background to the study by discussing the statement of the problem, the research questions, objectives and assumptions, the scope and limitations of the study and the rationale of conducting the study. Forming the first chapter of the study, it has been followed by chapter two which examines the literature review and theoretical framework, then chapter three which provides the research methodology, while chapter four gives the presentation, analysis and discussion of data and chapter five presents a summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

In this section we review various literature on Discourse in general, then Spoken Discourse, especially literature on politeness. In the second section, we review the theoretical framework adopted by this study. Each theoretical framework will be described, its tenets highlighted and relevance to the proposed study evaluated.

2.1 Studies on discourse

In everyday popular use, the term discourse is restricted to spoken language. Broadly speaking, discourse analysts investigate the use of language in context, thus they are interested in what speakers/writers do, and not so much in the formal relationships among sentences or propositions. Discourse analysis, then, has a social dimension, and for many analysts it is a method for studying how language “gets recruited ‘on site’ to enact specific social activities and social identities” (Gee 1999: 1). Discourse analysts explore matters such as: Turn-taking in telephone conversations, the language of humour, Power relationships in doctor/patient interviews, dialogue in chat rooms, the discourse of the archives, records or files of psychoanalysts, the conversation at a dinner table, the scripts of a given television program, the discourse of politicians, The characteristics of
persuasive discourse, openings and closings in different types of conversations, The structure of narrative, the use of linguistic politeness, The discourse of E-mail messages, Legal discourse used in trials, among others. By working with natural data, it is possible get revelations on how speakers use language in real-life situations in their communities (Gibbons, 1987; Mesthrie, 2000; Kebeya, 2008).

The 1970s saw a wide interest in the study of "texts" or "discourses" in such disciplines as linguistics, semiotics, literary scholarship, psychology, sociology, and anthropology. In each of these disciplines, an interest in texts seemed to mark a paradigm shift with respect to earlier studies of the structures and functions of language. In several of these areas, attention shifted from the study of individual words, phrases, or sentences to an analysis of structures and functions of actual forms of language use, that is, to discourse. The current study seeks to benefit from these studies by looking at the various exchanges between respondents as meaning carrying discourses. That each utterance has a turn and is made with considerations of Face wants for the other interactants.

2.2 Studies on Turn-taking in conversation

Zimmerman and West (1975) while analyzing conversation involving two participants in coffee shops also found out that there are differences between conversations involving two speakers of the same sex and those involving one speaker of each sex.
In another study on Adult-Child conversations, (Zimmerman and West (1977), found out that adults abuse the expected rules of turn-taking. Other researchers such as Ikaaria (2008); Tannen (1990); Mills (2003) also concur that there are stylistic differences in the way men and women speak and that men interrupt women more during conversation.

Stubbs (1983), while analyzing classroom discourse using an ethno methodological approach, found out that speakers take turns to speak.

Turn-taking as part of a structure of a conversation, includes aspects like overlaps and what others consider interruptions. Tannen (1984) views the phenomenon of ‘interruption’, more properly referred as ‘overlap’, as a manifestation of power and solidarity. Tannen observes that while some speakers believe that only one voice should be heard at a time, and any overlap is considered an interruption; others believe that enthusiastic listeners overlap cooperatively, establishing rapport between them and the speaker. There is need for balance in determining if an overlap becomes an interruption in a power-laden sense or if it is an overlap in which both parties win, thus cooperative/friendly interaction.

The current study seeks to analyze this phenomenon of overlapping as it occurs in Ekegusii and how it can be judged in terms of politeness. The study takes as its discourse type or genre everyday conversation analyzed within various contexts.
2.3 Literature on Politeness

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson define a turn as an uninterrupted stretch of talk produced by a speaker. They add that a conversation is organized on the basis of the principal that speakers take turns to speak and that such turns are allocated according to a rule accepted by the speakers. This rule states that one and only one speaker speaks at a time. Whenever the rule of one speaker at a time is contravened, it is interpreted as an overlap. In linguistic politeness, a complete turn or an overlap have various interpretations ranging from whether the person you are interacting with has respect for your face wants to whether he is trying to exercise power and control by overlapping. Brown & Levinson in their theory of politeness (1987:61) define Face as a ‘public self-image which every adult tries to project. This implies that individuals will try to save each other’s faces during an interaction. Goffman (1967:5) on his part defines Face as ‘the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact’. Since the contact will involve the use of language, then individuals have to weigh what they say and how they say it. If an individual projects what is considered an unfavourable face, he will create conflicts with fellow interlocutors. This study will find Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson’s (1974) work, and that of Brown and Levinson (1987) useful in interpreting how a turn or an overlap implicates on the politeness phenomena. Additionally, it will help expound on whether individuals cause Face threatening
acts when they overlap and also if such overlaps are indicative of power differences between the interlocutors.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

This study adopts the following theoretical framework. Brown and Levinson’s, (1987) The Politeness Theory; Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson’s (1974) Conversational Analysis theory; and Grice’s (1975) Cooperative principle. Each of these theories will be discussed and their relevance to the proposed study highlighted.

2.5 The Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson, 1987)

2.5.1 Face

Brown & Levinson (1987:61) define face as a ‘public self-image which every adult tries to project. This implies that individuals will try to save each other’s faces during an interaction. Goffman (1967:5) on his part defines face as ‘the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact’. Because the contact will involve the use of language, then individuals have to weigh what they say and how they say it. If an individual projects what is considered an unfavourable face, he will create conflicts with fellow interlocutors. To resolve the face threats and hence sound polite, participants employ various face-saving strategies or what Brown and Levinson call Politeness strategies.
This study looked at how people manipulate talk in various domains namely dispute resolution meetings at the village level, across the shop counter, in the street, and during work in a construction site.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), Face is crucial to power as it determines the identities that people will establish for themselves in different contexts and also the linguistic output during such an interaction. Considerations for face will also determine the linguistic strategies employed by interactants who are differentiated by varying degrees of social distance. It is important to note that not all situations will cater for the face needs of interactants. People will need to express urgency or emphasis and thus appear pushy, intimidating or impolite. For instance, one can object to a proposition in Ekegusii by quickly responding “yaya” (No!). This is an On Record utterance and is likely to be interpreted as rude hence the start of a dispute. To avoid conflicts during an interaction, individuals therefore employ various forms of politeness so that their talk is collaborative rather than competitive.

2.5.2 Politeness

Politeness is the expression of the speaker’s intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts towards another (Mills 2003:6)

Politeness may also be defined as the desire by interactants to avoid affronts on each other’s faces by use of appropriate politeness strategies to minimize the imposition caused by the face threatening acts. Central to the concept of linguistic
politeness is the notion Face and the strategies that help mitigate face attacks during interactions. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) look at conversation and interpret it within the politeness theory. They explore issues of power and age among other factors as they affect the choice of politeness strategies in mitigating FTAs.

Apart from power and age, the other factor determining linguistic choice in a bid to realize politeness is ‘domain’. The concept ‘domain’ as developed by Fishman (1966; 1971; 1972) is useful for both description and explanation of means of communication. He defines domain as a social construct abstracted from topics of communication, in accord with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a speech community (Fishman 1971:587). Three factors determining domain are identified as, the general subject area under discussion, for instance, religion family, and work; the role relations between participants, such as father-son, boss-secretary, priest-parishioner; the setting of the interaction, such as church, hotel, home, office. The domain model was applied to our research in defining how forms of politeness differ according to change of topic, setting and the role relations of participants.

The politeness model as developed by Brown and Levinson (1978;1987) therefore outlines different mitigating strategies when performing FTAs. This model was applied in our research in determining which of the two forms of politeness, that is positive and negative politeness, characterizes Ekegusii speech in the various
domains of use. Below is a brief discussion of each of the various types of Face-saving strategies.

