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ABSTRACT

The focus of the study is politeness in televangelism. It aimed at finding out the face threatening acts inherent in the televangelists’ discourse, the politeness strategies employed by the televangelists and the factors that influence their choice of politeness strategies. Despite the fact that many politeness studies have been carried out in the western countries and locally, no study specifically focuses on the Face Threatening Acts and Politeness Strategies employed by the Kenyan televangelists. The study made use of politeness theory developed by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1983 and 1987) and Speech Act theory by Austin (1962) as the basis of its theoretical framework. The background of the study and the literature review shed light on some major studies done on politeness both locally and internationally. The impetus to carry out this study was the fact that the Kenyan TLVs have been criticized in social media for being impolite. The data was collected by viewing and listening to video-recorded discourse of five Kenyan televangelists on a television set. The time taken by each of the televangelists was about 30 minutes, and the total duration was about two and half hours. The data was then transcribed on paper and the FTAs, Politeness Strategies and the factors influencing the choice of politeness strategies elicited, and then presented on frequency tables according to their categories. They were then analysed qualitatively and then summarised using descriptive statistics. The sampling methods used were purposive and random sampling. The sample was composed of two female and three male televangelists who telecast their sermons on four Kenyan TV channels: (KEC, NTV, KTN, and Citizen TV). The topics covered by the five televangelists were: ‘Midnight Prayer’, ‘Ingredients for Victorious Living’, ‘Lameness’, ‘Unity’ and ‘The Tabernacle’. The findings revealed that the televangelists are polite. Though they used many face threatening acts, they also employed many politeness strategies that mitigate the face threats and create cordial relations with the hearers. Orders, requests, challenges, advice, promises, criticisms, accusations and reminders occurred in the TLVs’ discourse. However, the televangelists employed all the four politeness strategies: positive, negative, bald-on-record and off-record. The factors that influenced the televangelists’ choice of politeness strategies were the pay-offs, relative power, social distance and social ranking.
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Face Threatening Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBC</td>
<td>Kenya Broadcasting Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTV</td>
<td>Nation Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTN</td>
<td>Kenya Television Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLV</td>
<td>Televangelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Speech Act Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Relative power of the speaker or hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ranking of imposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Social distance between the speaker and hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Televangelism</td>
<td>The use of television to communicate Christian faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Televangelist</td>
<td>A Christian minister who devotes his/her time to communicate Christian faith on TV broadcast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>The expression of the speaker’s intention to maintain harmony in a given social interaction by being sensitive to the feelings of the hearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>The self-image/ esteem a speaker wants to maintain in an interaction in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive face</td>
<td>The want of every adult member to maintain a positive self-image or be appreciated in a given social context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative face</td>
<td>The desire of every participant to be unhindered in social interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Threatening Act</td>
<td>Things that can be performed by utterances such as requests, promises and accusations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness Strategy</td>
<td>A technique used by speakers in conversation to achieve mutual understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicature</td>
<td>What a speaker can imply or suggest from what he/she implies depending on the background information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The study is concerned with politeness, a universal phenomenon that plays a key role in interpersonal communication. Without use of politeness in social interaction, human relationships are strained and communication hampered. In English for instance, expressions such as “I am sorry”, “please”, “excuse me”, “thank you”, “you are smart”, “welcome”, “goodbye” and other polite expressions are used to make people feel appreciated or unimpeded. This helps create harmonious relationships and facilitates attainment of the communicative goals.

Politeness is such an important principle in human language use because speakers must consider the listeners’ feelings. According to Brown and Levinson (1978), politeness has the notion of ‘face’ which exists universally in human culture and social interaction. ‘Face’ which originated from Goffman (1967) is the public self-image that every member wants to claim for him/herself and it has two related aspects: positive and negative faces. Positive face is the positive consistent self-image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants.

Negative face on the other hand is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves and rights to non-distraction, that is, freedom of action and freedom from imposition. The two aspects of face are the basic wants in any social interaction, so co-operation is needed amongst the participants to maintain each other’s face.
Harris (2003) describes negative face as an individual’s basic claim to territories, personal preserves and self-determination. Face is something that can be lost, maintained or enhanced and must be attended in an interaction.

Furthermore, Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) in their model of politeness posit that every utterance carries with it the potential to create a threat to either negative or positive face of the speaker or hearer. Both faces co-exist and the threat to one kind of face can be seen as a direct support for the other. Positive face is threatened when speakers or hearers do not care about their interlocutors’ feelings, wants or do not want what the other wants. Examples of damage to the hearer may be expressions of disapproval such as condemnation, insults, accusations, disagreements, complaints, contradictions and so on.

On the other hand, Negative face is threatened when an individual does not avoid the obstruction of their interlocutor’s freedom of action. It can cause damage to either the speaker or hearer and make one of the interlocutors to submit their will to the other’s requests, advice, suggestions, reminders, orders, warning or threats, apologies, offers, promises, persuasion, acceptance of offers, making confessions and so on. Brown and Levinson (1978) make the assumption that all competent adult members of society are rational and will seek to avoid the face threatening acts or will employ certain strategies to minimise the face threats. They came up with four main types of politeness strategies: Positive, negative, bald-on-record and off-record politeness strategies.

According to Macmillan dictionary, (2005), a televangelist is someone who talks about religion on television in order to persuade people to become Christians and give money to their organisations. Televangelists just like other T.V users buy air-time from the TV
stations to televise their information. Stewart (1985) observed that televangelists are skilled at awakening religious feelings in their audiences. They do so by inviting people to give testimonies of power faith and mix it with entertainment in form of ‘good music’. By using television which is a powerful tool for teaching, the TLVs are able to broadcast their information to national and international audiences.

However, there are some short-comings of the TV media. One is that the viewers remain passive since they have no direct contact with the TLVs and interaction is necessary for fruitful communication. Besides, the viewers have no time to analyse what they have been taught and the TLVs want the hearers converted immediately. Again as Stewart (1985) notes, the TLVs are insulated from viewers and this does not allow public scrutiny, opposition, and analysis. Some TLVs have also been criticised for distortion of the gospel where they preach the gospel of prosperity and promise success to their viewers. It has been said that most TLVs are driven by ‘power and economics’. Indeed some TLVs have used the same platform to propagate political ideologies while others have been involved in scandals where they have used some of their naïve faithful to give false testimonies of healing and material success as recently reported on the Kenyan media. This therefore makes televangelism a fertile ground for linguistic study.

Though many scholarly studies have been carried out in the area of politeness in various social contexts (such as classroom (teacher-pupil), hospital (doctor- patient) banking (banker-client), parliament (among parliamentarians) and even on characters on some TV programmes) regarding how various members of the community relate to each other, it is worth exploring how TLVs relate to their hearers.
This study therefore focused on the FTAs performed by the Kenyan TLVs, the politeness strategies they employed as they persuaded the hearers to become Christians and the factors that influenced their choice of the politeness strategies.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Televangelism is a social tool used by evangelical preachers to communicate Christian faith. In the process of persuading the hearers to become Christians and to contribute money to their organisations, televangelists threaten the face of their interlocutors. Since televangelists are model persons, it is pertinent that they attend to the face needs of their interlocutors so that they can smoothly attain their communicative goals.

However, the Kenyan televangelists have been criticised in social media for being insensitive to the face needs of their listeners. This prompted the researcher to carry out a study on the face threatening acts in the televangelists' discourse to establish whether they use politeness strategies, and give insight into the factors that influence their choice of politeness strategies.

1.3 Research Objectives

The study was guided by the following objectives.

1. To find out the face threatening acts used by the Kenyan televangelists.
2. To examine whether the Kenyan televangelists use politeness strategies.
3. To determine the factors which influence the TLVs' choice of politeness strategies.
1.4 Research Questions

The study sought to address the following questions.

1. Which FTAs are inherent in the Kenyan televangelists’ discourse?

2. Which politeness strategies do the Kenyan televangelists employ?

3. What factors influence the televangelists’ choice of politeness strategies.

1.5 Research Assumptions

The study was based on the following assumptions.

1. That there are Face Threatening Acts in the televangelists’ discourse.

2. The Kenyan televangelists use Politeness Strategies.

3. There are factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies.

1.6 Justification of the study

First, a study on politeness in televangelism is significant since politeness is a universal feature of human language whose norms and conventions serve to govern cooperative behaviour in conversation, promoting and maintaining harmonious relationships, and as Conary (1993) observes, there needs to be more research conducted to better explain the strategies which people engage to maintain human relationships. This study on politeness in televangelism will broaden the body of knowledge in sociolinguistics.

Secondly, TLVs’ discourse is worth investigation because TV has become home entertainment for many Kenyans, a source of news, information, and a powerful propaganda agent, thus, a source of role modelling in polite speech.
Lastly, the study was used to test the theory of politeness as advanced by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Speech Act theory by Austin (1962).

1.7 Scope and Limitation

This study focused on the video-recorded sermons of five Kenyan TLVs who telecast on Citizen TV, KBC, KTN and NTV which according to a recent national survey on TV viewers by inter-media (2010) showed that they were the most frequently viewed TV channels.

Evangelism has been selected as a topic of interest since it plays a crucial role in shaping society and is transmitted in many ways such as radio, print, online, or by evangelists moving from place to place, but this study focused on television evangelism.

The study focused on five TLVs: three male and two female for purposes of gender balance. As Labov (1982) argues, a minimum of four informants in a linguistic study are adequate because even if they are more, the information they give is mostly the same. The findings from the five TLVs can therefore be generalised to all Kenyan TLVs.

The study used non-participant observation, an investigative study method whereby the researcher observed the TLVs’ behaviour from video-recorded discourse on a TV set without directly interacting with the participant.

The study was limited to Kenyan TLVs despite the fact that there are other renowned world televangelists who telecast their sermons mainly on Family TV which entirely focuses on Christian evangelism. The reason is that Kenyan TLVs have unique linguistic
features such as code switching from English to Kiswahili or to mother tongue which the researcher focused on. In the next section of literature review, the studies that have been carried out from different contexts have been reviewed to show how they inform on this study.
2.0 Introduction

This section reviews studies that have been carried out on politeness and are related to the topic under investigation: (politeness, communication strategies, preaching and communication, and the Kenyan TV media). Besides, it expounds on the two theories (Politeness and Speech Act theories) used to identify the FTAs, the politeness strategies and factors that influence the choice of the politeness strategies.

2.1 Studies on Politeness

Joanna, et.al (2010) defines politeness as having or showing good manners and respect for other people’s feelings. According to Mills (2003) being polite consists of attempting to save face for another. Lakoff (1989) views politeness as the means of minimising the risk of confrontation in discourse. Different literature has viewed politeness differently: as formality, as difference, as etiquette or good manners, as tact. (Fraser 1990, Kasper 1994, Meier and Thomas, 1995)

Brown and Levinson (1978) argue that politeness is an expression of the speaker’s intention to mitigate face threats carried out by face threatening acts towards another person in social interaction. ‘Act’ here refers to what is intended to be done by verbal or non-verbal communication. Ambuyo et. al (2011) in their journal on Politic Speech explain that Brown and Levinson’s (1978 and 1987) view of politeness gets its strength over others by explaining it from a more fundamental notion of what is to be a human being, the basic notion of face; which is all about the public self –image that everyone wants to claim for themselves. Their work was influenced by Goffman (1967) who published the article on
face work. He goes on to say that face is emotionally invested and that it can be lost maintained or enhanced and must be attended to in an interaction. Goffman (1967:33) breaks down face into two categories: positive and negative faces.

Harris, (2003) describes Negative face as an individual’s basic claim to territories, personal preserves, and self- determination, while Brown and Levinson (1987) define positive face as the want of every member that his/her wants be desirable to at least some others or the positive consistent self- image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of). It further explains that every utterance carries with it the potential to create a threat to either the speaker’s or hearer’s negative or positive face and as such comprises a FTA such as request for information, help, advice, criticism, reminders, offers, and so on. Negative and positive face thus co-exist and the threat to one kind of face can be seen as a direct support for the other, for instance, request for information may satisfy the positive face of the speaker, but may be threatening the negative face of the addressee.

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) further posit that the degree of potential face threat of any utterance is based upon the perceived social distance between the speaker and hearer, the power of the speaker in relation to the hearer and the imposition of the act. Interactants use this knowledge when selecting from a set of super strategies used in crafting an utterance to manage the FTAs.

To begin with, a speaker can decide to perform an act On-record which is the least polite way and only occurs when efficiency is of great importance. Secondly, the speaker can perform the FTA using positive politeness strategies that address the hearer’s need for
belonging or to be seen as desirable to others. The speaker can use negative politeness strategies to mitigate the FTA, such as utterances acknowledging the respect for the hearer’s autonomy. Fourth, Off-record like hints can be used placing the interpretive burden upon the hearer. Lastly, the speaker can choose to remain silent not performing the FTA at all or defending his or her face. The study however focused on the FTAs. This study used the tenets of politeness as propounded by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Speech Act theory by Austin (1962) to identify the FTAs, the politeness strategies and to determine the factors that influence the choice of the politeness strategies by the Kenyan TLVs.

2.2 Communication Strategies

Scholarly studies have been done on communication strategies across the globe and they have revealed that communication strategies are part of the people’s repertoire whether they are old or young. According to Saville (1982), in the acquisition of routines and polite formulas, even infants of six or seven months are taught to wave and say ‘bye-bye’ among English speakers. This and others like, ‘please’, ‘thank you’, are usually the first routines taught to English speaking children.

Neustupny (1985) points out that in informative interviews where Australian businessmen discussed a range of attitudes towards code switching during business meetings, it was found out that some take lenient view in contexts where code switching is seen as a corrective device to rectify inadequacies in English communication on the part of Japanese interactants.

In another context, Neumann (1997) investigated the realization of requests, a potentially face threatening act in a business interaction between Germans and Norwegian buyers and
sellers negotiating in German. The findings showed that Norwegians employ more indirect strategies than the Germans and that there was a considerable higher incidence of direct requests than in every day conversation.

Grindsted (1997) analysed the use of jokes as a strategy for creating rapport in simulated interactions between Spanish and Danish professional negotiators. Apart from the studies carried out in western countries, many other studies on politeness have been done in Kenya in different social contexts such as the classroom, banking, hospital, Parliament and so on. This study is different in that it focuses on televangelism.

Hassan (2000) basing her study on an intercultural setting found out that the speakers ought to use politeness strategies so as to save their own faces and that of their interactants. She further argues that for communication to take place effectively, participants need to draw from their background knowledge and assumptions in order to interpret social meanings of other speakers. What might be polite to the speaker may turn out to be impolite to the hearer who may belong to a different cultural background and what may be polite in one culture is not necessarily polite in the other.

Walya (1996) studied the Kenyan banking discourse and identified those strategies that different interactants employ in their conversation and looks at the effects these may have on the entire discourse. She explains that effective communication presupposes grammatical competence and knowledge of culture and whatever governs the way in which a speaker uses certain lexical, sociolinguistic, and other knowledge in producing and interpreting information in a certain context. It is evident from her study that the structure
of the Kenyan banking discourse and strategies were influenced by grammatical as well as communicative competence.

Ambuyo, et al (2011) in their study on politic speech found out that politeness is an attempt by the speakers to linguistically show that they care about other people’s feelings. They observed that question time is a highly aggressive session full of FTAs but the parliamentarians are constrained to produce parliamentary language required by the standing orders of 2008, leaving politeness strategies as the only linguistic device to the realizations of fruitful political discussions. The next section deals with the relationship between preaching and communication.

2.3 Preaching and Communication

In preaching, speakers essentially use the spoken language. Lischer (1996) argues that the renewal of preaching is not only the discovery of what needs to be said, but how and when it needs to be said. This corroborates with Rodman and Fromkin’s (1988) view that all terms at man’s disposal are available for use but the social context determines what, when and how to say something. They go on to say that before making requests, the speaker chooses a safe topic like the weather or a current local happening as a way of reassuring the hearer that the speaker did not simply come to exploit him/her by making a request but has an interest in general in maintaining a relationship with them. Brown and Levinson’s (1987) agree with this view when they argue that when speakers use positive politeness strategies they create a cordial relationship with their interactants for purposes of effective communication.
Lischer further observes that a preacher could have profound insight in theology and the most imaginative stories yet the sermon will never get off the ground if delivered without intentional movement, linguistic sensitivity, cultural awareness and spiritual direction. These are aspects of communicative competence which are in line with Brown and Levinson’s (1987) view that a speaker should notice and attend to the interests, wants, needs and goals of the addressee.

Lischer (1996) also posits that preaching ought to concentrate on communication theory as well as understanding how meaning, reality and language are developed and interpreted. He emphasises that more and more meaning needs to be given to the act of communication itself. This agrees with Conary (1993) who observes that there needs to be more research conducted to better explain the strategies people engage to maintain human relations. The next section will briefly shed some light on the program telecast by the Kenyan TV media since televangelism is one of the many.