### 2.5.3 Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategies are used as a kind of wrapper to formulate messages in order to save interlocutors’ faces when face threatening acts are inevitable. Brown & Levinson (1987) outline five main types of politeness strategies:

a) Bald on –Record

b) Positive politeness

c) Negative politeness

d) Off-record

e) Don’t do the FTA

These strategies are schematized in figure 2.1 below.
Figure 2.1: Politeness strategies (adapted from Brown and Levinson 1987:60)

Figure 2.1 shows that interactants move to a higher numbered strategy if they are to be more polite and hence less imposing.

2.5.3.1 Bald on record (without redressive action)

The bald on record strategy is employed when the speaker wants to communicate in the most clear, direct and unambiguous way. Factors determining use of this strategy range from the need for efficiency or urgency, if the FTA is small in terms of its imposition and if one of the interactants is superior in power to the other. Both the speaker and hearer acknowledge that no face redress is necessary.

2.5.3.2 Positive politeness

In positive politeness, considerations for both the speaker’s and hearers positive face wants are considered. The sphere of redress includes claims to reciprocity of obligations, presuppositions of shared knowledge and wants. There is a tendency for some exaggeration in positive politeness.

Positive politeness as a super strategy consists of fifteen strategies some of which include taking notice and attending to the hearers needs, exaggerating and using in-group identity markers like mate, dear, etc.

Consider the following excerpt taken from chapter four from the dispute resolution domain as it captures one of the interlocutor’s efforts to resolve the differences between themselves by use of in group identity markers. He has been
identified as speaker C and the youngest among the three brothers in conflict over land. The targeted part is in bold.

Example 1:

C: Naende Nyasae Nyaasae. Ase morarore,       ( ) And God is God. Wherever you choose,

namontebia ng’a inche egepisi                        ( ) whether you tell me that this is the piece

eke iga naki mwang’eire, I will accept              ( ) of land you’ve given me,  I will accept and

naende ng’ancherane igo.                            ( ) and abide by that decision.

Ituko ndiyo ndabori naende oboremo.                ( ) there’s no day I will ask for land again.

Oyoriete enibo ere excess, nabo agoteba ng’a ( ) whoever took excess wealth, he is free to say

nindiete enibo ere egesesi.                         ( ) that ‘I’ took excess wealth.

eyio nerete oboamate bore obuya                   ( ) That will create peace

gati yaito buna chindugu                          amongst us as brothers.

kera omonto asiboke.                                ( ) and each of us will feel free.
Onye toetaine inche ne chindugu chiane, if we are at loggerheads,

tiga ngiche ntebe ngaki ,rero tiga mogambe let me say it here that today,
you discuss

amanga ane na barabwo. my issues with them.

The reference to his brothers as ‘Chindugu’ (my brothers) and not ‘people’ in general, shows that the speaker appreciates their positive wants by use of the in-group identity marker ‘brothers’ even in a dispute situation.

2.5.3.3 Negative Politeness

In Negative Politeness, an FTA is actually made on record but it is redressed to minimize its imposition on the hearer.

This implies that negative politeness enjoys both On-record delivery and redress of an FTA (Brown & Levinson 1987:130)

Contrary to this claim is the fact that an on-record utterance will coerce the hearer and impinge on his freedom from imposition. Therefore a speaker does not issue negatively polite FTAs completely directly.

This super strategy comprises of ten sub-strategies for doing FTAs including being conventionally indirect, hedging and giving deference.
2.5.3.4 Off record strategy

The off record strategy refers to indirect communication such that an utterance has more than one interpretation. This way the speaker is removed from the potential to be imposing. The hearer must employ inference to make out what was actually intended. The off record strategy employs conversational implicature and acts in violation to the Gricean maxims. This high level super strategy employs 15 strategies in doing FTAs including giving hints association clues and using tautologies.

2.5.3.5 Don’t Do the FTA

This is an important strategy in minimizing the imposition of, in having the hearer or speaker refuse to perform a FTA by remaining silent. The understanding is that silence would be more Face friendly than if the FTA were verbally made.

The politeness theory was applied in describing the various politeness strategies that detail the Ekegusii forms of politeness.

2.6 The Conversational Analysis Theory (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974)

Conversational Analysis, commonly abbreviated as CA is the study of talk in interaction. CA generally attempts to describe the orderliness, structure and sequential patterns of interaction, whether institutional (in school, a doctor’s surgery, court or elsewhere) or in casual conversation. Inspired by Ethnomethodology (e.g. Harold Garfinkel) and Erving Goffman, CA was
developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s by the sociologist Harvey Sacks and his associates Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Sacks (1974) identify turn taking as one of the fundamental organizations of conversation. According to CA, the turn taking system consists of two components namely; the turn constructional component and the turn allocational component. The turn-taking organization is described in Sacks, H., Schegloff E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1974) as “A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation”. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson define a turn as an uninterrupted stretch of talk produced by a speaker. They add that a conversation is organized on the basis of the principal that speakers take turns to speak and that such turns are allocated according to a rule accepted by the speakers. This rule states that one and only one speaker speaks at a time. Whenever the rule of one speaker at a time is contravened, it is interpreted as an overlap. This happens as a result of overlapping or failure by the other interlocutor to participate cooperatively in the conversation.

Conversational Analysis Theory informed this study in identifying the interactional turns in the various domains/contexts. By taking the conversational turn as the linguistic of analysis, the utterances were also analyzed in line with the tenets of the politeness theory in order to determine the forms of politeness that they employ.
2.7 Grice maxims

Interactants in any conversation are assumed to be cooperating for the conversation to be meaningful. This is the assumption upon which the Cooperative principle operates. It describes how effective communication in conversation is achieved in common social situations. The cooperative principle can be divided into four conversational maxims, called the Gricean Maxims, which are a way to explain the link between utterances and what is understood from them. All the four maxims are summarized as:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Grice 1975; Yule G 1985)

The first of the four maxims is the Maxim of Quantity which states that one should make his contribution as informative as is required, but not more or less, than is required. The second maxim is the Maxim of Quality which requires that one does not say that which he/she believes to be false or for which he/she lacks evidence. The third maxim is that of Relation which requires one to be relevant. The last of the Gricean Maxims is the Maxim of Manner which states that one should be clear, brief and orderly.

Although interactants are expected to observe the conversational maxims, there are times when they flout them to achieve various effects including the desire to sound appropriately polite. Flouting the maxims results in conversational
implicature. Speakers and hearers have to employ inference to understand the intended meaning from what is literally expressed.

The cooperative principle was useful to our study in describing how power plays out in interactions. For instance, someone could deliberately give scanty information because of rudeness and the fact he/she enjoys power over the other in the interaction.

2.8 Summary of chapter

This chapter has presented a review of relevant literature on studies in discourse, turn taking and politeness of Ekegusii and English languages. It has also reviewed general discussions on the politeness phenomena and the theoretical framework adopted in line with the objectives of the study.

In objective one, we seek to describe the nature of turn-taking in Ekegusii guided by the principles of turn-taking as provided for by the Conversation Analysis theory. We seek to establish whether interlocutors observe the turn allocational mechanisms and if not find the reason behind it.

In objective two, we describe the various turns in terms of the forms of politeness that they detail. The various politeness strategies will help classify the utterances into the forms, positive or negative politeness. Guiding this principle is the politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1978).
Similarly, in objective three, the study assesses the effect of age and role relations of Gusii speakers on the use of polite expressions. Like objective two, the third objective will be guided by principles of the politeness theory.

Chapter three evaluates the research methodology adopted for this study.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

In this section, the methodology that was adopted for this research is discussed in detail. The researcher discusses the research design, the source of data and sampling procedures, the method of data collection and how data is analyzed and presented.

3.1 Research design

This study adopted a descriptive research design. This is a design that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative methodologies thus enabling the researcher to describe events in greater depth as required and to engage quantitative statistics to organize information in meaningful ways. For the proposed research, the quantitative aspect will involve collecting and tabulating the various politeness strategies that detail positive or negative politeness in the recorded conversations, whereas the qualitative aspect will apply in describing the categories identified.

3.2 Study area

The data for this study was collected from speakers of Ekegusii in Kisii County, Sameta district, Sameta division. This area was preferred because it is where the Abagusii congregate. Also, this it is accessible to the researcher and offers
accessibility to all categories and ages of respondents. This would not be possible if the setting were in an urban where there could largely be young men and women.

The Abagusii are a people found on the Western part of Kenya. They are bordered by the Kipsigis to the East, the Maasai to the South East, the Kuria to the South and the Luo to the West. It is classified as a Bantu language and put in group 40 of zone E as No. E42 alongside Kuria, E43 and Lulogooli E41 (Guthrie 1967). Speakers of Ekegusii are estimated at about 1.7 million. This represents 4.4% of the country’s total population of about 38,610,097 people (The Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2010). The Ethnologue report (Lewis, 2009) places the speakers at about 2,120,000 in Kenya. The speakers are distributed over Kisii and Nyamira counties, south of Kavirondo Gulf. This area covers the administrative units of Kisii Central, Kisii South, Masaba, Gucha South, Nyamira, Manga and Borabu (Mose, 2010). Ekegusii is also spoken in Tanzania by about 300 speakers bringing the total number of speakers to about 2,120,300 (Lewis, 2009). Dialectic wise, the community is classified into ‘Rogoro and Maate’ dialects (Whiteley 1965; Kebeya 2008).

### 3.3 Population and sampling procedures

The target population for this study comprised of both males and females aged between eighteen and sixty years old. This group was considered mature enough to use language stylistically and forms a large sample that can fall into the various
domains of language namely dispute meetings, work, business, street chat. The need to collect data from both males and females is because it is documented that males and females speak differently (Tannen, 1984), and since we are looking at forms of politeness in Ekegusii, getting data from one type of gender would be unrepresentative of the Ekegusii speakers’ ways of expressing politeness. Also, this study required individuals with perceived power differences among others, such as father and child, husband and wife young brother and elder brother; purposive sampling was used to get the specific data from the target groups. (Mugenda & Mugenda 1999) observe that purposive sampling allows the researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of the study.

3.4 Data collection procedures

Taking into account the importance of a native speaker in research, the researcher took the role of participant observer in the four contexts of tape recording and note taking. This is in line with (Labov 1967, 1971; Spradley 1979) who observe that when the observer knows the rules of the culture and members of the community know that he/she knows the rules of culture, they expect the observer to behave like a member of the society. The nativist perspective is further corroborated by Chomsky (1977, 1986) in which he argues that the member of society is the repository of cultural knowledge and can easily tap the knowledge
introspectively to validate, enrich and expedite the task of ethnographic description.

The data for this study is spoken Ekegusii which was drawn from the following contexts using the tape recording method: The village headman’s Baraza during the resolution of disputes; across the shop counter, when buying something; on the street, during friendly chats; and from the construction site during work.

The recordings were about seven minutes long each except the one for dispute resolution which took about one and half hours. The data collection instruments were a tape recorder and observation notebook. The tape recorder was used to collect all the verbal utterances whereas the observation notes was used to capture the extra-linguistic information like body behaviour during interaction. The tape recording and note taking were done in the four contexts.

3.5 Ethical considerations

The data for this study was largely drawn through tape recording and note taking. Before the recording was done, the targeted respondents were duly informed on the intention to record. The identities of the respondents was protected by the use of pseudonyms. In situations like across the shop counter interaction, the shopkeeper, who would double up as one of the participants, also did the recording. The participants in each case were assured that information collected was to be used purely for research purposes.
3.6 Summary of chapter

This chapter has discussed the research methodology. It has focused on the research design, population and data sampling, research instruments and methods of data collection, presentation and analysis. Chapter four deals with the presentation, analysis and discussion of data.
CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter contains the findings from the field concerning data that was collected from participants in Dispute resolution, Work, Business and the Street contexts. The data were captured through tape recording and analyzed descriptively to: establish the structure of turn-taking in Ekegusii, the forms of politeness in Ekegusii, and finally how age and role relations influence the choice of politeness expressions by interactants in Ekegusii.

The collected data were analyzed within the politeness model by Brown & Levinson (1987), supplemented (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974) and Grice’s (1975) Cooperative Principle. A content analysis was conducted on the conversational utterances to establish the structure of turn-taking, the forms of politeness, and finally how age and role relations influence the choice of politeness expressions by interactants.

The data for this research has been presented using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Whereas the qualitative approach has helped describe the structure of the Ekegusii discourse especially the phenomenon of turn-taking, the quantitative approach has helped classify the various politeness strategies that are detailed by the forms of politeness in Ekegusii. Taking the conversational turn as
the linguistic unit of analysis, the transcribed turns were analyzed to determine which forms of politeness characterize interactions in Ekegusii.

4.1 The structure of Turn-taking in Ekegusii

This section examines the nature of turns in Ekegusii during dispute resolution, work, business and the street contexts. Sacks (1974) model of Conversational Analysis will be used to describe the structures.

Turn-taking has been identified as the most important aspect in the conversational structure. The other features of conversation include turn construction units, overlaps, silence, adjacency pairs, opening sequences, middle and closing sequences.

4.1.1 The structure of turns in the dispute resolution meeting.

A turn refers to an uninterrupted stretch of language produced by one speaker. The overriding principal in turn taking is that only one speaker talks at a time and that no overlaps should occur.

Turn taking in this study has been achieved with occurrences of overlaps as illustrated by the examples below. The nature of dispute in this study revolves around claims of unequal sharing of land by three brothers.
Example 1

EKEGUSII  GLOSS

T1.A: Mbuya mono ase ribaga,  A: Thanks for the chance, I ask
muyowr.  my brother,

Nkoboria endugu yane, tata tang’aterete?  Didn’t dad inherit me with land?

T1.B: Yaya, tata taateti boremo.  ( ) No he didn’t subdivide the
  land.

T2.A: Aiga ase nkorema nkwang’o?  ( ) Whose piece am I tilling
then?

( ) You are tilling a piece that

T3.B: Igo okorema ase kwetwe onakorema  temporarily allocated to you,
Koganyete toate oboremo.  awaiting formal

( ) subdivision

In example 1, the roles of speaker change occurs with speaker A taking the first
turn which is in form of a question; Tata tang’aterete?  (Didn’t my dad bequeath
me with a piece of land?). Speaker B then responds Yaya, tata taateti boremo (No
he didn’t subdivide the land.) In this case both speakers don’t interrupt each other
but allow the conversation to flow within the rules of turn taking.
Example 2

T1.A: Ekero mwacha aiga, when you came here
nigo mwacha gotatua amang’ana. You came to solve a problem.
kwana amang’ana onsi; a yoboremo discuss the issue of land,
na aye chiombe livestock
egere.... so that....

T2.B: [ ] Ngokumia eki endugu yane egokwana I wonder what my brother is saying.
[ ] Abaiseke mbari:
[ ] our sisters aren’t
ba M. onye M obwate obokong’u,
[ ] X’s daughters from whom he can demand dowry.