2.4 The Kenyan Media

Media in Kenya includes TV, radio, newspapers, magazines and the internet. The publications mainly use English as their primary language of communication with some media houses employing Swahili and vernacular based languages which are commonly used in broadcast media, mostly radio.

Though there are about 90 FM radio stations and 15 TV stations and an unconfirmed number of print newspapers and magazines, there are disparities in coverage and distribution. KBC which is state owned TV was the only broadcaster with countrywide coverage before the digital migration era. It broadcast both in English and Swahili and
other vernacular languages. Royal Media Services is the largest private national broadcaster with country wide coverage. It also broadcasts in English, Swahili and vernacular languages. Many private owned radio and TV stations have ranges that are limited to Nairobi area. KBC, NTV, KTN, Citizen TV, K24, are the largest TV stations in terms of coverage (http://w. w. w. media) (retrieved on 20th September 2014)

According to The Daily Nation of 9th, May, 2010 on the weekly TV guidep.15, there was a line-up of the programs that could be viewed across the Kenyan TV stations: morning show, fashion and design show, news, entertainment, soap opera, local show, sitcom, drama, chat show, talk show, game show, documentary, current affairs, series, serial and televangelism among others.

Televangelism which is the focus of this study is usually featured on Sunday morning from 5:30 - 11:30 in the morning on Citizen, KBC, NTV and KTN TV stations. Few TLVs telecast on week days in the morning and evening. It is worth noting that these findings are dynamic because the media stations have mushroomed in the past few years and TV broadcast is transiting from analogue to digital telecast.

According to a survey done in Kenya by Inter-media(2010), TV viewers were asked to list the stations they watched most frequently and four stations emerged as nationally dominant in order of popularity (Citizen TV, KBC, KTN, and NTV). Data for the study was drawn from five TLVs who telecast in four TV stations. Among the 1152 respondents, 58% of the sample said that they had watched TV the previous week, about 1/3 said they did not have a TV set at home. Of those who had a TV at home, nearly all said they receive six channels or fewer. A very small minority of all survey respondents (3 %) could watch more than six
channels at home. Although these TV channels could be viewed throughout the country, viewing rates, preferences and coverage varied widely across regions. However, the four TV stations had the widest coverage.

Like radio, TV is used as nearly frequently for news and information as for any other purpose (such as entertainment). It is also considered a very important source of information by at least half of the viewers for every topic included in the national survey (Inter-media 2010). The next section is the theoretical framework that will be used in the analysis of the data.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

The study used two theories: Politeness theory postulated by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Speech Act theory by Austin (1962). The two theories were used to identify the Face Threatening Acts, the politeness strategies and the factors that influenced the choice of politeness strategies.

2.5.1 Politeness Theory

Politeness Theory holds the view that politeness is a strategic conflict avoidance or control of potential aggression between interacting parties. Brown and Levinson’s (1978 and 1987) View is based on the basic notion of face; the public self-image that everyone tries to claim for him or herself. This idea of face originated from Goffman (1967) who discussed face in view of how people present themselves in social context and interaction.

Brown and Levinson (1978) note that both negative and positive face threatening acts exist universally in all human cultures and they involve acts such as persuading, requesting,
promising, giving advice and others that inherently damage the faces of the speaker and hearer by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other. There are two ways that are related to the two basic types of face in which the face of the speaker or hearer can be threatened. Those acts that primarily threaten the addressee’s negative face by indicating (potentially) that the speaker does not intend to avoid impeding the hearer’s freedom of action such as orders, requests, suggestions, advice, reminders, threats, warnings and dares.

Besides, Positive face is threatened when the interlocutors do not care about their interactants’ feelings, wants, or do not want what the other wants. Positive face threatening acts can cause damage to the hearer’s face by using expressions of disapproval, criticism, contempt, complaints, reprimands, disagreements, accusations, insults and others where the speakers indicate that they do not care about the addressee’s feelings, wants, acts, goods, personal characteristics, beliefs or values.

Politeness theory as advanced by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1983 and 1987) posits that Politeness strategies are redressive and are employed to minimise the threat to the speaker’s or hearer’s positive and negative faces. Positive politeness strategies are used to make the hearer feel good about themselves, their interests or possessions. They are mostly used in situations where the interactants know each other fairly well. Positive politeness strategies include statements of friendship, giving compliments, use of solidarity or in-group markers like (my friend, dear, brother, sister) and so on. Speakers are optimistic; they use ‘we’ inclusive and make promises to the hearers. There is exaggeration of interest in the hearer and his interests and disagreements are avoided. A speaker may seek agreement by choosing safe topics, repetition, joking, giving gifts to the listener, asking for or giving reasons, showing sympathy and understanding among others.
On the other hand, negative politeness strategies are oriented towards the hearer’s negative face and emphasise avoidance of imposition on the addressee. Instances of negative politeness include being direct, use of hedges on questions, being pessimistic, minimising imposition, use of obviating structures such as passives, statements of general rules, using plural pronouns such as ‘we’ when the speaker is asking the hearer for a favour. In negative politeness strategy, a request is often softened, made less direct and less imposing. The speaker may use deference by reducing his/her self-importance and/or use of down-scaling compliments. All of these are done in an attempt to avoid a great deal of imposition on the hearer and this is geared towards achievement of a goal in the smoothest way possible and show sensitivity to one’s interlocutors.

2.5.2 Speech Act Theory

Speech Act theory by Austin (1962) states that what we say has three kinds of meaning: the locutionary, illocutionary and the perlocutionary, that is, the propositional meaning or the literal meaning of what is said, for example, ‘it is cold in here’. The second meaning is the illocutionary force which bears the social or pragmatic meaning of an utterance. For instance, ‘It’s hot in here’, could be an indirect request for someone to open a window because someone is hot or an indirect refusal to open the window because someone is cold. The third is the perlocutionary meaning, the effect of what is said. The result of ‘it’s cold in here’ could result in someone opening the window.

Speech Act Theory attempts to explain how speakers use language to accomplish the intended meaning from what is said. Philosophers like Austin (1962), Grice (1957,1975), Searle(1965,1969 and 1975) and Brown and Levinson(1978, 1983, 1987) offered basic insight into the linguistic communication based on the assumption that the minimal units of
human communication are not linguistic expressions but rather performance of certain kinds of acts such as making statements, requesting, apologising, ordering and so on.

This study therefore used Politeness and Speech Act theories to identify the Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), the politeness strategies and give insight on the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies by the TLVs. The section that follows clearly outlines the methodological concerns of the study.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This section outlines the methodological details used in the study. It addresses the research design, area of study, target population, sampling techniques and sample size, research instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design
This research adopted a descriptive survey design. Orodho (2004) defines a research design as a program to guide the researcher in collecting, analysing and interpreting observed facts. A descriptive survey design is a process of collecting data in order to test the hypothesis and answer questions concerning the status of subjects in the study and reporting things as they are. Description in this study concerned itself in depicting the FTAs and the politeness strategies employed by the Kenyan TLVs as they persuaded their hearers to become Christians as well as the factors that influenced their choice of politeness strategies. Robinson (1993) says that a descriptive design is relevant in this study because the findings may be generalised to almost a whole population.

3.2 Area of study
The study focused on audio-visual sermons of Kenyan televangelists who telecast information on the Kenyan TV stations.

3.3 Target Population and Sample size
Data for this study was drawn from video- recorded corpus of five Kenyan TLVs who telecast their sermons on the four Kenyan TV channels which are the most frequently
viewed nationally. Televangelism is usually telecast on Sunday from 5.30 am-11.30 am. The four TV stations also have a wider coverage than the others. The video-tapes selected covered 5 episodes on different topics each taking about 30 minutes and a total duration of 150 minutes (2 1/2 hours). The study sample was representative of both gender: three (3) male and two (2) female TLVs to avoid gender bias. It is intended that the study covers 25% of the population. This sample was thought to provide adequate corpus and is representative to enable reliable and valid conclusions to be drawn. According to Milroy (1987) large samples are not necessary for linguistic surveys because they tend to be redundant bringing problems with diminishing analytical returns.

3.4 Sampling Procedure

The sampling techniques used were random and purposive sampling. Random sampling involved giving the subjects an equal chance of selection and purposive sampling involved deliberate and explicit choice of a sample which gave special insight into whatever the researcher wanted to study. The four media stations (Citizen, KBC, KTN, and NTV) were purposefully selected on the basis of their wide coverage and number of viewers. According to a survey by Inter-media, (2010), these are the stations most frequently viewed by majority of the Kenyan viewers. The TLVs were randomly sampled whereby (3) males and (2) females were selected from about 25 TLVS who telecast on the four TV stations. The topics the TLVs discussed were also randomly selected since each CD had about 5 episodes but the following topics were randomly selected: 'Midnight Prayer', 'Ingredients for Victorious Living', 'Unity' and 'The Tabernacle'. This is reflected in appendices AI-A5,
3.5 Data Collection

The study focused on conversational analysis, therefore, no questionnaires were administered to the participants. Spontaneous pre-recorded audio-visual TLVs’ discourse was viewed on a TV set and the specific utterances elicited, transcribed and then recorded in tables according to the FTAs and the face threatening acts. The five TLVs’ data viewed covered five different topics: ‘Midnight Prayer’, ‘Ingredients for Victorious Living’, ‘Lameness’ ‘Unity’ and ‘The Tabernacle’. Since the data collected is qualitative, the researcher elicited the FTAs and the politeness strategies from the TLVs’ discourse and then established the factors that influenced the choice of politeness strategies according to Brown and Levinson (1987). Patterns and relationships were then established.

3.6 Data Analysis and Presentation

Data analysis is a systematic process of selecting, categorising, and interpreting data to provide explanations of a single phenomenon of interest. The data collected was analysed using the qualitative approach. The video-recorded discourse was first viewed on a T.V set and then transcribed on paper. The FTAs were elicited using the Speech Act theory and politeness strategies using politeness theory. The data was organized and tabulated in frequencies and percentages. Inferences were then made. The section below presents the data analysis and interpretation.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 Introduction

The presentation of data starts with the face threatening acts, followed by the politeness strategies and then the factors that influenced the TLVs’ choice of politeness strategies according to Speech Act theory by Austin (1962) and Politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1987). Speech Act theory will be used to identify the face threatening acts such as requests, orders, promises, challenges and others that the TLVs employed as they persuaded the hearers to become Christians. Besides, Politeness theory will be used to elicit the politeness strategies and explain the factors that influenced the choice of Politeness Strategies by the TLVs. Data analysed was drawn from video-recorded discourse of five Kenyan TLVs whose names remain anonymous for ethical reasons. The TLVs covered the following topics: ‘Midnight Prayer’, ‘Ingredients for Victorious Living’, ‘Lameness’, ‘Unity’ and ‘The Tabernacle’. The data was transcribed and presented in the appendix sections A1-A5. Extracts that contain the face threatening acts and the politeness strategies were lifted from the discourse, italicized and marked U (utterances). The utterances containing the FTAs and the politeness strategies are numbered. It is worth noting that some of these extracts have been repeated to illustrate different linguistic features. For every linguistic feature, at least two extracts from different TLVs have been used as examples, after which a discussion and interpretation of the findings is done using the theories mentioned above. The data is then presented in tables to show frequencies of occurrence. A summary of the findings is then done using descriptive statistics. The section that follows explains how the FTAs are identified from the TLVs’ discourse.
4.1 How FTAs are identified

The first objective in this study was to identify the face threatening acts (FTAs) used by the Kenyan TLVs in their discourse. In this study, the FTAs were elicited by viewing the video-recorded TLVs' sermons on a TV set and identifying the utterances which convey the pragmatic or social meaning of the utterance. According to Austin (1962), in his lecture on 'How to Do Things with Words', the act of making a meaningful utterance performs a locutionary act which has to do with the simple act of the speaker saying something. The other is the illocutionary act such as asking or answering a question, giving information, warning, ordering, requesting and so on. Such acts can be expressed directly or indirectly. For instance, a person may say, 'Joan, can you shut the door?' thereby asking Joan whether she will be able to shut the door, but also requesting that she does so. This counts as an indirect speech act since the request is performed indirectly by means of directly performing a question. The speaker's intention is not to ask Joan about her ability to shut the door.

According to Austin (1962), the intention of uttering such an utterance is the pragmatic or social meaning of the utterance, that is, a request to close the door, which Austin he calls the pragmatic illocutionary force. A further act, that is, perlocutionary act of the speaker's intention in delivering the utterance (its effect such as persuading, inspiring or having the listeners to do something or change their attitude) is performed if the listener is persuaded to perform the act. The researcher therefore elicited the FTAs from the TLVs' discourse using Speech Act theory (SAT) by Austin (1962). These were then classified according to Brown and Levinson (1987) politeness theory which subdivides them into two major categories: negative and positive FTAs. Consider the discussion below.
4.1.1 Negative FTAs

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the FTAs which threaten the hearer’s negative face indicate that the speaker does not intend to avoid impeding on the hearer’s freedom of action. Instances of negative FTAs are orders, advice, requests, suggestions, reminders, threats, warning and dares, however, those recurrent in the TLVs’ discourse were orders, requests, advice, promises and reminders as shown in the examples below.

4.1.1.1 Orders

According to Quirk et.al (1973), orders are generally constructed in form of imperative sentences where the ‘you’ subject is omitted such as, ‘Hands up’. Austin (1962) argues that such an utterance has the illocutionary force of an order. Consider the following examples:

Example 1: TLV2:

*Turn to five people and tell them, ‘I bless you’* (U1).

*Tell your neighbour, ‘I have a story to tell’* (U2).

*I looked bad when I was parared. (coined word meaning to look pale) when I came from that place. So you can’t tell me to go back. Tell somebody, ‘I’m going places’* (U3). *How are yiuni?*

*Tell somebody, ’I’m better today than I was last Sunday’* (U4).

*You must be humble. Walk without fear* (U5). *When Christ comes in you, you don’t feel inferior.*

*Somedbody say, ‘I’m born again’* (U6). *What does that mean?*

It is evident from U1-U6 that the TLV performs the speech act of ordering the listeners when s/he tells them to ‘turn to five people, tell somebody or a neighbour something. According to Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) P.201, these are examples of orders because
the speaker sounds abrupt and does not tone down the utterances by markers of politeness such as ‘please’. Besides, the speaker does not use statements such as ‘I order you....’ which would be a direct command but indirectly expresses the order via an implicature. The next example is drawn from TLV3’s discourse.

Example 2: TLV3

When a man is in Christ, he is a new creation.
If you are not in Christ, nothing has changed. You will steal, cheat.
In the house of God is the gateway to heaven. Tell your neighbour, I told you, in Christ everything is new (U7). I have a testimony that Jesus saves. Tell your neighbour, you are in the right place (U8). If you are not born again, you are in the right place.

The highlighted utterances indicate that the TLVs used orders to “tell their neighbours something, to clap their hands’, and so on. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), orders predicate some future act of the hearers and in so doing put pressure on them to do or refrain from doing an act and this threatens their negative face. The next FTAs are requests.

4.1.1.2 Requests

The TLVs made requests to their listeners. Brown and Levinson (1987) say that in making requests just like orders, the speaker wants the hearer to do or refrain from doing an act. Most of these requests are in form of questions where the addressees are expected to give information or do some act. The extracts below illustrate this.
Example 3: TLV1

It's a joy to be with you. (Reads the Bible in the book of Acts 16:24 – 25). Can I have a Amen for reading the word of God? (U9) (moves nearer the audience). Are you listening to me? (U10)

If you need help at midnight, you may not get the answer, “mteja wa nambari hapatikani kwasasa”. Translated, (the mobile subscriber cannot be reached). No person will be awake at midnight to offer help. Midnight is a very dangerous hour. A new day begins a minute after midnight. In the middle of the night there's a lot of anguish (long pause). The beginning of your encounter with God is prayer. I thought somebody would say Amen. Everybody say, “Word of knowledge” x2. Some of them have the bible but never read it for you (audience laughs).

The TLV makes requests in (U9 and U10). According to Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) the numbered utterances are examples of interrogative questions. In (U9), the TLV expects the hearer to say Amen and in (U10) the hearer is expected to answer 'yes' or 'no'. Below are other examples of requests in TLV4’s discourse.

Example 4: TLV 4:

You may take your sit (U12).

Give tithes and God will receive and you gonna be blessed.

Whatever amount you want to give.

Those watching, we have a Safaricom line. Talking about basics of giving.

Why it is important to give. We thank God for you.

I would like everybody to redeem a pledge (U13).