In example 2 an overlap occurs as speaker B interrupts speaker A perhaps in a bid to stop him from saying what he (B) considers a falsehood or irrelevant to the present dispute. Speaker B seeks to stop speaker A from pursuing the issue of their sisters’ dowry claiming it is not relevant to the present dispute about land. This shows that Ekegusii has a structure and that overlapping occurs as a means of correcting a wrong perspective.
4.1.2 The structure of turns in the work domain

In the work domain, conversational responses tend to follow a verbal-action procedure. Speaker A will ask speaker B to pass a tool to him/her and speaker B may comply by a verbal response plus the tool or by handing the tool directly without having to talk. The talk therefore is on record and thus avoids any redress. The conversation all the same follows the rules of turn taking.

The following conversation from a carpentry workshop illustrates the structure

Example 1

T1.A: Naye obwate enyundo?  
T1.B: Ee ,rakini ngotumeka nde 

In this example, speaker A seeks information and is supplied with it by speaker B in a turn order. This implies that even in the work domain, conversation follows the rules of turn taking.

Example 2

T3.A: Nomanyete momura omwabo John omoke?  

( ) Are you the one with the hammer?  
( ) Yes but I am using it.  
( ) Do you remember  
John's young brother?
Bwango iga, nareta omorugi. Bono omorugi he recently married but the
oyio nigo amochandete wife now troubles him.

T4.B: Ng’ererie eranda ( ) pass the smoothening plane to me

T4.A: Sagwa, ngeye ( ) Fine, here it is.

T5.A: nare kogotebia igoro ye - - ( ) I was telling you about - -

T5.B: Mokaye nairanete sobo [ ] His wife went back to

her people.

From the short conversation in example 2 above it can be noted that the
speakers take turns to speak. However, speaker B in turn 5 does not
cooperatively respond to speaker A’s turn. For instance, instead of
contributing to speakers A’s story about John’s brother, he suddenly changes
topic and asks for a smoothening plane. In a bid to sustain the conversation, A
continues with the story but is rudely interrupted by B who supplies
information that suggests a conclusion to the topic. It is safe to conclude that
whether the responses are cooperative or not, they are constructed through
structured turns and sometimes overlaps.

4.1.3 The structure of turns in the street domain

Data was collected from adult men in a social gathering where they keep
themselves busy playing a draughts game and discussing various issues.
Among the topics of discussion is the forthcoming 2013 general elections in
Kenya. The conversation goes as follows.
Example 1

A: Aka ngo ndore. ( ) Make your move so that I may see

B: Narire egeche naende nabuire. ( ) I have captured one of your tiles and thus you've lost the game.

A: Ondi? Gose naye okobuu ( ) Captured? It is you that will be defeated.

A: Bwaerire. ( ) The game is over

B: Bado ( ) Not yet.

In this example 1, participants A and B observe the rules of turn taking as they play at the same time and discuss about their prowess in the game of draughts. For instance, B brags of having captured one of A’s tiles (B: Narire egeche naende nabuire. B: I have captured one of your tiles and thus I have won the game), upon which A, in his turn of speaking, tells B that it is he who will lose the game.

A: Ondi? Gose naye okobuu ( ) Captured? It is you that will be defeated.

It is evident from the above exchange that Ekegusii speakers observe the rules of turn taking during conversation.

Now consider a second example in which the talk shifts to the politics of the impending general elections.
Example 2

A: Abana siasa mbachareti igoro ( Politicians don’t care about round ye eroundi entangani ye chikura. one of elections. )

Mbamanyete nga tibakobua eraundi. ( they know that they might not win in round one )

B: Eke naki togotebera nga atakeire abe macho sana ( That is why they are ekero gie chikampeini ------ careful not to annoy their estranged lieutenants during campaigns---- )

C: Manya nga nonyora 49% igo torabua. ( Imagine that even if you score 49% will not have won yet. )

B: Ee nabo ere igo. ( Yes, that is how it is. )

C: Bono eraundi ya kabere nabo ebiama ( It is possible for parties to join hands in birache amo bakonye namba ibere onyore okoba round two and even make two namba eyemo. to become number one )
From example 2, we can note that speakers take turns to speak. However when one person feels he has a pressing idea to contribute he interrupts speaker B to make his point. This has happened with speaker ‘C’ interrupting ‘B’ in order to contribute that even if one garnered 49% of the total votes cast, he would still not be declared the winner.

Consider:

B: Eke naki togotebera nga atakeire abe macho sana ( ) That is why they are egere mbagechia abashirika babo careful not to annoy eker gie chikampeini ------ their estranged lieutenants during campaigns ----------

C: [ ] Manya nga nonyora 49% igo torabua. [ ] Imagine that even if you score 49% you will not have won yet

Just like other languages such as English, ekegusii speakers overlap during conversation.

4.1.4 The structure of turns in across the shop counter conversation

Conversation structures in Across the Counter conversation involves a customer ordering for goods from the shopkeeper. The findings from the study indicate that the customer and shopkeeper observe the rules of turn taking as postulated by SSJ (1974) theory of Conversational Analysis.
The following excerpt from the conversation illustrate thus:

Example 1                Gloss

CSTM: Bwakire omonyatuka   ( ) Good morning shop owner?

SH ATT: Bwakire buya. Naki  ( ) Good morning to you.

Mwabokire?               How have you woken up?

CSTM: Twabokire buya. Bono, ( ) we have woken up well.

Nobwate esukari na amachani? Well, do you have sugar and

beverage?

SH ATT: Eee               ( ) Yes

CSTM: Basi, bono ng’a esukari enusu na   ( ) Fine. Give me a half kg
of sugar             amachani aikomi. and tea leaves for

 ten shillings

SH ATT: Ebi bono. Notagete kende naende?  ( ) do you need something

else?

CSTM: Yaya. Tiga ing’ende   ( ) No, let me go.

SH ATT: Sawa, mbuya mono    ( ) okay, thank you.

From the excerpt, we note a well ordered pattern in turn-taking with both
customer and shopkeeper observing speaking turns.
4.2 Politeness markers

In this section, we refer to the second objective which seeks to establish the forms of politeness prevalent in the speech of Ekegusii speakers and the strategies that bring about the forms. During the various interactions participants were noted to employ various strategies of communication to achieve certain effects. The strategies are discussed as used in the domains of Dispute resolution, Work, across the Shop counter conversation and the Street as discussed below.

4.2.1 Politeness strategies and markers used in the dispute resolution domain.

Politeness strategies are many but their general use is to mitigate face threats during interaction. They are meant to save interlocutors’ faces when face threatening acts are inevitable. Brown & Levinson outline five main types of politeness strategies:

A) Bald on –Record

B) Positive politeness

C) Negative politeness

D) Off-record

E) Don’t do the FTA
4.2.1.1 Bald on Record (without redressive action)

The bald on record strategy is employed when the speaker wants to communicate in the most clear, direct and unambiguous way. Various circumstances determine the use this strategy. They range from the need for efficiency or urgency, if the FTA is small in terms of its imposition and if one of the interactants is superior in power to the other.

In this research, it was established that interactants engaged in heated arguments involving interruptions and being directly Bold On record. This was meant to achieve emphasis, correct an expressed idea and to express power differentials. Consider the excerpt below from a dispute resolution meeting.

B : Ekerenenduguyaneeneenegokwana ( ) when my elder brother talks , nigo ngokumia egento agoteeba. I wonder what he says.

Eki manyete ng’a mama nigo abarangeria ( ) what I know is that mom invited you moche gwata oboremo. ( ) to come and subdivide our land.

Baiseke mbarnabi A ( ) our sisters aren’t A’s daughters.

Onye A obwate obokong’u , ( ) If there’s an issue about our sisters dowry, then
Mama nabo akobarangeri naende ( ) mom will call you again to come and 

deliberate

egere mokwanere amangana ye chiombe. ( ) about wealth that was received 
as 
dowry.

Ekero aye B. ogoteba ng’a nde ( ) when you my brother claim that I am on 
magega gose omobuko bwo omongina, moms back, or in her pockets,

Inwee abaamate,ninki 
totagwancha toate oboremo ( ) Neighbours, why don’t we agree to 
kobua koirorera 
subdivide the land rather than 
amangana ya amari 
over repeat ourselves over 
buna chiombe? 
the issue of wealth such as 
cows?

A: Tiga toyakwanere ing’o onyorete chirichi ( ) Let us discuss everything 

egere amangana aya aere. ( ) so that we iron out all the 

issues.

totakwanereti onsi, riorio ( ) if we don’t do that, then you 

will go and 
nigo mokogenda mototige togoitana. ( ) leave us fighting.
From the above extract, the speakers employ various politeness strategies to achieve certain effects. Cases of non-minimization of the face threat have been employed with speaker ‘A’ interrupting ‘B’ in order to make his point. This is done out of the need for urgency to make a point. Example 1 below captures this case.

B: Ekero endugu yane enene egokwana ( ) when my elder brother talks ,
nigo ngokumia egento agote… ( ) I wonder what he...

A: [ ] Tiga toyakwanere ing’o onyorete chirichi [ ] Let us discuss everything
egere amangana aya aere. [ ] So that we iron out all the
issues.
totakwanereti onsi, riorio ( ) If we don’t do that, then you
will go and

nigo mokogenda mototige togoitana. leave us fighting.

4.2.1.2 Positive Politeness

In positive politeness, considerations for both the speaker’s and the hearer’s positive face wants are considered. The sphere of redress includes claims to reciprocity of obligations, presuppositions of shared knowledge and wants.
In this research, speaker ‘C’, the youngest of the three brothers has employed various politeness strategies in a bid to resolve the dispute about land. These include strategy 4: Use In-group identity markers; strategy 5: Seek Agreement; strategy 6: Avoid disagreement, all of positive politeness; and Strategy 6, of the off record super strategy which states: Use tautologies each of this has been discussed below.

**Strategy4: Use In-Group Identity Markers**

This strategy of positive politeness involves a speaker (S) claiming common ground with another speaker (H) by using in-group identity markers such as dear, brother, sister, buddy, pal, mate, guys etc. It may also involve use of slang, jargon and ellipsis. The following excerpt from the dispute resolution domain captures one of the interlocutor’s efforts to resolve the differences between themselves. He has been identified as speaker C and the youngest among the three brothers in conflict over land.

Example 1:

C: Naende Nyasae NyaasaeAse morarore,        ( ) And God is God. Wherever you choose, 

namontebia ng’a inche egepisi ( ) whether you tell me that this is the piece
eke iga naki mwang’eire, I will accept ( ) of land you’ve given me, I will accept and
naende ng’ancherane igo. ( ) and abide by that decision.
Ituko ndiyo ndabori naende oboremo. ( ) there’s no day I will ask for land again.
Oyoriete enibo ere excess, nabo agoteba ng’a ( ) whoever took excess wealth, he is free to say
nindiete enibo ere eggesesi. ( ) that ‘I’ took excess wealth.
eyio nerete oboamate bore obuya ( ) That will create peace amongst us as brothers
kera omonto asiboke. ( ) and each of us will feel free.
Onye toetaine inche ne chindugu chiane, ( ) if we are at loggerheads,
tiga ngiche ntebe ngaki, rero tiga mogambe ( ) let me say it here that today, you discuss
amanga ane na barabwo. ( ) my issues with them.
Rakini e issue yomongina ero ( ) But the issue of mom,
nigo nare goteba ng’akii, ( ) I would say,
abe ake gose karakane nga tari konga, ( ) be it small or big, or if she refuses to
bequeath me with a piece of land,

‘I will accept’ ndore ase nkogenda gochi. ( ) I will accept and see how I will manage.

Ase igo komwachire igaa, ( ) So, as you’ve come here,

omongina ekere arakwane, ( ) whatever mom will say,

nche naki nkobwati. ( ) That is what I will follow….

Igo, oyobwate riswari ambori. ( ) So, whoever has a question is free to ask me.

It can be noted that the youngest of the three brothers involved in the dispute employs the use of in-group identity markers such as ‘my brothers’ to claim a common ground with them and solidarity maybe in a bid to resolve the dispute amongst them.

**Strategy 5: Seek Agreement.**

The youngest of the brothers also employs strategy 5 of positive politeness (Seek Agreement) by avoiding disagreement. Avoiding disagreement is done in three ways:

i) Token agreement

ii) White lies
iii) Hedging opinions

I) Token agreement

Here, S appears to agree with H in responding to a preceding utterance by twisting his utterance or by preceding a ‘yes’ to an utterance rather than a blatant ‘NO’. The youngest of the three brothers employs this strategy in his talk. Consider example 2 below.

Example 2

Ase iго komwachire igaa ,                               ( ) So, as you’ve come here,

omongina ekere arakwane,                               ( ) whatever mom will say,

nche naki nkobwati.                                         ( ) That is what I will follow....

Igo, oyobwate riswari ambori.                        ( ) So, whoever has a question is free to ask me.

. II) White lies

In this case S is forced to lie in stating his opinion rather than damage H’s positive face. The youngest of the brothers employs a white lie in order to seek agreement. He says that he will not complain even if he is not given a piece at all. This is a lie. We can sense a note of bitterness beneath his comment.
Example 3 illustrates thus:

C: Rakini e issue yomongina ero ( ) But the issue of mom,
nigo nare goteba ng’akii, ( ) I would say,
abe ake goshe karakane nga tari konga, ( ) be it small or big, or if she refuses to
bequeath me with a piece of land,

I will accept ndore ase nkogenda gochi. ( ) I will accept and find
where to go

Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement

Sub strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons

This interactional strategy involves the speaker (S) including H in the activity by giving reasons why he (S) wants what he wants. This justifies his expectation that H will cooperate and hence save face for both of them.

Example:

M: Tiga toyakwanere ing’o onyorete chirichi ( ) Let us discuss everything
egere amangana aya aere. so that we iron out all the

issues.

totakwanereti onsi, riorio if we don’t do that, then you

will go and
nigo mokogenda mototige togoitana. *leave us fighting.*

4.2.1.3 Use of the off record strategy during the resolution of disputes.

**Strategy 6: Use tautologies**

Tautologies are expressions of general truths. Once stated, H is forced to search for their intended meaning and function.

For the current dispute the youngest of the three brothers uses a tautology in the introduction of his talk/submission. The short excerpt from his speech illustrates this use of tautologies.

Naende Nyasae NyaasaeAse morarore, ( )And God is God. Wherever you choose,

namontebia ng’a inche egepisi ( ) whether you tell me that this is the piece

eke iga naki mwang’eire, I will accept ( ) of land you’ve given me, I will accept and

naende ng’ancherane igo. ( ) and abide by that decision.

Ituko ndiyo ndabori naende oboremo. : There’s no day I will ask for land again

From the example, the use of the tautology ‘Naende Nyasae Nyaasae_ _ (And God is God) leaves the audience and the parties in dispute searching for the
speakers intended message. The researcher upon interrogation of the speakers meaning learnt that the speaker was hitting out at those he considers greedy and at the same time contending that he will still be blessed even he is given a piece and wealth smaller than that of his brothers. Indeed sources at the meeting told us that he had been ‘blessed’ by his cow bearing twin calves;-a blessing in our community.

4.2.2 Forms of politeness in the work domain

A: naye obwateenyundo? ( ) Are you the one with the hammer?

B: Ee, rakini ngotumeka nde ( ) Yes but I am using it.