Just want to remind you that we have a Pay Bill number on the screen.
(U12) *You may take your sit* and (U13) *I would like everybody to redeem a pledge*, according to Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) are polite requests because of the use of the auxiliary *may* and *would*. In Austin’s view, such utterances have the illocutionary force of direct requests. The TLVs’ frequently requested their hearers to do something or give information.

Brown and Levinson (1978) call this demanding behaviour coercion since the speaker does not give the hearer an option but to do what the speaker requests the hearers to do or abstain from. This is against negative politeness since the speaker does not intend to avoid impeding the addressee’s freedom of action. Leech (1983) argues that speech acts just like other actions that involve some cost or benefit to the speaker or hearer threaten the face of the addressees. It can therefore be argued that requests are speech acts that threaten the addressees’ negative face. Another FTA recurrent in the TLVs’ discourse is giving advice. Consider the examples below.

4.1.1.3 Advice

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), when speakers give advice, they predicate that the hearer ought to do some act, thereby threatening the addressees’ negative face. Kioko and Jepkirui (2010) say that the modal auxiliary *must* is used to express strong advice. Consider the examples below.

**Example 5: TLV5**

*There are two kinds of places where you bring your prayers. You will not reap anything until it becomes of the spirit. For that marriage to work, HIV, cancer to heal e.t.c. Tell your neighbour, ‘I need divine intervention’. You must come beyond to the holy place*
“Hapa ni kama utamguza Mungu”. translated (here it is like you will touch God). (moves across the dais). Let me remind you, you can never obey the ten commandments in the flesh, you must be walking in the spirit, friends (UI5).

In U14 and U15 the speaker uses the modal auxiliary ‘must’. In English, a doctor may say to a patient, ‘You must take the medication three times a day’. This means that it is an obligation or necessity that the patient takes medication. According to Austin (1962) a further perlocutionary act is performed if the addressee is persuaded to act. Below is an example drawn from TLV3’s discourse.

Example 6: TLV3

I’m glad you came (points at the audience). Are you understanding me friends? They want to go to India, U.K for the wrong reasons. Ask your neighbour, ‘Are you a disciple of Jesus Christ? Your life must be a testimony of Jesus Christ (UI6). Some of you cannot tell your neighbours, ‘look at us’. Can we help you? If your neighbour beats his wife and you do the same, can you tell others look at us?

In U16, TLV3 uses the modal auxiliary ‘must’ which according to Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) indicates obligation, necessity or compulsion. In (U16) above, the speaker expresses the fact that a Christian is obliged to live a life that is Christ-like. According to Austin (1962), should the hearers heed the advice and change their attitude or psychological state, a further perlocutionary act of persuading is performed.

Another reason for regarding advice as face threatening is clearly illustrated by Leech (1983) who argues that although the recommended action may be considered beneficial to
the hearer, the actual speech act of advising may offend the addressee because it takes it for granted that the speaker is superior in knowledge, experience or judgment to the hearer. Brown and Levinson (1987) assert that giving advice is putting pressure on the hearer and to perform such acts as humbling oneself or conforming to some pattern of behaviour threatens the negative face of the addressee because cooperation between the speaker and hearer is required for an act of communication to take place.

The other type of negative face threatening acts recurrent in the TLVs’ discourse is making promises.

4.1.1.4 Promises

The TLVs also made promises to their listeners in their discourse. Brown and Levinson (1987) say that promises predicate some positive future act of the speaker towards the hearer and in so doing put pressure on the hearer to accept or reject them and possibly incur a debt.

In Speech Act theory by Austin (1962), the propositional content of an illocutionary act, that is, its force can either be expressed directly or implied via implicature. For instance, ‘I promise you that you will be blessed’. The promise is direct because it is expressed in the utterance. According to SAT, an utterance constitutes a locutionary act because it is the simple act of a speaker saying something or producing a meaningful linguistic expression. Besides this, an illocutionary act is performed, that is, the intention of the utterance. For instance, a statement such as (U23) below ‘Do your business by faith and you will be ahead of your competitors. A promise is implied in this illocutionary act because the TLV’s intention is to promise the hearers that if they exercise faith, they would be successful in business though the propositional content of the utterance does not directly
predicate a future act of a promise such as, 'I promise you that you will be successful in business. This threatens the addressee’s negative face. Consider the examples below.

Example 7: TLV1

You will be blessed because you came x2 (U17). Something was telling you, you were sick but you will be blessed because you came (U18) (a song is sang). We dedicate our hearts to you. We pray for those who came. We welcome everyone to this morning service. You will be blessed because you came (U19).

U18 and U19 above are promises made to the listeners to be blessed because they attended the church service and if they were sick, they would be healed. Below is another extract containing promises.

Example 8: TLV2

Are you ready for the word? I will never be the same again (U20). This family operates by faith x2 (rising intonation). You are blessed in the city, you are blessed in the village (U21). By your stripes, I am healed. Whatever you touch shall prosper (U22). Declare it is about me (points at self). Do your business by faith and you are ahead of your competitors (U23). You see things before they see (U24). May you know what prosperity, good health is (U25). See what others have not seen (U26). Somebody declare, 'I'm not limited'. Don't allow sickness, wife or husband, to have or not to have children or history limit you.
From the above (U17-U26) the TLVs promise their listeners, to ‘be blessed because they went to church, be blessed in the city and village, be healed by the stripes of Jesus if they exercise faith and to be successful in business and so on’.

In Brown and Levinson’s (1987) view, making these promises by the TLVs put pressure on the hearers to accept to perform acts such as attending church services and by converting to Christianity in order to enjoy the benefits. This act of promising threatens the hearer’s negative face because they must incur some debt such as believing or praying in the spirit to receive blessings. Austin (1962) argues that the speaker will have performed a perlocutionary act because such promises (like earlier mentioned) may cause the hearers to be persuaded to change their state of mind or do something in order to enjoy the promises. The next negative FTAs are reminders.

4.1.1.5 Reminders

According to Austin (1962) reminders (just like other speech acts discussed above) are illocutionary acts performed by speakers with intentions of convincing the hearers to do certain acts or change their psychological state. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), when speakers remind hearers to do something, they indicate that the hearers should remember to do act A. These reminders are recurrent in the TLVs’ extracts as shown below.

Example 9: TLV4

We thank God for you. I would like everybody to redeem a pledge. Just want to remind you (U27) that we have a Pay Bill number on the screen. Our M-PESA Pay Bill No: is... (gives account number). When we receive, God will bless you. The next extract is drawn from TLV5.
In (U27) the TLV reminds the hearer the Pay-Bill number of their organization so that the hearers can give money to the organization. Below is another extract showing reminders.

Example 10: TLV 5:

Tell your neighbour, ‘I need divine intervention’. You must come beyond the holy place. (Hapa ni kama nitamguza Mungu). (Here it’s like I will touch God). (Moves across the dais). Let me remind you, you can never obey the Ten Commandments in the flesh (U28)

(U28) is a reminder to the TLVs to obey the Ten Commandments in the spirit.

Brown and Levinson (1987) point out that reminding predicates a future act of the addressee. For instance, in (U27) TLV4 reminds the addressees to give money to their organisation and they would be blessed in return. TLV5 in (U28) reminds the hearers to obey the Ten Commandments in the spirit to receive maximum benefits from Christianity such as being successful in marriage, or getting healed. Austin (1962) points out that such speech acts have an effect on the audience and they will act either by doing something or changing their state of mind and/or attitude. This act of reminding threatens the addressees’ negative face according to Brown and Levinson (1987) since the hearers must do some act, that is, remember to do something in order to be blessed. Leech (1983) agrees with Brown and Levinson that reminding is an intrusion on the hearer’s privacy and that, in reminding, the speaker coerces the listeners to do some act for self benefit. However, the TLVs have used reminders sparingly. In the next sub-section we are going to look at the positive FTAs the TLVs used in their discourse.
4.1.2. Positive FTAs

The positive face threatening acts according to Brown and Levinson (1978, 1983 and 1987) indicate that the speaker does not care about the addressees' feelings, or wants and that in some respect does not want the hearer's wants. They express disapproval and include the following: accusations, challenges, criticism, contempt or ridicule, complaints, reprimands and insults. The FTAs found in the TLVs' discourse are accusations, challenges and criticisms. Consider the examples below.

4.1.2.1 Accusations

Brown and Levinson (1987) posit that when speakers accuse their hearers it is an indication that they have a negative evaluation of some aspects of the hearer's positive face. Austin (1962) points out that speech acts such as accusations are performed when a speaker utters words (locutionary act) which carry out certain acts such as accusing. Such an act may produce an effect (illocutionary act) which may trigger another action or a change in attitude (perlocutionary act). This is exemplified in the TLVs' discourse in the examples that follow.

Example 11: TLV3

When you are in the house of God, you are not far from the kingdom of God. Do you know there are men here who never sleep in their houses but they never miss a church meeting? They come from a brothel but go to a church meeting (U29). The man who was brought in the house of God – the guy was looking for money. I am a pastor, I'm not stupid – can I talk to you? (Gives a story of a woman who came to church with a baby but was a pick pocket and demonstrates how she holds the baby but picks from ladies' handbags). Tell them, 'I hope the pastor is not talking about you? Please check your mobiles, some came
here to steal (U30). There are others who came here because the girl they are after comes to this church (U31). So they followed her and are looking at her. I know you are here. I'm glad you came because you are not far from the kingdom. Others are here for business. (U32) The person they are after comes to this church.

It is evident that the TLVs made accusations against some members of the audience in (U29-U32) who 'sleep in a brothel and go to the church the next morning, those who go to church to steal, to see friends, and to do business' The next extract gives more examples of accusations.

Example 12: TLV4

Why do we fight unity? My God! Are you understanding what I am preaching this morning? Listen carefully church. Just remove your masks and say, she's talking to me. Listen to me church. Talk, baby, talk in Jesus' name. Tell your friend, I don't talk about people, I talk about events. Do you know you can be sitting next to somebody in church but you are not one? (U33) Let those saying 'Yahweh' say, 'Yahweh! What is unity? Am I communicating to someone? We are sitting together and smiling at me but cursing me (U34). Tell your neighbour, 'you dare not curse me'.

From the highlighted (U29-U34) the TLVs accuse the hearers for doing certain acts they do not consider right. For example, hearers are accused of sleeping in a brothel and then going to church, for being pickpockets in church, for wearing masks and smiling at a neighbour, yet cursing them and so on.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), when a speaker accuses a hearer, s/he implies that they do not want one or more of their characteristics, goals, beliefs or values. It can therefore be concluded that accusations threaten the hearer's positive face since the
speakers do not seem to care about the addressees’ feelings and in some respect, they do not want the hearers wants. The TLVs have a negative evaluation of some aspect of the hearer’s positive face. The next positive FTAs are challenges.

4.1.2.2 Challenges

Challenges are other speech acts performed by the TLVs in their discourse. Challenges just like accusations and criticisms according to Brown and Levinson (1987) show that the speaker has a negative evaluation of some aspect of the hearer’s positive face and when speakers challenge hearers, they indicate that they think the hearers are misguided or unreasonable about some issue, such wrongness being associated with disapproval. The instances below show the occurrence of challenges in the TLVs’ discourse.

Example 13: TLV 2:

*In each of us, there’s a gift put in us.* (Wewe umepewa enablement yakutengeneza cake). You have been given the gift of baking cakes. (Badala ya kuuza vitabu, unauza gari). (Instead of selling books, you sell vehicles. You hear kwa T.V. “Ukituma, zinapitana’ (when you send money, more money comes to you. Demonstrates how money by-passes more money). Semateeh. kuna Wakristo hawataki kutia bidii. (There are Christians who never want to put effort) (U35) Wewe ndiye utakaye tambua gift yako. (You are the one to discover your gift) (U36) UkJua ukiimba ndiyo gift yako, imba (when you know that when you sing, that is your gift, sing). Another extract that illustrates the use of challenges is shown below.

In (U35), the listeners are challenged for not putting effort and (U36), they are challenged to discover their talent and not to do what everyone else is doing. Below is another extract which contains challenges.
Example 14: TLV3

But now if you don’t say Amen, you will miss the greatest opportunity. A powerless Christian is one powerless in prayer and can end up disgracing or embarrassing God (U37). Wacha niseme kwa Kiswahili unielewe. Let me say in Kiswahili so that you understand me. Are you hearing me, somebody? There are two kinds of places where you bring your prayers (demonstrates by moving to the altar). That’s not a prayer. (moves to the place she calls holy of holies). You will not reap anything until it becomes of the spirit (U38). For that marriage to work, HIV or cancer to heal. Tell your neighbour, I need divine intervention. You must come beyond the holy place.

In (U35-U38), the TLVs challenge their listeners to do or abstain from doing certain acts. For instance, the listeners were challenged to put effort in their work, to identify their gifts, and to pray in the spirit until they touch God so that their marriages could work, sicknesses healed and so on.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), when speakers challenge their listener(s), they indicate that the addressee is wrong or misguided about some issue, such wrongness being associated with disapproval. It can therefore be argued that the TLVs disapprove of their hearers’ way of life such as not putting effort in their work (U35), not discovering their gifts (U36) and not praying in the spirit (U38). The inference made is that if they did what the TLVs challenged them to do, their marriages would work and they would enjoy good health among other benefits. These examples used by the TLVs indicate that the hearers ought to do things differently because they may be wrong or misguided. This therefore threatens the addressees’ positive face. The FTAs that follow are criticisms.
4.1.2.3 Criticism

Brown and Levinson (1987) say that when speakers criticise the hearers, they indicate their disapproval of some characteristics, beliefs or values of the hearer. A Criticism is performed when a speaker makes certain utterances and just like other speech acts, it is a locution which carries an illocutionary force of criticising. Consider the extracts below.

**Example 15: TLV3**

Ask your neighbour, are you a disciple of Jesus Christ? Your life must be a testimony of Jesus Christ. Some of you cannot tell your neighbours, 'look at us' (U39) can we help you? If your neighbour beats his wife, you do the same. Can you tell others look at us? Can you tell your neighbour look at us? One thing I like about Deliverance Church for forty years is that we can tell others 'look at us'. I'm tired of preachers who start a church and the next day they are holding a harambee to buy the pastor a car (U40). Brother, sister, tell your neighbour, 'your life must be a testimony to others.' Another extract that illustrates the use of criticism is presented below.

(U39 and U40) are criticisms. For instance in (U39) the hearers are criticised for not acting as role models and in (U40) religious leaders are criticised for having the wrong priorities in their ministries.

**EXAMPLE 16: TLV4**

Say Amen. I want us to just stand. Can we talk today? Are you hearing this, this morning? Somebody say 'unity'. I wish I had a church in this house (U42). Am I talking to somebody? Talk somebody.
(U39-U41) above, indicate that the TLVs criticise the hearers for not acting in some way such as (U39) not being role models and in (U41) for fund raising to buy cars for pastors within a short time after starting a church.

Brown and Levinson (1987) posit that criticisms just like complaints, reprimands, accusations and insults are expressions of disapproval and the speaker doesn’t care about the addressee’s feelings, thus threatening their positive face. From the above findings, it can therefore be concluded that the TLVs generally threatened the hearers’ negative and positive faces. Below is a frequency table that summarises the Negative and Positive FTAs used by the televangelists.

The table below shows a summary of the FTAs the TLVs used.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLV</th>
<th>Orders</th>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Reminders</th>
<th>Promises</th>
<th>Accusations</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| %age | 28.64 | 25.94 | 9.72 | 1.62 | 8.64 | 1.62 | 8.10 | 15.67 | 100   |

From the table above, it is clear that the most recurrent FTAs in the TLVs’ discourse were orders which form 28.64%, followed by requests forming 25.94%, challenges 15.67%, advice 9.72%, promises 8.64%, criticism 8.10%, accusations and reminders were the least at 1.62% each. The next section presents the politeness strategies.
4.2. Politeness Strategies TLVs used.

The second objective of this study was to examine the politeness strategies TLVs used in their discourse according to Brown and Levinson (1987) politeness model which posits that social interactants are model persons who think strategically and are conscious of their language choices that will mitigate the inevitable face threats in human interchange. They came up with four major categories of politeness strategies: positive, negative, bald-on-record and off-record politeness strategies which speakers select from depending on the social circumstances. These are dealt with in the section that follows. The first to be dealt with are positive politeness strategies.

4.2.1 Positive politeness strategies

Positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee’s positive face; his perennial desire that his wants (or the actions or values resulting from them) should be thought of as desirable. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that positive politeness is not necessarily redressive of a particular face want infringed by the FTA but a kind of social accelerator between speakers and their interactants. Participants use the language of intimates and show approval of each other’s personality for purposes of interaction as somehow similar. This intimate language gives positive politeness its redressive force. Brown and Levinson (1987) came up with fifteen positive politeness strategies. Below is a brief explanation of each.

*Strategy 1 (Notice, attend to H)*

This stresses that a speaker should notice aspects of the hearer’s condition and approve of it. For instance in English, someone may tell a friend, *‘what a beautiful vase you have?’*
**Strategy 2 (Exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with H)**

This is usually done with exaggerated intonation, stress and other aspects of prosodics as well as intensifying modifiers, as in English: ‘What a ‘fantastic’ garden you have?’

**Strategy 3 (Intensify interest to H)**

In this strategy, a speaker can communicate to the hearer that s/he shares some of his wants with the hearer by intensifying the interest of his own contributions to the conversation by ‘making a good story’ using the vivid present. A similar example is exaggeration of facts.

**Strategy 4 (Use of in-group identity markers)**

The strategy conveys in-group membership where the speaker claims common ground with the hearer. One way of showing in-group membership is use of generic names such as (mac, mate, buddy, pal, honey, dear, love, mom, brother, sister, sweetheart) and so on. Another way is use of code switching which involves any switch from one language or dialect to another. This switch occurs where we may expect a switch into a code associated with in-group and domestic values to be a potential way of encoding positive politeness when redress is required by an FTA. The use of jargon or slang is yet another way of expressing in-group membership. In-group membership can also be expressed by use of contraction and ellipsis.

**Strategy 5 (seek agreement)**

Another characteristic of claiming common ground with the hearer is seeking ways in which it is possible to agree with the speaker. The raising of safe topics allows the speaker to stress agreement with the hearer. The weather is virtually a safe topic for everyone and it is meant to create rapport. It is a way of doing FTA of initiating an encounter with a
stranger. Agreement may further be stressed by repeating part or all of what the preceding speaker has said in a conversation.

*Strategy 6 (Avoid disagreement)*

Token agreement occurs where the speaker shows the desire to appear to agree with the hearer which leads to mechanisms of pretending to agree. This can be done by use of white lies where a speaker confronted with a necessity to state an opinion wants to lie, for instance a speaker may say, *'Yes, I do like your new hat'* rather than damage the hearer’s positive face.

*Strategy 7 (Presuppose, raise or assert common ground)*

This indicates the value of a speaker spending time and effort on being with the hearer as a mark of friendship or interest in him/her and it redresses an FTA by talking awhile about unrelated topics. This is used to do FTAs such as requests.

*Strategy 8 (Joke)*

Since jokes are based on mutual shared background knowledge and values, jokes maybe used to stress shared background or those shared values. Joking is a positive politeness technique for putting the hearer at ease.

*Strategy 9 (Assert or presuppose s’ knowledge of, and concern for H’s wants)*

This stresses that S and H are co-operators, and thus potentially puts pressure on the listener to cooperate with the speaker. This implies knowledge of the hearers wants and willingness to fit one’s own wants with them.

*Strategy 10 (Offer, Promise)*
The use of this strategy stresses cooperation with the hearer in another way. The speaker claims that whatever the hearer wants, the speaker wants for him and will help him obtain. Offers and promises are the natural outcome of this strategy even if they are false. They stress the speaker’s good intentions in satisfying the hearer’s positive face.

\textit{Strategy 11 (Be optimistic)}

The speaker assumes that the hearer wants the speaker’s wants and will help the hearer obtain them. The speaker is presumptuous that the hearer will cooperate with the speaker because it will be for their mutual benefit, such as when a wife tells her husband, ‘\textit{You haven’t combed your hair}’ as husband moves out of the door. Such optimistic expression of the FTA seems to minimise the size of the threat; it implies that it’s nothing to ask.

\textit{Strategy 12 (include S and H in the activity)}

A speaker uses the ‘\textit{we}’ inclusive when s/he really means ‘\textit{you or me}’. They can call upon the cooperative assumption and thereby redress FTAs. Common examples are; ‘\textit{let’s have dinner, or Give us a break}’

\textit{Strategy 13 (Give or ask for reasons)}

Another aspect of using the speaker in activity is for the speaker to give reasons as to why s/he wants what they want, that is, want S’ wants thereby leading the hearer to see the reasonableness of the speaker doing the FTA.

\textit{Strategy 14 (Assume or assert reciprocity)}

The existence of cooperation between the speaker and hearer may also be claimed by giving evidence of reciprocal rights between the speaker and hearer. Thus the speaker may say, in effect, ‘\textit{I’ll do X for you if you do Y for me.}’ or ‘\textit{since I did X for you last week, you}’
must do Y for me this week. By pointing to the reciprocal habit of doing FTAs to each other, the speaker may soften the FTA.

Strategy 15: Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

In this strategy, the speaker may satisfy the hearer’s positive face by actually satisfying some of the hearer’s wants- hence the classic positive politeness of gift-giving, not only tangible gifts but human relations such as sympathy, being admired, understood, listened to and so on.

However, the positive politeness strategies recurrent in the TLVs’ discourse include: ingroup identity markers: use of generic names, and code switching; seeking agreement by use of repetition, Being optimistic, Including S and H in activity especially by use of the inclusive ‘we’ and Giving gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation). These will be discussed below.

4.2.1.1 Be optimistic

Being optimistic is one of the positive politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). It is evident from the TLVs’ discourse that the speakers were hopeful about the future of the hearers and tended to expect that good things would happen to their hearers. Instances of such optimistic utterances can be found in the examples below.

Example 17: TLV2

This family operates by faith (uses a rising intonation). You will be blessed in the city, you are blessed in the village (U42). By your stripes, I am healed (U43). Whatever you touch shall prosper (U44). Declare it is about me (pointing at self). Do your business by faith
and you are ahead of your competitors (U45). You see things before they see (U46). May you know what prosperity, good health is (U47). See what others are not seeing (U48). Go places where others have not gone (U49). Somebody declare, ‘I’m not limited’. Don’t allow sickness, wife or husband, to have or not to have children or history limit you.

It clear that in U42-U49 the TLV expresses optimism about the future when s/he tells the hearers that they will be blessed in the city and in the village (U42), that they will be healed by the stripes of Jesus (U43), that whatever they touch will prosper (U44) and so on. All the highlighted utterances in this extract above encourage the hearers to be optimistic about the future. The TLV assumes that the hearer wants his/her wants and that s/he will help them to obtain them. The speaker is presumptuous that the hearer will cooperate with the speaker because it is for their mutual benefit, thus minimises the size of the threat. Another positive politeness strategy is use of in-group identity markers.

4.2.1.2. In-group identity markers.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) these convey in-group membership by use of address forms of language, dialect or jargon. The TLVs employed this positive politeness strategy by using:

a) In-group generic names (such as 'friend', 'babe', 'honey', 'mum', 'brother', 'sister' and 'dad') to claim common ground with the hearers. Consider the examples below.

Example 18: TLV3

It is not about things you have done. I stand to be corrected. I want you to know 'friends' (U50). when a man is in Christ, he is a new creation. If you are not in Christ nothing has
changed. You will steal, cheat. Tell your neighbour I told you, in Christ everything is new. 
I have a testimony that Jesus saves. Are you understanding, 'friends'? (U51).

In (U50 and U51) the TLV uses the word 'friend' which claims in-group solidarity. Another extract with in-group identity markers is given below.

Example 19: TLV4

Talk, 'babe', talk in Jesus name (U52). Tell your 'friend', I don't talk about people, I talk about events (U53). Do you know you can sit next to somebody and you are not one? Let those saying Yahweh say Yahweh. What is unity? Are you getting the word, 'honey'? (U54). Below is yet another extract which contains in-group identity markers.

Example 20: TLV 5

'Friends', I went and prayed (U55). Let me tell you a story, 'friends' (U56) (Tells a story how she went to a friend who gave her a lot of money without documentation). Prayers for the holies are not for the lazy Christians.

When the TLVs use the words 'friend', 'honey' and 'babe', in the extracts above and others like 'brother' and 'sister' in other parts of the TLVs' discourse, they intend to claim common ground with them. This may not just minimise any imposition such as requesting or giving information but they show that they share something in common. Leech (1983) calls the attempt to maximise praise for the other, approbation strategy which shows ones loyalty to a particular social group. This agrees with Brown and Levinson (1987) view of in-group membership which stresses common ground as indicated above. When the TLVs address their addressees as 'friend', 'honey' or 'babe' they show that they
do not want to threaten their own face as they belong to the same group. This reveals solidarity or closeness.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the use of such terms also reveals that the speaker considers the relative power and status difference between himself and the addressee to be small thus softening the commands in the imperative sentences which begin with words ‘talk, ‘tell’ ‘turn’, thereby turning them into requests. The other form of in-group membership used by the TLVs is code switching.

b) Code switching

Code switching refers to the use of in-group codes such as language, dialect or local terminology. Brown and Levinson (1987) posit that when a speaker uses in-group codes, they assume that the hearer understands and shares the associations of that code and this creates common ground between the interactants. The Kenyan TLVs used English language as their medium of communication but they frequently switched to Swahili language as a way of creating rapport with their hearers. Such usage can be found in the extracts below.

Example 21: TLV 2

In each of us, there’s a gift put in us. Wewe umepewa enablement yakutengeneza cake (U57), (You have been given the gift of baking cakes). Badaayá kuuza vitabu, unauza gari (U58), (Instead of selling books, you sell vehicles). You hear kwa T.V, Ukituma, zinapitana (U59), (when you send money you receive more). (demonstrates how money by-passes more money). Sema teeh, kuna Wakristo hawataki kutia bidii (U60), (There are Christians who never want to put effort.) Wewe ndiye utakaye tambua gift yako, (You are the one to
discover your gift). Ukijua ukiimba ndiyo gift yako, imba (U61), (when you know that when you sing, that is your gift, sing). Umepewa enablement, (You have been given the ability) Baadaya kuua vitabu, unauza gari, (Instead of selling books, you sell vehicles). You hear kwa TV, ukituma zitapitana (U62), (You hear on TV, when you send money, it will by-pass with the blessing on the way) (U57-U62) indicate where the TLV switches codes from English to Kiswahili. Below is an extract showing more examples of code switching.

Example 22: TLV 1:

Are you listening to me? If you need help at mid-night you may get no answer. Mteja wa nambari uliyopiga, hapatikani kwa sasa (U63), (The mobile subscriber you have called cannot be reached). No person will be awake at midnight to offer help. Midnight is a very dangerous hour. A new day begins a minute after midnight. In the middle of the night, there's a lot of anguish. The beginning of your encounter with God is prayer.

It can therefore be concluded from the highlighted (U57-U63) above that code switching presupposes that the hearer understands and shares the associations of that code. This may be exploited as a positive politeness device. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that it is expected that a speaker will switch into a code associated with in-group and domestic values. They note that this is a potential way of encoding positive politeness when redress is required by an FTA. Neustupny (1985) argues that code switching is used to rectify inadequacies in English. This may explain why the TLVs switch from English to Kiswahili, a lingua franca in Kenya, and a language that most Kenyans are conversant with. Another recurrent positive politeness strategy recurrent in the TLVs’ discourse is seeking agreement. This is achieved through repetition.
4.2.1.3 Seeking agreement (repetition)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) another common characteristic of claiming common ground with the hearer is to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with the speaker. Ways of doing this are raising safe topics such as talking about the weather as a way of doing FTA of initiating encounter with a stranger, and the use of repetition which is recurrent among the TLVs. The examples below illustrate this.

Example 23: TLV1

*Can I have a Amen for reading the word of God? (U64) (Audience repeats, 'Amen'). I thought somebody would say 'Amen' (U65). (Audience repeats, 'Amen').*

In (U64 and U65) the hearers repeat 'Amen' as a way of agreeing with the speaker.

Example 24: TLV2

*Tell somebody 'I am not alone' (U67) (Audience repeats, 'I am not alone'. Tell someone, 'I am better today than I was last Sunday'. (Audience repeats). Somebody say, 'I'm born again' (U68) (audience repeats), 'I'm born again'.*

Again in (U67 and U68) the audience repeats what the TLV asks them to say.

Example 25: TLV3

*Tell your neighbour, 'You are in the right place' (listeners repeat) (U68). Tell your neighbour, I told you in Christ, everything is new. (Audience repeats) (U69).*
In the examples shown above (U64-U69) the hearers repeat what the TLVs request them to say. This stresses emotional agreement between the speakers and hearers. It also demonstrates that they have heard correctly what was said by the previous speaker. When the TLVs ask the hearers to repeat what they have said, this creates solidarity between the participants and the speakers indicate that they want to come closer to the hearers. Hasan (2000) identified repetition as one of the ways of repairing communication problems and interpreting meaning. This shows that the speakers want to repair their communication especially where some hearers may not be very conversant with the English language, thus a way of coming closer to their listeners. The next positive politeness strategy is the use of inclusive ‘we’.

4.2.1.4 The inclusive ‘we’

The other positive politeness strategy inherent in the TLVs’ discourse involves inclusion of both speaker and hearer in an activity. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), when a speaker uses ‘We’ form, s/he really means ‘you’ or ‘me’. This then means that the speaker can call upon the cooperative assumption and redress the FTAs. Examples of such usage can be found in the extracts below.

Example 26: TLV1

You will be blessed because you came. (x2). Something was telling me that you were sick but you were blessed because you came. ‘We’ dedicate our hearts to you (U70). ‘We’ pray for those who have come (U71). ‘We’ welcome everyone to this morning service (U72). You will be blessed because you came. It’s a joy being with you (Reads Acts 16:24-25). Below is another extract with the use of ‘we’ inclusive.
Example 27: TLV2

'We' also discover that this family is the household of faith (U73). 'We' are the household of faith (U74). What do 'we' need to do? (U75). Tumesoma mstaari unasema, 'One Lord, one baptism, one faith'. To each of 'us', grace was given (U76). In each of 'us', there is a gift put in 'us' (U77).

The TLV repeatedly uses the inclusive 'we' and 'us' which actually mean 'you' or 'I'.

Below are utterances drawn from TLV4's discourse.

Example 28: TLV4

'We' thank God for you (U78)

'We' couldn't catch it in the word (U79)

Can 'we' talk today? (U80)

Why do 'we' fight? (U81).

Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that when speakers use the inclusive 'we', they call upon the cooperative assumption by including both the speaker and hearer in activity thereby redressing the imposition. For example, 'lets' in English is an inclusive 'we' form. For example, in 'Let's stop for a bite', 'Lets' redresses the request because the speaker wants the object or action requested as well. In the highlighted utterances in the extracts above, the TLVs pretend that they too wanted to 'have their hearts dedicated to God and to be prayed for' as they did it to their hearers. The cooperative 'we' is thus used to soften the offers as if pretending that the hearer wants the object or action requested as well. The last positive politeness strategy to be dealt with is giving gifts.
4.2.1.5 Giving Gifts.

TLVs use the positive politeness strategy of gift-giving. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that this strategy involves speakers giving not only tangible goods but showing sympathy, understanding and cooperation to the hearers. Instances of these can be found in the extracts below.

Example 29: TLV2

This family operates by faith. You will be blessed in the city, you are blessed in the village (U82). By your stripes, I am healed (U83). Whatever you touch shall prosper (U84). Declare it is about me (pointing at self). Do your business by faith and you are ahead of your competitors. You see things before they see. May you know what prosperity, good health is (U85). See what others are not seeing. Go places where others have not gone. Somebody declare, "I'm not limited". Don't allow sickness, wife or husband, to have or not to have children, history limit you.

From the highlighted (U82-U85) the TLV expresses cooperation and sympathy with the hearers. For instance he tells them that they would be blessed, become prosperous, that they would be ahead of others and that they would be healed. The extract below further indicates examples of gift-giving.

Example 30: TLV3

I thank God you came to this service. That God will make you a new creature. (U86) If you are in Christ, everything has become new (U87). If you are not in Christ, nothing has become new. I was lame from my mother's womb. I was blind but now I see (U88). Are you
getting what I am saying? If you are not born again, I'm glad you are here. If you are here today, I want you to know that the house of God is the gateway to heaven (U89).

From the highlighted (U86-89) the TLV stresses cooperation with the hearers. For instance the TLV tells the hearers in (U86 and U87) that they would become new, that is, change for better. In (U88) for instance, if one is 'spiritually' blind, one would become spiritually 'see' when they get converted to Christianity like the speaker himself. In (U89) the TLV implies that the hearers' action of going to the house of God is moving closer to God. The extract that follows is yet another example of gift-giving.