A: Nomanyete momura omwabo John omoke? ( ) Do you remember John’s Younger brother?

Bwango iga, nareta omorugi. Bono omorugi ( ) he recently married but the wife now

Oyio nigo amochandete troubles him.

B: Ng’ererie eranda ( ) pass the smoothening plane to me.

A: Sagwa, ngeye ( ) Fine, here it is.

A: nare kogotebia igoro ye- - - ( ) I was telling you about - - -
B: Mokaye nairanete sobo ( ) His wife went back to her people.

In the work domain, the exchanges tend to be bald on record. This can be attributed to the task-oriented nature of the conversation.

For instance, speaker A poses a direct question to B when inquiring if A has the hammer. I.e

A: naye obwate enyundo? ( ) Are you the one with the hammer?

B: Ee, rakini ngotumeka nde ( ) Yes but I am using it.

Speaker B in his response acknowledges but goes ahead to say that he is still using it. Though bald on record, the exchanges are taken as normal in this context of work.

There are however exchanges between the two speakers that might be interpreted as rude and face threatening.

Consider:

A: naye obwate enyundo? ( ) Are you the one with the hammer?

B: Ee, rakini ngotumeka nde ( ) Yes but I am using it. --- ----

A: Nomanyete momura omwabo John omoke? ( ) Do you remember John’s younger brother?

Bwango iga, nareta omorugi. Bono omorugi ( ) he recently married but the wife now. Oyio nigo amochandete troubles him.
B: ( ( ) ) ( ( ) )

A: nare kogotebia igoro ye- - - A: I was telling you about- - -

B: [ ] Mokaye nairanete sobo [ ] His wife went back to her people

The conversation that relates to John’s younger brother and marital issues, it appears, doesn’t interest B whose responses besides being bald on record and involving interruptions, seem to discourage A from talking. A is rudely interrupted by B who supplies information to B that John’s younger brother’s wife already left to her maternal home, perhaps an indication that he knows the story and is not keen on hearing about it again.

4.2.3 Forms of politeness in the street domain

Just as has been stated elsewhere in this work, the data was collected from adult men in a social gathering where they keep themselves busy playing a draughts game and discussing various issues. Among the topics of discussion are the forthcoming 2013 general elections in Kenya. The conversation goes as follows.

A: Aka ngo ndore. ( ) make your move so that I may see

B: Narire egeche naende nabuire. ( ) I have captured one of your tiles and thus you’ve lost the game.

A: Ondi? Gose naye okobuu ( ) Captured? It is you that will be defeated.

A: Bwaerire. ( ) The game is over
In this example 1, participants A and B employ the bald on record strategy of politeness to tease each other and boast about their prowess in the game of draughts. When speaker B brags of having captured one of A’s tiles, and A in his turn of speaking tells B that it is he who will lose the game; they do this baldly without redressing their utterances.

B: Narire egeche naende nabuire .  
\( I have captured one of your tiles and thus you’ve lost the game),

A: Ondi? Gose naye okobuu  
\( Captured? It is you that will be defeated.\)

Now consider a second example in which the talk shifts to the politics of the impending general elections.

A: Abana siasa mbachareti igoro eroundi  
\( politicians don’t care about round one of the elections.\)

Mbamanyete nga tibakobua eraundi entangani. ( \( They know that they might not win in round one\)

B: Eke naki togotebera nga atakeire abe macho sana ( \( That is why they are not to annoy\)
ekero gie chikampeini ------ their estranged lieutenants

during campaigns----

C: Manya nga nonyora 49% igo torabua. [ ] Imagine that even if

you score 49% you will

not have won yet.

B: Ee nabo ere igo. ( ) Yes, that is how it is.

C: Bono eraundi ya kabere nabo ebiam ( ) It is possible for parties to

join hands in

birache amo bakonye namba ibere onyore okoba round two and even make

number two to

namba eyemo. emerge number one.

From example 2, we can note that the conversation adopts a positive
politeness strategy where they both seek agreement on the issue of discussion.

When speaker A says that one cannot be declared winner even with 49% of
the votes in his favour, B and the others present collaborate his statement by
affirmation. This they do by employing positive politeness Strategy. Seeking
agreement is done by choosing safe topics and by repeating part or all of what
the preceding speaker has said in a conversation.

Safe topics allow the speaker to stress his agreement with the hearer and
therefore satisfy the speaker’s desire to be right or corroborated in his
opinions.
Consider:

C: Manya nga nonyora 49% igo torabua. : Imagine that even if you score 49% you will not have won yet.

B: Ee nabo ere igo. : Yes, that is how it is.

4.2.4 Forms of politeness in a cross the counter conversation.

Consider:

Example 1                Gloss

CSTM: Bwakire omonyatuka   ( ) Good morning shop owner?

SH ATT: Bwakire buya. Naki   ( )Good morning to you.

Mwabokire?                     How have you woken up?

CSTM: Twabokire buya. Bono,   ( ) we have woken up well.

Nobwate esukari na amachani? ( ) Well, do you have sugar and beverage?

SH ATT: Eee                     ( ) Yes

CSTM: basi bono ng’a esukari enusu na   ( ) Fine. Give me a half kg of Machani aikomi sugar and tea leaves for ten shillings.

SH ATT: Ebi bono. Notagete kende naende? ( ) do you need something else?
CSTM: Yaya. Tiga ing’ende ( ) No, let me go.

SH ATT: sawa, mbuya mono ( ) okay, thank you.

In the business domain such as the across the Shop Counter conversation, employs both the bald on record strategy and positive politeness. The examples below illustrate thus:

Example 1

CSTM: Bwakire omonyatuka? : Good morning shop owner?

SH ATT: Bwakire buya. Naki : Good morning to you.

Mwabokire? How have you woken up?

CSTM: Twabokire buya. Bono, : we have woken up well.

In this example the customer (CSTM) employs strategy number ----of positive politeness by first greeting the shop owner and inquiring about his well being before making his request for goods. This is consistent with Brown and Levinson’s (1987 ) that requires that the speaker ( S ) appreciates the hearer’s needs and possessions. When this condition is met, the conversation will flow smoothly.

As the conversation continues, the customer goes ahead to order for what he she wants. This is done baldly. It is important to note that though the order for the goods is done baldly, it is not considered seriously face threatening given the fact that the CSTM began by first greeting the shop owner before the order.
Consider.

CSTM: Twabokire buya. Bono, : we have woken up well.

Nobwate esukari na amachani? Well, do you have sugar and

beverage

SH ATT: : Eee Yes

CSTM: basi bono ng’a esukari enusu na : Fine. Give me a half kg

Machani aikomi. of sugar and tea leaves

for ten shillings

4.3 The effect of age and role relations in the choice of politeness expressions.

4.3.1 The effect of age and role relations in the choice of politeness expressions in the dispute resolution domain.

4.3.1.1 Use of politeness expressions by speaker A (Elder brother, 50 yrs old)

During the resolution of disputes in Ekegusii, it was noted that age differences accounted for different choices and use of politeness expressions. Among the three brothers involved in the dispute over the sharing of land, the eldest used fewer or no politeness expressions, his immediate follower also used few politeness expressions with the youngest of the three using more polite expressions during their talk. The following excerpts from the conversation illustrate thus.
A: Mbuya mono omogambi ase ribaga.
  :thank you elder for the chance
to talk

Inche abaamate, nigo ngoteba iga,
  : I want to say this my clasmen.

omogaka tata orarrire,
  My late father bequeathed a
nang’aterete oboremo
  piece of land to me.
onye batagete, bamobokie
  If my brothers have a problem ,
  let them resurrect him

achiche gosaria chimbebe chiria abegete. :
so that he can reset the boundaries

Onye mokobwatia amangana a H na omongina : But if you believe what my
  brother and my mom say,
rirorio ntorakonyeka.
  : Then we won’t be helped.
H nigo are mogongo bwo omongina
  : H is on mom’s back
nere naende obekire omongina omobuko. :
  And has equally put mom in his
  pockets.
Keri agotebia omongina naki ekio nere agokorera. : Whatever he tells mom,
  that is what she follows.