Example 31: TLV1

Something was telling you that you are sick but you will be blessed because you came. (U90). We dedicate our hearts to you. We pray for those who came (U91). It's a joy to be with you. (Reads Act16:24-25). Having received this charge, he put them in prison and fastened their feet in the stocks but at midnight, Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns to God and the prisoners were listening to them. At midnight Paul and Silas were praying and chains loosened. Can I have a Amen for reading the word of God? (moves nearer the audience)

(U90 and U91) the TLV expresses sympathy and understanding towards the hearers. The speaker implies that they would be healed if they were sick and that they would be prayed for since they went to church. Generally, in (U82-91), the speakers stress cooperation and understanding of the hearers' needs, to 'be blessed, healed, to become prosperous, enjoy good health and be prayed for'. This satisfies the hearers' positive face of receiving not only tangible gifts but also psychological gifts. The speakers also demonstrate that they know some of the hearers' wants.
In a nutshell, when the TLVs use positive politeness in their discourse, they express optimism, make statements of friendship and claim common ground with the hearers. They also make use of the 'we' inclusive, exaggerate interest in the hearers and their interests, and avoid disagreements with them. By so doing they are able to redress any FTAs without difficulty and communication becomes effective and efficient. They also indicate reduced power and social distance between themselves and the hearers. The next politeness strategies to be discussed in this section are the negative politeness strategies.

4.2.2 Negative politeness strategies

Negative politeness strategies according to Brown and Levinson (1987) are oriented mainly toward satisfying the hearers' negative face, that is, their basic want to maintain claims of territory and self-determination. Negative politeness, thus, is essentially avoidance based. The realisations of negative politeness strategies consist of assurances that the speaker recognises and respects the addressee's negative face wants and will not (or minimally) interfere with the addressees' freedom of action. It performs the action of minimising the particular imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects. Negative politeness is the most conventionalised set of linguistic strategies for FTA redress: it is stuff that fills etiquette books such as use of words like, 'please', 'excuse me', 'may I' and so on.

Brown and Levinson (1987) came up with ten negative politeness strategies: be conventionally indirect, question/hedge, be pessimistic, minimise the imposition, give deference, apologise, impersonalise S and H, state FTA as a general rule, nominalise, and finally, going-on-record as to incur a debt. Below is a brief explanation of the ten negative politeness strategies.
**Strategy 1: Conventional Indirectness**

Conventional indirectness is the use of phrases and sentences that have contextually unambiguous meanings that are different from their literal meaning. For instance, the use of indirect speech acts, that is, the kind of things that are done by use of utterances and that sentences carry in their structure are indications of their paradigmatic use of illocutionary force (as earlier discussed in section 4.1). For example, syntactic questions can be used to request information, assertions to make statements of fact, imperatives to command, and so on. For instance, 'Can you pass me the salt?' can only be an indirect request but not a question about the addressee's potential ability. Indirect speech acts function as hedges on illocutionary force. The idea of indirectness is derived from the negative politeness that redress is given to the hearer's negative face by carefully avoiding assuming that anything involved in the FTA is desired or believed by the hearer.

**Strategy 2: Question, Hedge**

This derives from the want not to presume or want to coerce the addressee. A hedge is a particle, word or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set, it says that membership is partial or only true in certain respects, for instance, 'I guess/suppose/think that he is coming' or the use of 'if' clauses. To hedge as in the above sentence is to avoid commitment, a primary fundamental method of disarming routine interactional threats. The next negative politeness strategy is being pessimistic.

**Strategy 3: Be pessimistic**

This strategy involves the speaker assuming the hearer is not likely to do act A, thereby making it possible for the hearer to opt out. Avoiding coercion of the hearer may take the
form of attempting to minimise the threat of coercion by clarifying the speaker’s view of the P, D and R values. For instance, ‘would you do X for me?’ This satisfies the injunction, ‘Be pessimistic’. This is done for face preserving motives.

Another aspect of being pessimistic is the use of the ‘if clause’. To question or doubt a precondition on a speech act is to indicate that the speaker does not presume that the precondition is in fact met. These act as hedges on illocutionary force.

**Strategy 4: Minimise the imposition (RX)**

The choice of the above strategy encodes the perceived danger of the FTA, that is, (WX) but it does not indicate which of the social factors D, P or R, is the most responsible in determining the value of (WX). One way of diffusing the FTA is to indicate that (RX), the intrinsic seriousness of the imposition is not in itself great, leaving D and P as the possible weighty factors. So indirectly this may pay the hearer difference. In English, it is achieved by expressions such as I ‘just’ want to ask you if I may borrow your pen. ‘Just’ conveys both its literal meaning of ‘exactly’, ‘only’ which narrowly delimits the extent of the FTA and its conventional implicature ‘merely’.

**Strategy 5: Give deference**

Deference can be realized in two ways, one, where the speaker humbles himself and abases himself and the other where the speaker raises the hearer (pays him positive face) of a particular kind which satisfies the hearer’s want to be treated as superior.
Strategy 6: Apologise

By apologising for doing an FTA, the speakers indicate their reluctance to impinge on the hearers’ negative face and thereby partially redressing the impingement. There are four ways to communicate regret or reluctance to do an FTA.

a) Admit the impingement. This can be done with an expression such as ‘I would like to ask you for a big favour’.

b) Indicate reluctance. This may be done with use of hedges such as ‘I don’t want to bother or interrupt you’

c) Give overwhelming reasons. The speakers can claim that they have compelling reasons for doing FTAs (e.g. their own incapacity) thereby implying that normally they would not dream of infringing the hearer’s negative face, for instance, ‘Can you possibly help me with this because I can’t manage it’.

d) Beg forgiveness. The speaker may beg forgiveness or at least beg for acquittal, that is, the hearer should cancel the debt implicit in the FTA. For instance, ‘excuse me,...but...’ or insert ‘please’, or ‘I’m sorry forgive me if...’ or ‘would you...’

Strategy 7: Impersonalising S and H

One way of indicating that the speaker does not want to impinge on the hearer is to phrase the FTA as if the agent were other than the speaker alone and the addressee were other than the hearer or only inclusive of the hearer. Ways of avoiding the pronouns, ‘I’ or ‘you’, is in the use of imperatives, impersonal verbs as in the use of passives, and in pluralisation of ‘you’ or ‘I’.
Strategy 8: State FTA as a general rule

One way of dissociating the speaker and hearer from the particular imposition of the FTA hence communicating that the speaker does not want to impinge but is merely forced by circumstances is to state the FTA as a general rule. For instance in English ‘Passengers will please refrain from smoking’.

Strategy 9: Nominalise

As far as FTAs are concerned, the removal of the active doing part of an expression, the less dangerous it seems to be. For example, in English the use of verbal nouns to replace finite verbs such as, ‘Your going away is a relief to us’ instead of ‘You should go away’. This softens the FTA to a polite suggestion.

Strategy 10: Go-on record as to incur a debt

Speakers can redress an FTA explicitly claiming their indebtedness to the hearer or disclaiming any indebtedness. For instance, ‘I will eternally be grateful to you if you would help me with five hundred shillings.

The negative politeness strategies recurrent in the TLVs’ discourse are conventional indirectness, hedging, apologies and impersonalising the speaker and hearer. These will be discussed below.

4.2.2.1 Be conventionally indirect

The most significant form of conventional indirectness used by the TLVs is the use of indirect speech acts. (These are things that can be done by means of utterances that sentences carry in their structure such as syntactic questions which are paradigmatically
used to request information, rhetorical questions to make assertions, imperative sentences to make commands and so on (Brown and Levinson 1987, Austin 1962 and Searle 1969). The TLVs have made extensive use of imperative sentences and rhetorical questions in their discourse. Consider the examples below.

Example 32: TLV1

*Can I have a Amen for reading the word of God? (U92) (moves nearer the listeners). Are you listening to me? (U93). If you need help at midnight, you may get the answer (Mieja wa nambari hapatikani kwa sasa). No person will be awake at midnight. In the middle of the night there's a lot of anguish (long pause). The beginning of your encounter with God is prayer. I thought somebody would say, Amen (U94).*

*(U92-U94) are questions that make indirect requests to 'say Amen or listen to the speaker'.*

For instance (U92) is not a question about the hearers’ ability to say Amen but an indirect request to do so. So is (U94) which has nothing to do with the speaker thinking but actually requesting that the listeners say, 'Amen’ The next extract also illustrates the use of conventional indirectness.

Example 33: TLV3: *Who carried you here? (U95) Tell your neighbour, that's why I am next to you (U96). Do you understand friends? When you are in this house, you are not far from the kingdom of God. Do you know there are men here who never slept in their houses but they never miss a church meeting? (U97) They come from a brothel but go to church (U98). The man who was brought to the church, the guy was looking for money. I am a pastor, I am not naive. I’m not stupid. Can I talk to you? (U99).*
In (U95-U99) the TLV uses indirect speech acts in form of indirect questions, rhetorical questions, and imperative. For example in (U95) the speaker requires no answer when s/he asks the hearers, ‘who carried you here?’ This makes an assertion that they actually went there on their own accord. (U96) is an imperative sentence where the subject ‘you’ is omitted. This is a command to the hearer to tell a neighbour something. (U97) is an rhetorical question which requires no answer but makes an assertion that some people sleep in a brothel but go to church on Sunday. (U98) is a statement that makes an assertion. (U99) is not a question on ability of the speaker but a request to talk to the hearers.

In (U92-U99) the TLVs use conventional indirectness to communicate unambiguously to their hearers. For instance, in (U94) the speaker says ‘I thought somebody would say amen.’ The TLV avoids being direct but presumes that the interactants understand what he or she means. (U92 and U93) are also indirect requests to the hearers to give information. Some of these sentences contain ‘can’ and ‘would’ which according to Quirk et.al (1973) are used to make polite requests. In another portion of TLV4’s discourse, there is a rhetorical question; ‘Why do we fight unity?’ This stresses the gist of the speaker’s topic, ‘Unity’. When the speakers use questions such as indicated above, they minimise imposition of the FTA.

The TLVs expansively made use of conventional indirectness. This usage conveys something more than or different from what it literary means. In context it could not be depended on as ambiguous between the literal and the conveyed meaning and therefore provides a line of escape to the speaker or hearer thus saving the face threat. Another instance of conventional indirectness used by the TLVS is hedging.
4.2.2.2 Hedging

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) hedging is a linguistic means of satisfying the speaker's want of not assuming that the hearer is able to or willing to do A (and to some extent, the want to make minimal assumption about the hearer's want). Instances of such hedges are use of words and phrases such as 'exactly', 'perhaps', 'I wonder', 'I'm thinking, 'if', 'may be' and so on. The TLVs used the 'If clause' extensively. Consider the examples below.

**Example 34: TLV3**

> When a man is in Christ, he is a new creation. If you are not in Christ, nothing has changed (U100). You will steal, cheat. Tell your neighbour, I told you everything in Christ is new. I have a testimony that Jesus saves (people in the audience clap and applaud). Tell your neighbour, you are in the right place. If you are not born again you are in the right place (U101). Not at the night club or the witch doctor. The house of God is the gateway to heaven.

*(U100 and 101)* are used by the speaker to make requeststo the hearer to be born again so that things can change for better. Below are two other extracts with more examples of the use of 'if' clause.

**Example 35: TLV3**

> If you are in Christ everything has become new (U102). If you are not in Christ nothing has become new (U103). I was lame from my mother's womb. I was blind now I see. Are you getting what I am saying? If you are not born again and you are here, I am glad you came (U104). If you are here today, I want you to know the house of God is the gateway to heaven (U105). Below is yet another example.
Example 36: TLV4

If you love God and are not ashamed of him, put up your hands and clap. (U106) Do I speak for you? We believe in esteeming those who have honoured us. We esteem you and honour you. If you are a father, and proud to be one, lift up your hands. (U107) You may sit down.

The TLVs extensively used the “if” clause as seen in the instances above. (U100-U106) have been used as hedges to mitigate the advice given. The hearer is advised to convert to Christianity. For instance, (U102) 'If you are not born again, nothing has changed'. The speaker implies that people should be born again for things to change for better. (U106 and U107) are hedges on commands. For instance 'If you love God and are not ashamed of him, put up your hands and clap.' This is a command to put up hands and clap but it is mitigated by the condition introduced by the ‘if’ clause, that is, ‘If you love God’. According to Brown and Levinson(1987) the ‘If’ clause provides a line of escape to the speaker and functions as a hedge on illocutionary force, that is, on the advice to convert to Christianity and the command to lift up hands and clap. The next negative politeness strategy used by the TLVs is the use of apologies.

4.2.2.3 Apologies

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) when speakers make apologies for doing an FTA, they indicate reluctance to impinge on the negative face of the hearer, thereby partially redressing the impingement. There are many ways of apologising such as admitting the impingement, indicating reluctance, giving overwhelming reasons, begging for forgiveness, and so on. The extracts below indicate this.
Example 37: TLV3

*Let me tell you something, I have not stolen anyone's money. I have not even beaten my mother (pauses). Am I correct? Excuse me, (U108) this is African English. Are you catching what I am trying to say? Tell your neighbour, when we talk about sin, you were lame from your mother's womb. If you are not born again you are still lame.*

When a speaker begs forgiveness or asks for acquittal, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), it suggests that the hearer should cancel the debt implicit in the FTA. This was used only once by one TLV. This minimises imposition. The last example of negative politeness strategy to be discussed in this section is the act of impersonalising the speaker and hearer.

4.2.2.4 Impersonalising S and H

This is a way of avoiding the use of pronouns 'I' and 'you'. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that impersonalising the speaker and hearer refers to the act of indicating that the speaker does not want to impinge on the hearer or self by phrasing the FTA as if the agent were other than the speaker or at least possibly not the speaker alone and the addressee were other than the hearer or only inclusive of the hearer. By so doing, the speaker avoids the 'I' and 'you' pronouns. Consider the examples below.

Example 38: TLV2 *Turn to five people and tell them, 'I bless you'. (U109) Tell your neighbour 'I have a story to tell. (U110) I looked bad when I was parared.*when I came from that place so you can't tell me to go back. Tell somebody I'm not alone, I am going places (U111). You must not fear. When Christ comes in you, you don't feel inferior. Somebody say, 'I'm born again (U112).*
In (U109-U111), the subject you is omitted in crafting the order to tell the speaker something. In (U112), the subject ‘you’ has been replaced by the indefinite pronoun ‘somebody’. Below is another extract to illustrate the omission of the ‘You’ or ‘I’ subject or object.

**Example 39: TLV4**

Tell your neighbour, ‘you dare not curse me’. Say, ‘halleluyah’. (U113) Mega Church is brought up by who? We gonna be united for real. Tell your neighbour, I love mum more today. (U114) There is no limitation to what we can receive. Am I talking to somebody? (U115) Someone say, ‘Unity’. (U116).

From the highlighted utterances in the extracts above, it can be concluded that the TLVs used imperative sentences to craft orders where the ‘you’ subject is omitted or replaced with the words, *somebody, and someone*’ thereby intentionally avoiding overt reference to ‘you’ subject and sometimes indirect object of the performative verb. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that in many languages and especially English, agent deletion is allowed not only in imperatives but also in the other verb forms that encode acts which are intrinsically FTAs.

To sum up, it can be argued that negative politeness is the heart of respect behaviour just as positive politeness is the kernel for the familiar and joking behaviour. Negative politeness corresponds to rituals of avoidance; it performs the function of minimising the particular imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects mainly through indirectness. The next politeness strategy to be dealt with is Bald-on-record politeness strategy.
4.2.3 Bald-on-record Politeness strategy

Bald-on-record politeness strategy is one of the politeness strategies propounded by Brown and Levinson (1978). It is an element in formal politeness that sometimes directs one to minimise imposition by coming rapidly to the point, avoiding further imposition of prolixity and obscurity. Going on-record provides pressure towards directness and forthrightness. Brown and Levinson (1987) posit that bald-on-record strategy is speaking in conformity with Grice Maxims (Grice 1975): the Maxim of Quality which states that a speaker should be non-spurious, that is, speak the truth or be sincere. The second is the Maxim of Quantity where a speaker should not say less or more than is necessary. The third is the Maxim of Manner where a speaker should avoid ambiguity or obscurity and the fourth is the Maxim of relevance which states that a speaker ought to be Relevant. Brown and Levinson (1987) further argue that the maxims define the basic set of assumptions underlying every talk exchange but this does not imply that utterances in general must meet these conditions because the majority of natural conversations do not proceed in such brusque fashion at all. The desire for not speaking maxim-wise is to give attention to face.

Bald-on-record usage falls into two classes. One type of on-record usage is where face is not minimised, is ignored or irrelevant; and where doing the FTA baldly-on-record the speaker minimises face threats by implication. Direct imperatives stand out as clear examples of bald-on-record usage. It is used where interaction is task oriented in instances such as 'Give me a nail' or when the speaker is more powerful than the hearer and does not fear retaliation or non-cooperation from the addressee. The other type of bald-on record usage is where doing the FTA baldly-on-record the speaker minimises face threat by implication. An instance of non-minimisation in English is an exclamation such as 'Help!' which shows urgency while in 'Please help me if you would be so kind' is minimised and the urgency reduced. Direct imperatives in English stand out as clear examples of bald-on-
record usage with minimisation because the subject is deleted. The TLVs frequently used bald-on-record with minimisation and rarely did they use bald-on-record without minimisation, thus violating the Maxim of Quantity where they said less than they ought to.

**4.2.3.1 Bald-on-record (without minimisation)**

Brown and Levinson (1987) say that bald-on-record without minimisation of FTA is used where maximum efficiency is very important and this is mutually known to the speaker and hearer and no face redress is necessary. In case of great urgency and desperation, redress would actually decrease the communicated urgency such as in the following sentences.

- *Help!*
- *Watch out!*
- *Your house is on fire!*

Speakers also speak as if maximum efficiency were very important when they provide a metaphorical urgency for emphasis and a good example is found in attention getters used in conversation such as ‘*Listen, I’ve got an idea*’ ‘*Look, the point is this...*’

Another motivation for bald-on-record (non-redressed) FTA is found in cases of channel noise, or where communication difficulties exert pressure to speak with maximum efficiency. This can be seen where the speaker is calling across a distance. For instance, ‘*come home right now!*’ or when talking on the phone with a bad connection.

Again, where the focus of interaction is task oriented, face redress may be felt to be irrelevant. For example ‘*Lend me a hand here!*’ or ‘*Give me the nails*.’ Such task orientation
probably accounts for the paradigmatic form of instructions and recipes such as, ‘Open the other end’ or ‘Add three cups of flour’.

Another case where non-redress occurs is where the speaker wants to satisfy the hearer’s face is small, either because the speaker is powerful and does not fear retaliation or non-cooperation from the hearer, for example, Bring me the salt, Jane. This can also happen when the speaker wants to be rude or doesn’t care about maintaining face. A good example of socially acceptable rudeness comes in joking or teasing such as when teasing a baby, one can say, ‘Cry’ or ‘Get angry’ without the risk of offending.

A third set of cases where non-minimisation is likely to occur is where doing the FTA is primarily in the hearer’s interest. Then in doing the FTA the speakers convey that they do care (about the hearer’s positive face) so no redress is required. Sympathetic advice or warning may be done baldly-on-record.

For example, ‘careful, he’s a dangerous man (warning the hearer against someone who could threaten him/her) or

‘Your headlights are on’

One other example of bald-on-record usage is found in greetings and farewells and in general rituals of beginning and/or terminating encounter. For example, ‘sit down’, ‘come again’. Instances of bald-on-record (without minimization) found in the TLVs’ discourse can be cited in the extracts below.
Example 40: TLV2


In (U117) the ‘You’ subject is not omitted and the TLV crafts an order and uses the auxiliary ‘must’. Quirk (1973) says that the use of ‘must’ indicates an obligation. The FTA is thus non-minimised. Below is another extract with non-minimised FTAs.

Example 41: TLV4

Are you understanding what pastor is preaching this morning? Listen carefully church. (U118) Just remove your masks and say ‘she’s talking to me’. Listen to me church (U119). Where are J.C.C members? (laughs) Talk, baby talk in Jesus name. (U120) Tell your friend, I don’t talk about people, I talk about events. Do you know you can sit next to somebody in church and you are not one?

In (U119 and U120) the TLV wants to get the attention of the listeners and says, ‘Listen...’

From the highlighted examples, (U117-U120) the TLVs do not minimise the FTAs (orders). As Brown and Levinson (1987) posit, efficiency is very important and this is mutually known to the speaker and hearer. In such instances, face redress is not necessary. Another reason is that the TLVs are more powerful than the addressee. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that a speaker or hearer is more powerful if one plays the role of manager, is a thug with a gun or one is a priest. It could therefore be argued that the TLVs did not minimise the threats in the examples above because they are more powerful than
the hearers. They play the role of priests. The TLVs often used Bald-on-record strategy with minimisation as seen in the examples that follow.

4.2.3.2 Bald-on-record (with minimisation)

Bald-on-record with minimisation is where the speaker minimises face threats by implication. Imperatives stand out as clear examples of such usage and the speakers further minimise threats by being indirect as to who the object of the FTA is. Consider the extracts that follow.

Example 42: TLV2

*Turn to five people and tell them, 'I bless you'.* *(U121)* Tell your neighbour, 'I have a story to tell' *(U122)*. I looked bad when I was parared* when I came from that place so you can’t tell me to go back. *Tell somebody, 'I’m not alone, am going places* *(U123)*. You must not fear. *When Christ comes in you, you don’t feel inferior. Somebody say, ‘I’m born again.* *(U124)*

From the highlighted *(U121-U124)* above, the TLV avoids direct imposition on the hearers. For instance in *(U124)* the speaker tells the hearer to ‘turn’ to five people and tell them ‘I bless you’. It therefore appears like it is the hearer blessing the five people and not the speaker. This reduces the sting of the imposition and saves the speaker’s face. The same applies to *(U122 and U123)* whereby the speaker tells the hearer to tell ‘*a neighbour*, ‘*somebody*’ something thereby redressing the imposition. Below is another extract that shows minimised FTAs.
Example 43: TLV3

Can I talk to you? (U125) (Tells the story of a woman who came to church with a baby but was a Pickpocket). Tell them I hope that the pastor is talking to you. (U126) 'Please check your mobiles'. (U127) Some came here to steal (U128) (rebukes the spirit). There are others who came here because the girl they are after comes to this church (U129). So they followed her. I'm glad you came because you are not far from the kingdom. Others are here for business (U130). The person they are after comes to this church.

Again in (U126, U128, U129 and U130) the TLV does not directly address the hearers but uses pronouns such as, 'them', 'some' and 'others' to refer to those who went to church to steal, to do business and to see a girl they are after. This reduces imposition on the hearers because the use of the pronouns identified above singles out the culprits and excludes those who are not affected by the vices. In (U125 and U127) the TLV uses the word 'can' and 'please' which introduce polite requests, thus softening the infringement.

In the highlighted utterances used above, the speakers use imperative sentences and pronouns to do the FTAs baldly on-record but minimise face threats by implication. They make requests and avoid reference to the 'you' subject to craft the orders such as 'tell your neighbour' something instead of directly addressing the 'you' subject. They also use the indefinite pronouns: 'some', 'others', 'everybody', and 'somebody' to refer to the addressees in the hope that the target of the FTA will understand that they are the ones being addressed.

Such communication violates the maxim of quantity which states that one should not say more or less than necessary. From the examples above, the TLVs said less than necessary
because part of their communication is understood via implicatures. According to Grice (1975) implicature refers to what is suggested in an utterance, even though neither expressed nor strictly implied by the utterance. Bald-on-record usage is mainly used when efficiency is most important and when face redress is not necessary because it is mutually known to both the speaker and the hearer or the speaker is more powerful than the hearer, thus the sting of imposition is minimised.

4.2.4 Off-Record Politeness strategy.

In Brown and Levinson's (1987) view, a communicative act is done off-record if it is done in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one communicative intention to the act. In other words, the actor leaves himself an 'out' by providing himself or herself with a number of defensible interpretations. S/he cannot be held responsible to have committed one's self to just one particular interpretation of the act. Thus if a speaker wants to do an FTA but wants to avoid responsibility for doing it, S/he can do it off-record and leave it up to the addressee to decide how to interpret it. Brown and Levinson (1987) came up with fifteen off-record politeness strategies: give hints, give association clues, presuppose, understate, overstate, use tautologies, use contradictions, be ironic, use metaphors, use rhetorical questions, be ambiguous which is further classified into; be vague, overgeneralise, displacement of hearer, and finally be incomplete or use ellipsis. A brief explanation of each of the off-record politeness strategies is given below.

Strategy 1: Give hints

If a speaker wants to do an FTA and chooses to do it indirectly, he must give the hearer some hints and hope that the addressee picks up on them and thereby interprets what the speaker really means (intends) to say. The basic way is to invite conversational
implicatures (as explained in the section above). For example, if someone says ‘what a boring movie’ it could implicate, ‘let’s leave’. Giving hints violates the relevance maxim which states that the speaker ought to be relevant.

Strategy 2: *Give association clues*

A related kind of implicature triggered by relevance violation is provided by mentioning something associated with the act required by the addressee, either by precedent in speaker-hearer experience or by mutual knowledge irrespective of their interactional experience, for example, ‘Oh God, I have a headache again’ may be used to convey a request to borrow the hearer’s swimming suit if the speaker and hearer mutually know that they have an association between the speaker having an headache and wanting to borrow a swim suit in order to swim off the headache. Someone may tell a friend, ‘my house is not far away’ implying, ‘please come and visit’. Such hints leave it up to the hearer to offer, taking off the responsibility for the FTA away from the speaker. The third off-record politeness strategy is to presuppose.

Strategy 3: *Presuppose*

An utterance can be almost wholly relevant in context but, and yet violate the relevance maxim just at the level of its presupposition. For instance if the speaker says, I washed the car again today’ presupposes that the speaker has done it again and therefore may implicate a criticism. The use of ‘again’ forces the addressee to search for the relevance of the presupposed prior event; if it is relevant only on the assumption that the speaker and hearer are counting the times each does the task, then a criticism is implicated. The fourth strategy is to understate.
Strategy 4: Understate

In this strategy and the next two, that is, overstate and use of tautologies, we consider how the addressee can be invited to make inferences by the speaker’s violation of the quantity maxim, that is, ‘say as much as and no more than is required’ since by being indirect the speaker is inevitably saying less than s/he actually intends to convey. By saying less or more than is required, the speaker invites the hearer to consider why. For instance one might say, ‘That car looks like it might go. (about a flashy sports car) as a compliment.

Strategy 5: Overstate

If the speaker says more than is necessary, thus violating the quantity maxim, s/he may also convey some implicatures. The speaker may do it by exaggerating or choosing a point on a scale which is higher than the actual state of affairs. For example, ‘I tried calling a hundred times, but there was no answer’ (to convey an apology).

Strategy 6: Use of tautologies

This is the third method of generating inferences by violation of quantity maxims. This is to utter patent truths such as, ‘boys will be boys’. By uttering a tautology, the speaker encourages the hearer to look for an informative interpretation of the non-informative utterance. It may be an excuse.

Strategy 7: Use contradictions

By violating the Quality Maxim (‘speak the truth’, be sincere’) the speaker forces the hearer to find some implicature that preserves the quality assumption. The principle of speaking the truth is so fundamental that any violation provides the major figures of speech, that is, contradictions, ironies, metaphors and rhetorical questions (all involve
violation of Quality Maxim). In contradiction, by stating two things that contradict each other, the speaker makes it appear that one cannot be telling the truth, thereby encouraging the hearer to look for an interpretation that reconciles the contradictory propositions. For instance,

A: *Are you upset about that?*

B: *Yes and No.*

Such contradiction may convey a criticism or a complaint. For instance one might say about a drunken friend to a telephone caller, *'Peter is here and he isn't here.***

**Strategy 8: Be ironic**

When speakers say the opposite of what they mean, again there is a violation of quality maxim and the intended meaning can be conveyed indirectly if there are clues that the intended meaning is being conveyed indirectly. Such clues may be prosodic, kinesics or simply contextual. For instance one can say, *'lovely neighbourhood'*(referring to a slum).

**Strategy 9: Use of metaphors**

Metaphors are a further category of quality violations, for they are literary false. For example, *'John is a real fish'* can mean a variety of things such as, *'John drinks', 'John swims', 'John is slimy*, or is *'cold blooded like a fish.'* Metaphors may be marked with hedging particles such as (*'real, regular, sort of, as it were')*that make their metaphorical status explicit. Euphemisms can also be metaphorical. For instance the use of *'home economist'* for *'housewives', or 'pass away' to mean 'to die'***
Strategy 10: Use of rhetorical questions

To ask questions with no intention of obtaining answers is to break a sincerity condition on questions. Questions that leave their answers hanging in the air, implicated may be used as FTAs, for example in excuses such as, ‘what can I say? (nothing, it’s so bad).

Strategy 11: Be ambiguous

This is violating the Manner Maxim. A speaker may choose to go off-record by being ambiguous or vague in such a way that the communicated intent is ill-defined. It may be that the clues sum up to an utterance that is ambiguous in context but by using what is technically indirect the speaker will have given a bow to the addressee’s face and therefore minimised the threat of the FTA. Purposeful ambiguity may be achieved through the following ways:

a) Use of metaphor

It is not always be clear exactly which of the connotations of a metaphor are intended to be invoked. For example, ‘Kamau is a pretty sharp cook’. This could either be a compliment or an insult depending on the connotations associated with the word ‘sharp’.

b) Being Vague.

A speaker may go off-record with an FTA by being vague about who the object of the FTA is, or what the offence is such as a criticism. For instance, ‘someone’ may have had too much drink’. (vague understatement) or ‘I’m going down town for ‘a bit’ (to a local pub).

c) Over-generalise
A speaker may state something as a general rule that leaves the object of the FTA vaguely off-record. For instance, ‘Mature people sometimes help do the dishes’. The addressee then has the choice of deciding whether the general rule applies to him/her, in this case. The same case applies to the use of proverbs though their use may be conventionalised. For example, ‘People living in glass houses should not throw stones’. Such advice in context may serve as criticism.

d) Displace hearer
The speaker may go off-record as to who the target of the FTA is, or one may pretend to address the TFA to someone else whom it wouldn't threaten, and hope that the real target will see that the FTA is addressed to them. For instance, a secretary may ask another secretary to pass the stapler to her while a professor is nearer to the stapler than the secretary. The professor’s face is threatened, and he/she can choose to do it as a bonus ‘free gift’.

e) Be incomplete, use ellipsis
This is a violation of both the Quantity Maxim as well as the Manner maxim. Elliptical utterances are legitimised by various conversational contexts- in answers to questions. By leaving an FTA half undone, the speaker can leave the implicature ‘hanging in the air’, just as with rhetorical questions. For instance, ‘If one leaves the tea on the wobbly table…’ This is one of the most favoured strategies for making requests especially to superiors.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) in off-record usage, the mutual knowledge of the speaker and the hearer in context is crucial; the intonational, prosodic and kinesics clues of the speaker’s attitude provide viable interpretations in context. Below are instances of off-
record usage recurrent in the TLVs’ discourse: use of ambiguity, displacement of the hearer, metaphors and rhetorical questions.

4.2.4.1 Ambiguity

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), ambiguity is a violation of the Maxim of Manner (Grice 1975) which states that a speaker should avoid ambiguity or obscurity. Ambiguity is achieved by a speaker being imprecise about who the object of the FTA is or what the offence is, for example, a criticism. It can be achieved in five ways identified above: being vague, displacing the hearer, giving hints and being incomplete or using ellipsis, some of which seem to overlap. In this study displacing of hearer and vagueness will be treated as one strategy (vagueness).

4.2.4.1 Vagueness

The TLVs frequently displaced the hearer by using the words ‘someone’, ‘somebody’, ‘everyone’, ‘some’ and ‘neighbour’ in their discourse to craft FTAs such as commands and requests. The speaker may go off-record as to who the target of the FTA is, or may pretend to address the FTA to whom it would not threaten and hope that the real target will see that the FTA is aimed at him or her. Consider the extracts below.

Example 44: TLV3

*Mega church is brought up by whom? We gonna be united for real. Tell your ‘neighbours’ I love mum more today (U131). There’s no limitation to what we can receive. I’m I talking to somebody? (U132) ‘Someone’ say unity (U133).*
In (U131) the TLV goes off-record as to who the target of the FTA is by telling the hearers to tell their 'neighbours'. In (U132) the speaker asks whether s/he is talking to 'somebody' and in (U133), the subject 'you' is displaced with the indefinite pronoun 'someone'. The next extract is another example of such displacement of the hearer which creates vagueness.

Example 45: TLV2

*Turn to five people and tell them, 'I bless you'. Tell your neighbour, 'I have a story to tell (U134). I looked bad when I was parared* when I came from that place so you can't tell me to go back. Tell somebody, 'I'm not alone, am going places (U135). You must not fear. When Christ comes in you, you don't feel inferior. Somebody say, 'I'm born again (U136).*

In (U134 and U135) the TLV also pretends that s/he is not addressing the hearers but tells them to tell the 'neighbour' and 'somebody' and in (U136) the subject 'you' is displaced with the indefinite pronoun 'somebody'. Below is another example.