Onye motagete twaate oboremo buya : If you want us to subdivide our land
  a fresh,
rirorio kwanera na amari ya abaiseke : then let us discuss about the wealth
from our sisters’ bride price

tomanye oyorite amange airanie : we ask those who got excess to return

tomanye gwaata oboremo. : and then we reset the boundaries.
timbwati ande mbuya mono : I don’t have much, thank you.

M:Tiga toyakwanere ing’o onyorete chirichi M: Let us discuss everything
egere amangana aya aere. : so that we iron out all the issues.
totakwanereti onsi, riorio : if we don’t do that, then you will go and
nigo mokogenda mototige togoitana. : leave us fighting

Speaker A here uses a lot of bald on record expressions which are considered unhealthy in as far as dispute resolution is concerned. For instance he says;

B nigo are mogongo bwo omongina : B is on mom’s back
nere naende obekire omongina omobuko. : and has equally put mom in his pockets.
Keri agotebia omongina naki ekio nere agokorera. : Whatever he tells mom,
that is what she follows.
The claim that his immediate follower is on his mother’s back and that he (B) has equally put the mother in his pockets is seriously face threatening and an impediment to peaceful resolution of disputes.

4.3.1.2 Use of politeness expressions by speaker B (2nd born bro, 42 yrs old)

B: Ekero endugu yane enene egokwana: when my elder brother talks,

nigo ngokumia egento agoteeba. : I get worried.

Abaiseke mbari: : our sisters aren’t

ba A onye A obwate obokong’u, : A’s daughters from whom he can
demand dowry.

Ekero aye A ogoteba ng’a : when my brother claims

Inde omobuko bwomong’ina : that I am in mom’s pockets

Gose nde mogongo bwo omongina,___ : or on her back,

Inwee abaamate,ninki totagwancha: neighbours, why don’t we agree
toate oboremo : to subdivide the land rather than

kobua kona koirorera : overrepeat ourselves over the
amangana ya amari buna chiombe?: issue of cows as dowry

From A’s submission we can note that he has tried to use a bit of positive
politeness by imploring and involving the audience (Inwee abaamate----- why
don’t we agree to subdivide the land ----in a bid to find a solution to the
current impasse.
He however just his predecessor has made serious face damaging remarks. This he does when reacting to his elder brothers demands especially about dowry from their sisters. Example below illustrate thus

Abaiseke mbari : \textit{: our sisters aren’t A’s daughters}

ba A. onye A obwate obokong’u , \textit{: from whom he can demand dowry.}

Ekero aye A ogoteba ng’a \textit{: when my brother claims that I am in mom’s pockets}

nde magega gose omobuko bwo omongina___ \textit{: or on her back,}

The direct assertion that the sisters are not daughters to A is a FTA. It is baldly stated and attacks the other party directly. This therefore hinders dispute resolution.

4.3.1.3 Use of politeness expressions by speaker ‘C’ (3\textsuperscript{rd} born, 28yrs)

Naende Nyasae NyaasaeAse morarore, \textit{: And God is God. Wherever you choose,}

namontebia ng’a inche egepisi \textit{: whether you tell me that this is the piece}

eké iga naki mwang’eire, I will accept \textit{: of land you’ve given me, I will accept and}

naende ng’ancherane igo. \textit{: and abide by that decision.}
Ituko ndiyo ndabori naende oboremo. : there’s no day I will ask for land again.

Oyoriete enibo ere excess, nabo agoteba ng’a : whoever took excess wealth, he is free to say

nindiete enibo ere egesesi. : that ‘I’ took excess wealth.

eyio nerete oboamate bore obuya : That will create peace amongst us as brothers

From the excerpt on C’s speech, it can be noted that his message is reconciliatory and employs more positive politeness than any of his two other brothers. He adopts the positive politeness strategy of ‘seek agreement’. This helps a lot in mitigating the tension that had already built between them.

Below is a classification of the strategies he employs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>politeness strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Naende Nyasae</td>
<td>: And God is God</td>
<td>O.R, tautology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nyaasae

2. Ase morarore                      | : Wherever you         | p.p, seek agreement |
name teibia nga egepisi              | choose, if you say that|
eka iga naki mwang’eire,             | this is the peace of land |
nabo ngwancherana                   | you’ve given me, I will accept |
4.3.2 The effect of age and role relations in the choice of politeness expressions during work.

It was noted that age differences and role relations between the workers had an effect on their communication patterns and linguistic choices. For instance the lead-mason assumed a superior role and his linguistic choices had less redress. This was different from his assistant who tried everything to make the work go on smoothly. His efforts to narrate a story were cut short by rude interruptions and interjections. The short excerpt from their conversation illustrate thus:

A: Nomanyete momura omwabo John omoke? : Do you remember John’s younger brother?

Bwango iga, nareta omorugi. Bono omorugi : he recently married but the wife Oyio nigo amochandete troubles him.

B: (silent)

A: nare kogotebia igoro ye- - - : I was telling you about- - -

B: Mokaye nairanete sobo : His wife went back to her people

The fact that B finally responds even after interrupting is not a show of cooperation but an expression of his disinterest with the conversation. He supplies a quick answer to the issue of John’s wife as though intent on putting a stop to that line of conversation.
We can conclude that B uses his superior position of lead mason to interrupt the conversation, a thing perhaps we couldn’t expect of A.

4.3.3 The effect of age and role relations in the choice of politeness expressions in the street.

A: Abana siasa mbachareti igoro          A: politicians don’t care about round eroundi entangani ye chikura          one of the elections.

Mbamanyete nga tibakobua eraundi entangani. : they know that they might not win in round one

B: Eke naki togotebera nga atakeire   B: that is why they are not to annoy abe macho sana their estranged lieutenants ekero gie chikampeini ------ during campaigns---

C: Manya nga nonyora 49%.              C: Imagine that igo torabua even if you score 49% you will not have won yet.

B: Ee nabo ere igo.                                B: Yes, that is how it is.

Here, the conversation is purely cooperative with each party trying to contribute to the conversation. For instance when speaker C says that one can’t win even after garnering 49% of the votes, B collaborates this assertion with an affirmation.
4.3.4 The effect of age and role relations in the choice of politeness expressions in across the counter conversation.

Here the customer adopts a superior position linguistically when speaking to the shopkeeper. The conversation is however cooperative.

Consider: gloss

CSTM: Bwakire omonyatuka : Good morning shop owner?


Mwabokire? : How have you woken up?

CSTM: Twabokire buya. Bono, : we have woken up well.

Nobwate esukari na amachani? : Well, do you have sugar and beverage?

SH ATT: Eee : Yes

CSTM: basi bono ng’a esukari enusu na machani aikomi. : Fine. Give me a half kg of sugar and tea leaves for ten shillings

SH ATT: Ebi bono. Notagete kende naende? : do you need something else?

CSTM: Yaya. Tiga ing’ende : No, let me go.

SH ATT: sawa, mbuya mono : okay, thank you.
In the shop context, the buyer leads the conversation and employs both the Bold on Record and positive politeness. For instance, the customer ‘demands ‘for sugar and tea leaves. Conventional politeness requires that he, the customer, requests for the item using expression such as ‘could you please sell sugar and tea leaves to me?’ instead of the seemingly rude and commanding;

CSTM: ng’a esukari enusu na : Give me a half kg of sugar
Machani aikomi.

: and tea leaves for ten shillings

4.4 Summary of chapter

This chapter has given an account of the various speaker turns, face saving strategies and the overall forms of politeness employed by interactants in various interactional situations such as in the village headman’s Baraza during the resolution of disputes, at the shop in exchanges between the customer and shopkeeper, at the construction site in exchanges between two masons, in the street involving exchanges between two people battling it out to find the winner of a draughts game will be, in Ekegusii. It has emerged that there are well-ordered turn taking rules between speakers in their various interactions. It has also been established that Ekegusii speakers largely employ the positive politeness forms in a bid to maintain harmony with fellow interlocutors. The next chapter gives a summary of the findings and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

The study sought to investigate the forms of politeness in Ekegusii within various contexts of usage. This has been done based on Brown & Levinsons (1987) Politeness Theory and Sacks Shegloff and JefferSons (1974) Communication Analysis (CA) theories in order to: establish the structure of turn-taking in Ekegusii, the forms of politeness in Ekegusii, and finally how age and role relations influence the choice of politeness expressions by interactants in Ekegusii. This chapter gives a summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.

5.1 Summary of Findings

In order to establish the structure of turn taking in Ekegusii, transcripts from various contexts were analyzed. The results from these analyses indicate that Ekegusii speakers make use of turns while conversing with minimal interruptions. There is clear use of turns when interactants are exchanging greetings, such as ‘Bwakire’ in which the respondent replies to as ‘Bwakire buya.’ (good morning :- good morning to you.)

During meetings to resolve disputes, the analyses revealed that turns are observed but interruptions also featured as each party tried to correct what
they considered a misrepresentation of facts or where they wanted to take over the conversation and advance their views.

On the Across the Counter conversation, the analyses revealed that the Customer and Shopkeeper observed turns of speaking and that there were minimal interruptions. This can be explained on the basis that both interactants are conversing on the platform of meeting certain needs.

Equally, on the work domain, the analyses show a concurrence with the rules of turn taking between the interactants involved. There were however, some silences and overlaps noted as well. These overlaps were occasioned by one speaker’s disinterest with what the other speaker was saying. He may have considered the topic too obvious, unimportant and irrelevant to their task. For instance when speaker ‘A’ made a comment about John’s troubles with his wife, speaker B as a response supplies information that shows his awareness of it and his disinterest with the topic. Speaker ‘B’ does this through an overlap i.e (mokaye nachiete sobo.-His wife went to her maternal home) implying the issue is obvious to him.

Finally on the structure of turns in Ekegusii, the analyses showed that interactants tended to interrupt each other more on the Street Domain. The topics of discussion here ranged from politics to daily activities like who is likely to win a draughts game.
5.2 Conclusion

The present study set out to establish the forms of politeness in Ekegusii from a sociolinguistic perspective. It specifically analyzed the forms of politeness in Ekegusii, examining how the choice of linguistic expressions in Ekegusii varies depending on role relations, age and the context of usage. The study also set to identify the turns from the spoken excerpts, to describe the forms of politeness in the spoken excerpts, and to assess the effect of age and role relations of participants on the use of politeness in Ekegusii. After the analysis of the data, this study concludes that Ekegusii is well ordered with rules of turn taking as postulated by Sack, Schegloff and Jefferson’s (1974) Conversational Analysis theory. This study also concludes that Ekegusii is largely characterized by positive politeness in conversations. Most of the utterances in four domains under investigation revealed a marked tendency for interactants to employ the positive politeness strategies in their interactions. For instance in the dispute resolution domain, the youngest of the three brothers involved in the dispute employs strategy number five of positive politeness which states: Seek Agreement. The youngest of the brothers does this to avoid disagreement.

Here, he appears to agree with the hearers in responding to a preceding utterance by twisting his utterance or by preceding a ‘yes’ to an utterance rather than a blatant ‘NO’. The youngest of the three brothers employs this strategy in his talk. Consider example the below.
Ase igo komwachire igaa, ( ) So, as you’ve come here,
omongina ekere arakwane, ( ) whatever mom will say,
nche naki nkobwati. ( ) That is what I will follow….
Igo, oyobwate riswari ambori. ( ) So, whoever has a question is
free to ask me.

Besides seeking agreement, the speaker in the dispute issue employs a second
sub strategy of positive politeness, that of white lies. He is forced to lie in
stating his opinion rather than damage his other brothers’ positive face. The
youngest of the brothers employs a white lie in order to seek agreement. He
says that he will not complain even if he is not given a piece at all. This is a
lie. We can sense a note of bitterness beneath his comment. Example 2 from
chapter 4 illustrates thus:

C: Rakini e issue yomongina ero ( ) But the issue of mom,
nigo nare goteba ng’akii, ( ) I would say,
abe ake gose karakane nga tari konga, ( ) be it small or big, or if she
refuses to

( ) bequeath me with a piece of
land,
This study also concludes that age of participants and the situational context determine the choice of politeness expressions in Ekegusii. From the data analyzed it was found out that those relatively senior in terms of age assumed power upon themselves and employed more imposing linguistic forms than the junior in age who preferred the less imposing positive politeness expressions. The context on the other hand played a significant role on the choice and use of politeness expressions. The following excerpt from the across the counter conversation lends credence to our claim.

Here the customer adopts a superior position linguistically when speaking to the shopkeeper. The conversation is however cooperative.

Consider:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ekegusii</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSTM: Bwakire omonyatuka</td>
<td>: Good morning shop owner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH ATT: Bwakire buya. Naki</td>
<td>: Good morning to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mwabokire?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: How have you woken up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTM: Twabokire buya. Bono,</td>
<td>: we have woken up well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobwate esukari na amachani?</td>
<td>: Well, do you have sugar and beverage?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the shop context, the buyer leads the conversation and employs both the Bold on Record and positive politeness. For instance, the customer ‘demands ‘for sugar and tea leaves. Conventional politeness requires that he, the customer, requests for the item using expression such as ‘could you please sell sugar and tea leaves to me?’ instead of the seemingly rude and commanding; ‘Give me a half kg of sugar’.

In the street where topics range from politics to teasing as to who wins a draughts game, the conversation employs more of the Bald on Record forms of politeness. This has been attributed to the argumentative nature of political issues and competitive nature of most games. To win in either, one has to tease the other hence the use of more imposing Bald on Record forms.

5.3 Recommendations

This study has focused on establishing the forms of politeness that characterize Ekegusii in conversational interactions. It has taken the linguistic turn as the unit of analysis and also made use of the context, participants’ age and role relations in identifying and discussing the politeness forms in Ekegusii. According to Brown and Levinson (1998), there are many factors that affect the choice of politeness expressions in conversation. These include gender, occupation, social distance, age, topic, power and education levels.
This research recommends for an exhaustive study that incorporates all these factors and many others.

This study also employed the Conversational Analysis theory, The Politeness theory and the Gricean Maxims. The researcher recommends further research using Sillars (1983) Attribution theory of verbal conflict resolution and any other relevant theories.
REFERENCES


APPENDICES

A1: TENTATIVE CHAPTERIZATION

Chapter One : Introduction

Chapter Two : Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Chapter Three : Research Methodology

Chapter Four : Data Presentation and Analysis

Chapter Five : Summary of Findings; Conclusion and Recommendations

A2: TIME SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME SCHEDULE</th>
<th>PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
<td>Jan – March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense of Proposal</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection and Presentation</td>
<td>May–Dec 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>Jan – Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td>Jan-June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of Drafts</td>
<td>July- August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final drafts</td>
<td>Jan-Nov 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A3: BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS/ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reams of Foolscaps</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Papers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Disc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Ink</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape Recorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Cost</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>