Example 46: TLV1:

*The beginning of your encounter with God is prayer. I thought somebody (U137) would say 'Amen'. Everyone say, 'word of knowledge' (U138). Some of them have the bible and they have never read it to you. (U139) 'If you pay the devil money, he will still lie to you).*

In (U137-U139) the TLV again uses indefinite pronouns 'somebody' and 'everyone' to displace the subject. In (U139) it is vague as to who the statement 'some of them' refers to.
By using the words, ‘somebody’, ‘someone’, ‘everyone’, ‘neighbours’ and ‘Some’ in the examples shown above, the TLVs go off-record with an FTA by being vague about who the object of the FTA is. This leaves the speakers’ intent ill-defined and by using what is technically indirect, the speaker will have given a bow to the hearer’s face and therefore minimised the threat of the FTA. The next off-record politeness strategy is the use of metaphor.

4.2.4.2 Metaphor
The TLVs used metaphors and these are quality violations. Brown and Levinson argue that metaphors are literally false. Oxford dictionary (2010) defines a metaphor as a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to something to which it is not literally applicable. For instance, a crumbling building can be used as a metaphor for the society of the time. When a speaker uses metaphors, it is not clear exactly which of the connotations of the metaphor is intended to be invoked. For instance, in English someone may say, ‘It was a ‘stormy’ relationship.’ This means the relationship involved a lot of ‘anger or arguments’. The speaker may say this to be technically indirect and will give a bow to the hearer’s face thereby minimising the threat of the FTA. The TLVs used a number of metaphors as found in the extracts that follow.

Example 47: TLV3

_I thank God you came to this service. That God will make you a ‘new creature’ (U140). If you are in Christ, everything has become new. If you are not in Christ, nothing has become new. I was ‘lame’ from my mother's womb. (U141). I was ‘blind’ but now I see. (U142) Are you getting what I am saying? If you are not ‘born again’, I'm glad you are here_
(U143). If you are here today, I want you to know that the house of God is the ‘gateway to heaven’ (U144).

(U140-U144) indicate metaphorical use of language whereby the Quality Maxim is violated. For instance when the TLV uses expressions such as ‘new creature’ s/he may imply that if the hearers convert to Christianity, they would become better people than before. Being ‘lame’ literary means not able to walk well, but in this context it could imply that before the speaker got converted he was spiritually ‘disabled’. To be blind literary means, ‘not able to see’, but in this context it refers to ‘inability to perceive things spiritually’. Being ‘born again’ in context refers to converting to Christianity. ‘Gateway’ to heaven is where one gets instructions that would lead to ‘eternal life’. Below is another extract with metaphors.

Example 48: TLV1: Can I have a Amen for reading the word of God? (moves nearer the listeners). Are you listening to me? If you need help at ‘midnight’, you may get the answer. Mteja wa nambari hapatikani kwa sasa. (The mobile subscriber cannot be reached. (U149). No person will be awake at ‘midnight’. In the middle of the night there’s a lot of anguish (long pause). The beginning of your encounter with God is prayer. I thought somebody would say, Amen.

‘Midnight’ has been used metaphorically to refer to that hour of the night which is very dangerous and when no help would be forth coming.

The TLVs in the extracts above have used metaphors such as: ‘new creature’ which may be interpreted to mean positive change that occurs after one converts to Christianity.
‘Lameness’ which could refer to a state of being in sin before one gets converted and is not able to discern things spiritually. ‘Blindness’ may imply spiritual blindness when one is lost in sin and cannot distinguish right or wrong. The TLV views the church as the place where one could get an opportunity to get converted and therefore be able to go to heaven (eternity). ‘Midnight’ may have been used literally to refer to the middle of the night but may also imply, the most difficult moment in one’s life. The use of metaphors means that the hearer should make inferences within the given context and therefore the speaker gives a bow to the hearer’s face, thereby minimising the face threat. The next off-record strategy is the use of over-generalisation.

4.2.4.3 Giving hints

If speakers say something that is not explicitly relevant, they invite the hearer to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance, and hope that the hearer picks up on them and interpret what the speaker means (intends) to say. For instance if someone says, ‘I need some more nails to finish up the chicken pen.’ The speaker intends that the hearer buys some more nails.

Again someone could say, ‘what a hot day!’

This is a suggestion that they have a drink. Consider the examples below.

Example 49: TLV 4

You may take your sit. Give tithes and God will receive and you gonna be blessed. Whatever amount you want to give. Why is it important to give? We thank God for you. I would like everybody to redeem a pledge (U150).

(U151) above is an indirect request to give tithes and this violates the Relevance Maxim. The TLV is not explicit but tells the hearers to ‘redeem a pledge’ which hints upon an interpretation that makes the violation understandable. Below is another example.
EXAMPLE 50: TLV5

There are two kinds of places where you bring your prayers. You will not reap anything until it becomes of the spirit. For that marriage to work, HIV, cancer to heal e.t.c. Tell your neighbour, 'I need divine intervention'. You must come beyond to the holy place (U151) “Hapa nikama utamguza Mungu” (here it is like you will touch God). (moves across the dais). Let me remind you, you can never obey the Ten Commandments in the flesh. You must be walking in the spirit, friends (U152).

Again, (U152 and U153) are hints as to the speakers' intention that the hearers must not just pray but do it intensely. From (U151-U153) given above, it is clear that the TLVs want to do an FTA (give advice) but choose to do it indirectly but give the hearers hints and hope that they will pick up on them and thereby interpret what the speaker really intends.

The last off-record politeness to be dealt with in this paper is the use of rhetorical questions.

4.2.4.4 Use of Rhetorical Questions

To ask questions with no intention of obtaining answers is to break a Sincerity condition on questions. When a speaker asks questions, s/he wants the hearer to provide the indicated information. This sincerity condition follows: 'Be sincere' that is the Quality Maxim.

Consider the examples below.

Example 51: TLV 3

I was lame in my father's womb.

You were lame in your mother's womb.

Listen, there are reasons.

Let me tell you something, I have not stolen anyone's money.
I have not even beaten my mother (pauses)
(Leaning forward). Am I correct? (U154)
Excuse me, this is American English
Are you catching hat I am trying to say?
Tell your neighbour x2
When we talk about sin, you were lame from your mother’s womb.

In (U154) the TLV uses a rhetorical question because he does not expect anyone to give him/her an answer as to whether s/he is correct or not. He is the only one who can tell whether he has stolen anyone’s money or beaten his mother. Below is an example drawn from TLV4.

Example 52: TLV4

Somebody say ‘unity’. I wish I had a church in this house.

I’m I talking to somebody? Talk, somebody.

No amount of legislation can bring unity. Christ never intended for us...

Cut yourself, blood is the same colour

Come on somebody, can you talk, where do you fall? (a delirious laugh)

Why do we fight unity? (U155)

Yai my God!

Are you understanding what Pastor is preaching this morning?

Listen carefully church.

(U155) is another rhetorical question because the speaker does not expect to get answers from the hearers. When the speakers leave their answers hanging in the air, implicated, may be used to do FTAs such as excuses.
Generally, the findings on off-record usage indicate that when the speakers go off-record, they invite the hearers to search for the intended meaning thereby minimising the face threats.

It is clear from the discussion on the FTAs and the politeness strategies that the Kenyan TLVs threatened their addressees’ faces but they were also careful to redress them accordingly by employing the four politeness strategies propounded by Brown and Levinson (1987); that is, Positive, Negative, Bald-record and Off-record politeness strategies. The table below clearly illustrates this.

Table 4.2

The table below represents a summary of the politeness strategies used by the five Kenyan TLVs.

A summary of politeness strategies by TLVs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITENESS STRATEGIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCIES</th>
<th>TOTAL NO. POLITENESS STRATEGIES %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLV 1</td>
<td>TLV 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-record</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-record</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table shown (above), Positive politeness strategies were the most frequently used by TLVs forming 38.7%, followed by Negative politeness strategies that form 35.5%, Bald-on-record 15.0% and the least used were Off-record which form 10.8%. According to the table, the TLVs used all the four types of politeness strategies but in varying frequencies of occurrence. In the next section we shall look at the factors that influenced the choice of politeness strategies by the TLVs.

4.3 Factors that Influence the choice of politeness Strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that any rational agent will seek to avoid face threatening acts or employ certain politeness strategies to minimise face threats in social interaction. A speaker will take into consideration the relative weightings of at least three wants: the want to communicate the content of the FTA, the want to be efficient or urgent and the want to maintain the hearer’s face at any degree unless the want to be efficient is greater than the want to maintain the hearer’s face and the speaker will want to minimise the threat of the FTA. They go on to argue that any rational agent will choose the same genus of strategy under the same conditions, that is, make the same moves as any other would under the circumstances. This is due to the fact that the particular strategies afford certain pay-offs or advantages, and the relevant circumstances are those in which one of those pay-offs would be more advantageous than any other. The factors to be discussed below are the pay-offs, the social distance of the speaker or hearer, the relative power of either the speaker or hearer and the ranking of imposition of the FTA.

4.3.1 The Pay-offs

An actor goes On-record in doing an act A if it is clear to the participants what communicative intention led the actor to do A. For instance when someone says, ‘I
Promise to come', s/he has committed herself/himself to the act A in an unambiguous manner. By going on-record, speakers can also potentially get any of the following advantages: they can enlist public pressure against the addressee or in support of them; they can get credit for honesty for indicating that they trust the addressee or can get credit for outspokenness, avoiding the danger of being seen to be manipulators.

Besides, by going on-record with positive politeness, a speaker can minimise the face threatening aspect of the act by assuring the addressee that he considers himself to be of the same kind, that he likes him and wants his wants. Thus a criticism with an assertion of mutual friendship may lose much of its sting. For instance, TLV3 criticises the people who go to church to steal, those who go to see their friends, others who go to see their business partners, and the witches in the audience but finally asks them, ‘Are you understanding me ‘friends’? The criticism is softened by the use of in-group membership; the word ‘friends’. According to Labov (1972), the assumption of friendship context makes it game. The pay-off is that the TLV minimises positive face threat by assuming friendship.

Another possible pay-off is that the speaker can avoid or minimise the debt implication of the FTAs such as requests and offers by using positive politeness either by referring (indirectly) to the reciprocity of the on-going relationship between the addressee and himself (as in reference to pseudo prior agreement with them) by including the addressee and himself equally as participants or as benefactors from the request or offer. The TLVs frequently made requests and offers using the inclusive ‘we’ as shown in the extracts below.
Example 53: TLV1

'We' dedicate our hearts to you. (U156) 'We' pray for those who came'. (U157) 'We' welcome everyone to this morning service. (U158) You will be blessed because you came. It's a joy being with you'.

Another example of 'we' inclusive can be cited below.

Example 54: TLV4 'We' believe in esteeming those who have honoured 'us' (U159). 'We' esteem you and honour you. You may have your seat. (U160) 'We' thank God for you (U161).

The pay-off is that the TLVs minimise the threat implication because they are only inclusive of those imposing on the hearer so they give themselves a bow and save their own face.

Again, when speakers go on-record with negative politeness, they can benefit by paying respect, deference to the addressee in return for the FTA, and can therefore avoid incurring a debt and can maintain social distance and avoid potential loss by advancing familiarity towards the addressee, for instance they use in-group identity markers such as 'brother, sister, honey, babe, friend' as occasionally used by the TLVs' in their discourse. Consider the extracts below.

Example 55: TLV3

I want you to know 'friends' when a man is in Christ, he is a new creation. (U162) If you are not in Christ, nothing has changed. You will steal, cheat. Tell your neighbour I told
you, in Christ everything is new. I have a testimony that Jesus saves. Are you understanding, friends? (U163).

Below is are extracts that illustrate the use of negative politeness to avoid potential loss of face by the speaker by paying respect to the addressee in return for an FTA by advancing familiarity towards the addressee.

Example 56: TLV4

Talk, ‘babe’, talk in Jesus name (U164). Tell your ‘friend’, I don’t talk about people, I talk about events (U165). Do you know you can sit next to somebody and you are not one? Let those saying Yahweh say Yahweh. What is unity? Are you getting the word, honey? (U166).

TLV 5: Friends, I went and prayed (U166). Let me tell you a story, friends (U167) (Tells a story how she went to a friend who gave her a lot of money).

The use of such intimate terms as highlighted above indicate that the speakers have the other person at heart and though they impose on the hearers, the sting is reduced.

On the other hand, when a speaker goes Off-record in doing an act, it means there is more than one unambiguously attributable intention so that the actor cannot be held to have committed himself to just one particular intent. For example, when someone says in English, ‘Damn, I’m out of cash, I forgot to go to the bank today’. The intention may be to you to lend him some money but the speaker can’t have been held to have committed him/herself to the intent. Off-record hints to what the speaker wants or means to communicate without doing it directly so that to some degree the meaning is negotiable.
By going off-record, the speakers can gain by getting credit for being tactful and non-coercive. Besides, they run less risk of their acts entering the gossip biography that others keep of them and can avoid responsibility for the potentially face damaging interpretation.

From the illustrations above (on the pay-offs) it is clear that the choice of different politeness strategies afford the speaker or hearer certain advantages. For instance, the use of positive politeness strategy indicates that the speaker calls upon the cooperative assumption and anoints the positive face of the hearer and redresses the FTA. By using negative politeness strategy, the speaker pays respect to the addressee in return for the FTA, whereby in off-record usage the speaker gains by getting credit for being tactful and non-coercive apart from avoiding responsibility for the potentially face damaging interpretation. The factors to be dealt with in the next section are sociological in nature, that is, (D, P and R).

4.3.2 The Sociological factors (D, P and R)

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1983 and 1987) argue that the seriousness of a FTA involves three factors: Social distance (D) of the speaker and addressee; the relative power (P) of the speaker or the addressee and the absolute ranking of imposition. (R) Below we deal with social distance.

4.3.2.1 Social Distance (D)

Social distance (D) is the value that measures the social distance between the speaker and hearer. It is an asymmetric social dimension of similarity or difference within which the speaker and hearer stand for the purposes of an act. In most and not all cases, it is based on an assessment of the frequency of an interaction and the kind of material or non-material
goods (including face) exchanged between the speaker and hearer. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the social distance between the speaker and hearer can be assessed as great because the hearer speaks another dialect or language, or lives in the next village or is not a kinsman. Social closeness is generally characterized by the reciprocal giving and receiving of positive face.

It is evident from the findings that there was social closeness between the TLVs and the hearers because a lot of interaction took place between them as TLVs asked the hearers for information and they received answers. They also asked them to do certain acts such as clapping hands, shouting and turning to their neighbours to tell them something and it was done. The TLVs also switched codes from English to Kiswahili and this showed solidarity. There was also reciprocal giving and receiving in the many offers and promises made. Generally this is illustrated by the extensive use of positive politeness strategies which acted as social accelerators and were not necessarily redressive but reduced the social distance between the TLVs and the addressees. The next is the relative power of the speaker and hearer.

4.3.2.2 Relative Power of the speaker or hearer (P)

On the other hand, power is the degree to which the hearer can impose his own self plans and his own self-evaluation at the expense of the hearers’ plans and self-evaluation. Power may be assessed as being great because the hearer is eloquent and influential, or is a prince, a witch, a thug with a gun or a priest. Power differential is characterized by deference. There are two sides of the coin in the realization of deference; one in which the speaker humbles and debases himself and the other where the speaker raises the hearer and pays him positive face (which satisfies the hearer’s want to be treated as superior). A common
characteristic of showing deference is where the TLVs used words such as *neighbour, somebody and someone* to avoid direct reference to the hearer. They also avoided using the ‘I’ subject and ‘you’ object to indirectly refer to the hearer to show that the TLVs do not want to impinge on the hearer and phrased the FTA as if the agent was at least not the speaker alone, and the addressee were only inclusive of the hearer. This aspect of negative politeness was extensively exploited by the TLVs when they used the inclusive ‘we’. For instance, ‘we pray for you’, ‘we welcome you to this morning service’ this indicates that at least it is not the speaker alone who impinges on the rights of the hearer and that at least it was not the speaker alone who impinges on the rights of the hearer and thus calls for the cooperative assumption and redresses the FTA.

It can therefore be argued that though the TLVs are perceived to be more powerful than the hearers because they play the role of priests, are influential, and eloquent, they chose indirectness as a politeness strategy to minimise imposition by avoiding acts which are intrinsically FTAs. This enables them to reduce the power differential and be able to attain their communicative goals in the most effective and efficient way. The other sociological factor is the ranking of imposition.

4.3.2.3 Ranking of Imposition

Ranking of imposition has to do with whether actors have specific rights or obligations to perform an act or have specific reasons for not performing them and whether actors are actually known to enjoy being imposed on. Ranking therefore is defined by the degree to which acts are considered to interfere with the agent’s wants of self determination or of approval (that is, positive and negative face wants). The ranking of imposition identifiable with negative FTAs is in proportion to the expenditure of services (including provision of
time) and goods (including non-material goods like information as well as the expression of regard and other face payments). The lessening of certain impositions on a given actor is determined by the obligation (legally, religiously, morally, by virtue of employment and so on) to do the act A; and also by the enjoyment that the actor gets out of performing the required act.

On the other hand, the increasing of certain impositions is determined by the reasons why the actor should not do them, and why the actor could not do them. For FTAs against positive face, the ranking involves an assessment of the amount of 'pain' given to the hearer's face based on the discrepancy between the hearer's own desired self-image and that presented in the FTA.

Thus, three observations could be made: as the speaker's power increases, the weightiness of the FTA diminishes; the speaker goes off-record where the imposition is small but the relative speaker-hearer distance and power are great and also where the hearer is an intimate equal of the speaker's but the imposition is very great.

It can therefore be argued that the ranking of imposition between the TLVs and the hearers appears to be small because the TLV shave a religious obligation toward the hearers (TLVs play the role of priests) and the hearers have the obligation to obey the TLVs who act the role of priests. Though the TLVs made requests for information, and ordered the hearers to perform acts such as clapping, saying Amen, and so on, the imposition was again lessened since the hearers seemed to enjoy clapping, shouting Amen, and doing whatever else they were requested to do by the TLVs. The pain inflicted on them was also small because the requests made were for free goods such as clapping hands, shouting Amen and so on.
Though the requests such as paying tithes may be painful, the imposition is lessened by the fact that it is an obligation for the Christians to do so.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) the factors mentioned above are not the only relevant factors in the choice of politeness strategies but they subsume all others (status, authority, occupation, ethnic, identity, friendship, context and others) which have been identified by other scholars. They argue that weightiness of the FTAs provides the speaker with the major reason for choosing the politeness strategy. They go on to say that, for instance, where P and R are constant and have a small value, that is, where the relative power of the speaker and hearer is more or less equal, and the imposition is not great, there are requests for 'free goods' such as telling the time, asking for a match, or giving direction. The TLVs extensively requested for free goods such as 'clapping hands,' 'saying Amen,' 'shouting', and so on. This implies that the relative power and ranking of imposition between the TLVs and the hearers were more or less equal and imposition was not great.

It can therefore be concluded that pay-offs, relative power, social distance and the ranking of imposition just as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) were the major factors that greatly influence the choice of politeness strategies by the Kenyan TLVs. The section below presents a discussion of the findings of the study.

4.3.3 Discussion of findings

It is clear from the findings of this study that the TLVs used a number of both negative and positive face threatening acts (FTAs) but in varying degrees of frequency. The negative FTAs include orders, requests, advice, promises, and reminders while the positive FTAs
are challenges, criticisms and accusations. These threatened the negative and positive faces of the hearers respectively.

However, the TLVs used politeness strategies: negative, positive, on-record, and off-record which minimise the face threats. Negative politeness strategies are oriented towards satisfying the hearer’s negative face where the speakers minimally interfere with the addressee’s face. Negative politeness strategies are the most conventionalised. Examples are conventional indirectness, hedging, apologies and impersonalising the hearer. The speakers mainly mitigate FTAs by using rituals of avoidance.

The positive politeness strategies such as in-group identity markers, generic names, code-switching, ‘we’ inclusive, giving gifts and repetition were recurrent in all the TLVs’ discourse. These show that the TLVs approved the addressees’ personality, thereby minimising FTAs. The use of intimate language gives positive politeness its redressive force.

The TLVs also used Bald-on-record politeness strategies with and without minimisation. Bald-on-record without minimisation was rarely used. This is primarily done in the hearer’s interest and efficiency is important and this is mutually known to the speaker and hearer and FTA redress is not necessary.

On the other hand, Bald-on-record with minimisation was often used by the TLVs especially in the use of imperative sentences where the ‘you’ subject was omitted. Another form of minimisation was where the speakers were commanded to ‘turn’or’tell’ ‘a neighbour’, ‘someone’ or somebody something, thereby displacing the hearer which
reduces the sting of imposition on the hearer. These were quite recurrent in the TLVs’ discourse.

Moreover, the TLVs made use of off-record politeness strategies where indirectness is used and the hearer is invited to search for the intended meaning, thus minimising the imposition. Examples of off-record usage in the TLVs discourse were the use of ambiguity, displacement of the hearer, use of metaphors and rhetorical questions. The speaker violates the Sincerity and Relevance Maxims thereby minimising the threat of the FTA.

The findings of the study also indicate that the factors that influenced the choice of the politeness strategies were those proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987); the pay-offs, the social distance between the speaker and the hearer (D), the ranking of imposition (R) and the power differential (P) which subsume other social factors such as context, social status and so on. The next chapter deals with the summary, conclusion and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the findings from the research, conclusions and recommendations for further research.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The study focused on Politeness and Speech Act theories. The objectives of the study were to examine the face threatening acts, to find out if the Kenyan TLVs employ politeness strategies and to establish the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies.

The researcher randomly sampled CDs with pre-recorded audio-visual Kenyan TLVs' discourse and viewed them on a T.V set. Using both Politeness and Speech Act theories, the researcher identified the FTAs, the politeness strategies and established the factors that influenced the choice of politeness strategies from the data.

5.1.1 Face Threatening Acts

The observations showed that the TLVs frequently used both negative and positive FTAs in their discourse. The FTAs that threaten negative face include: orders which form 28.3%, requests 25.7%, advice 9.63, promises 8.60%, and accusations 1.06%.

On the other hand, the FTAs that threaten the addressee's positive face include: challenges which form 15.5%, criticism 8.02% and accusations 1.06%. Such FTAs are inevitable in social interaction particularly in the context of televangelism where the TLVs' intention is to persuade the hearers to become Christians and contribute money to their organizations.
It is worth noting that topics such as religion have a likelihood of threatening the hearer’s positive face.

5.1.2 Politeness Strategies

The study further revealed that the TLVs used the four types of politeness strategies advanced by Brown and Levinson (1978): positive, negative, bald-on-record and off-record politeness strategies. The TLVs used the politeness strategies to mitigate the face threatening acts thereby creating a friendly atmosphere for social interaction.

The Positive politeness strategies employed by the Kenyan TLVs form 38.8 %. The most recurrent were in-group identity markers, the inclusive ‘we’, giving gifts, code switching and repetition. These are not necessarily redressive of the FTAs but a kind of social accelerator where interlocutors use the language of intimates to show approval of each other’s personality. This is the kernel of positive politeness which stresses solidarity for purposes of smooth social interaction.

Observations made further showed that the TLVs used a number of negative politeness strategies which form 35.5%. These were indirect speech acts, hedging, apologies, and impersonalising the hearer. These are mainly oriented towards satisfying the hearer’s negative face where speakers indicate that they recognise and respect the hearers and will minimally interfere with their freedom of action.

The TLVs used the on-record politeness strategies which form 15.0 %. One way of realising bald-on-record usage is bald-on-record without minimisation whereby they came rapidly to the point and avoided further prolixity and ambiguity. This was rarely used.
However, the TLVs frequently used bald-on-record with minimisation where used imperative sentences and displaced the hearers.

It was further noted that the TLVs used off-record politeness strategies which form 10.8%. They occasionally used ambiguity, metaphors, rhetorical questions and displaced the hearers in order to reduce the face threats.

5.1.3 Factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies

As earlier noted, any model speaker will choose the same politeness strategy as any other given the same circumstances. The factors that influenced the TLVs choice of politeness strategies were the pay-offs, that is the advantages and the sociological factors associated with each of the politeness strategies.

5.1.3.1 The Payoffs

A speaker goes on-record in doing an act if it is clear to the participants what communicative intentions led to doing the particular act. By going on-record, the speakers can get credit for honesty and outspokenness avoiding the danger of being seen as manipulators.

It is clear from the findings that the most recurrent politeness strategies were the positive politeness strategies which include: in-group identity markers, such as 'friend' and the inclusive 'we' to minimise the debt on requests which are numerous in the discourse. For instance, the use of the inclusive 'we' implies that the addressee and the speaker are equal participants or beneficiaries from the requests. This also shows cooperation between the speaker and hearer.
By going on-record with negative politeness, the TLVs paid the hearer deference in return for an FTA. They advanced familiarity by using terms such 'brother', 'sister', 'mum', 'daughter' and 'dad'. This minimised the imposition from any FTAs.

When the TLVs went off-record, it meant that there was more than one attributable intention so that the actor could not be held to have committed himself to just one particular intent. The meaning was therefore negotiable and the TLVs gained credit for being tactful and non-coercive and avoided responsibility for potential face damaging interpretation.

5.1.3.2 Power, Distance and Ranking (P, D and R)

The assessment of the seriousness of the FTA, that is, the calculations participants actually seem to make involve the three factors: Relative power (P), social distance (D) and absolute ranking of imposition (R).

Relative power is the degree to which a speaker or hearer imposes his/her own self plans and evaluation at the expense of others. The Power of the TLVs could be assessed as great because they were influential, eloquent and the fact that they acted as priests. This was evident from the many orders and requests they made by without fear of retaliation.

The distance of the speaker and hearer is assessed by the frequency of interaction between the interactants and the material and non-material goods exchanged between them. The social distance between the speaker and hearer can be assessed as great because the speaker speaks another language, dialect or comes from another valley. The fact that the
TLVs and the hearers shared the same language (English) and a dialect (Swahili) was an indication of reduced social distance. The TLVs occasionally switched codes from English to Swahili to converge and some even switched to local dialects such as kikuyu. The discourse was also characterized by the reciprocal giving and receiving of positive face when the TLVs frequently made requests to the hearers. It should be noted that requests threaten the faces of both the speaker and hearer.

Ranking of imposition has to do with whether the actors enjoy being imposed. When the TLVs made many requests for free goods such as clapping hands, shouting Amen, and telling a neighbour something, the hearers seemed to enjoy doing what they were requested and this was an indication of small ranking of imposition. Since the TLVs and the listeners were very interactive as the TLVs asked questions and the hearers answered, it could be concluded that the relative power of the TLVs and the hearers were more or less equal and therefore ranking of imposition was not great.

5.2 Conclusions from Findings

The following conclusions can be drawn from the findings. The Kenyan TLVs used many FTAs with orders being the most recurrent, followed by requests. This shows that the TLVs threatened the face of the hearers a lot, however, it is evident that the TLVs employed a lot of positive politeness strategies such as use of in-group identity markers, the inclusive ‘we’, code-switching and others which create a cordial environment for interaction. These demonstrated a high level of closeness where the TLVs interacted with the hearers without restraint though the setting is formal. It should be noted that the participation of the hearers in such a religious setting is usually minimal (as earlier noted) but the TLVs engaged the hearers in giving information, in clapping or shouting Amen.
This reduced the social distance between the interlocutors making communication effective.

Furthermore, the TLVs used negative politeness strategies which are the most conventionalised polite forms. By use of negative politeness strategies, the TLVs assured the hearers that they respect their negative face and will minimally interfere with their freedom of action. That is why they used strategies such as conventional indirectness such as use of questions to request information. The TLVs impersonalised the hearer by use of words such as 'neighbour, someone, some, and everyone' to avoid direct reference to the hearer as a sign of respect.

The use of bald-on-record with minimisation was recurrent in the TLVs discourse and they were able to reduce the sting of imposition by implication especially in the use of imperative sentences. This implies that the TLVs are powerful and they do not fear retaliation from the hearers since they play the role of priests.

Finally, employing off-record politeness strategies gave a bow to the hearer's face and minimised the threats of the FTAs. This is done in such a way that it is not possible to attribute only one communicative intention to the act and therefore the speaker provides him/herself with a number of defensible interpretations. By so doing, the TLVs avoided responsibility for doing it and left it to the hearer to interpret it.

It can therefore be concluded that the Kenyan TLVs are tactful, non-coercive and avoided being seen as manipulators. This therefore means that they are polite. It should also be noted that FTAs are inevitable in televangelism since the TLVs' major communicative
goal is to persuade the hearers to convert to Christianity. Persuasion is in itself an FTA and it cannot be avoided in this context. In fact, face threatening acts such as giving advice, promises, challenges and criticism are the means by which the TLVs can attain their communicative goals of persuading the hearers to convert to Christianity and ask them to give money to the TLVs' organisations. However it has emerged from the findings that only one TLV out of the five who asked viewers to give money. The rest concentrated on teaching Christian faith.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from the findings is that the factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies emanate from the pay-offs, the power relations, social distance and the ranking of imposition as postulated by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1983 and 1987). Since this is a study based on pragmatics, the social context is very significant. However, this is implied in the sociological P, D and R values. These subsume all other social factors (context, gender, social status).

It can be concluded that the TLVs were powerful since they performed many orders and requests owing to the fact that they play the role of priests. This exonerates them from being viewed as impolite. Besides, though the TLVs and hearers social distance is great by virtue of their religious role, they minimised this by the frequent use of Swahili language which indicates domestic shared values.

Apart from the above, the ranking of imposition can be said to be small. It emanates from the fact that the actors seem to enjoy being imposed. Though this study does not concern itself mainly with non-verbal cues, it was observed that the hearers were quite enthusiastic as they clapped their hands. It has also emerged from the findings that though the TLV-
listener relationship is formal, there was a lot of interaction between them as the TLVs asked for information and the hearers gave without restraint. The findings therefore reveal that the choice of politeness strategies agrees with Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness that the major sociological factors are social distance (D), power (P) and ranking of imposition (R).

5.3 Recommendations

The recommendations of the study for the Kenyan TLVs and other preachers of Christian faith is that they should be careful how they communicate to their hearers by employing the appropriate politeness strategies since face threats are inevitable in any social interaction. For instance, they have to request them to participate in the speech event, and sometimes order them to perform other FTAs which are inevitable in the continuity of the speech event and attainment of communicative goals (Brown and Levinson 1987).

Television viewers in Kenya should be aware of what it means to be polite or impolite, otherwise the word ‘impolite’ may have been brusque to describe the TLVs. Majority of the TLVs as the findings reveal can actually be said to be linguistically polite as exemplified by the politeness techniques they employed in their discourse.

This study is also useful to the general public who engage in formal or informal communication where FTAs such as giving advice, requesting, persuading and others are inevitable. However, since politeness is a universal method of disarming face threats, every competent member in society needs to acquire these communicative skills in order to communicate effectively and efficiently (Brown and Levinson (1987). The next section presents suggestions for further study.
**5.4 Suggestions for further Research.**

1. The present study specifically focused on the face threatening acts, the politeness strategies by the Kenyan televangelists and the factors that influenced their choice of politeness strategies. There is need for other politeness studies to be carried out on other religious settings such as churches, crusades and other Christian groupings to find out whether there are similarities or differences on the findings on the use of FTAs, politeness strategies and factors that influence the choice of politeness strategies.

2) More politeness studies need to be carried out on other Kenyan languages such as Kiswahili and local languages such as Kimeru, Gikuyu, Dholuo and others to broaden the body of knowledge in sociolinguistics.

3) Further studies on politeness should be carried out on other media such as radio, print and social media.

4) Since the use of TV media is gaining popularity especially with the migration from analogue to digital TV more linguistic studies ought to be carried out on linguistic aspects such as communicative competence, non-verbal communication and code-switching to close the gaps in sociolinguistics.

The current study informs a lot on politeness as a sociolinguistic aspect. It is clear that speakers in formal context need to be tactful in their approach lest they are branded impolite and their communicative goals fail to take off the ground. They need to be equipped with the politeness strategies which facilitate a smooth negotiation with their interlocutors. It has also emerged from the study that televangelists are indeed competent adult members of society who avoid or redress what may appear impolite in the eyes of the general public.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Sermon by TLV1

Topic: Midnight Prayer

TLV1: You will be blessed because you came x2

Something was telling you that you are sick but you will be blessed because you came. \textit{(A song is sang)}

We dedicate our hearts to you.

We pray for those who came.

We welcome everyone to this morning service.

You will be blessed because you came.

It's a joy to be with you. \textit{(Read s Acts 16: 24-25)}

Having received this charge, he put them into the inner prison

And fastened their feet in the stocks but about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing Hymns to God and the prisoners were listening to them. At midnight Paul and Silas were praying, doors opened and chains loosened.

Can I have a Amen for reading the word of God? \textit{(Moves nearer the audience)}.

Are you listening to me? If you need help at midnight, you may get the answer.\textit{('Mteja wanambari hapatikani kwa sasa)}
No person will be awake at midnight to offer help.

Midnight is a very dangerous hour.

New day begins a minute after midnight.

In the middle of the night there's a lot of anguish (long pause).

The beginning of your encounter with God is prayer.

I thought somebody would say, Amen. Everyone say ‘word of knowledge’ x2. Some of them have the Bible but never read it for you.

(Audience laughs)

If you pay the devil money, he will still lie to you.

True or false (Audience repeats) true (Takes another long pause).

How many of you know Balam? (Audience raises hands)

I am talking about midnight prayer.

Your midnight trouble comes because you are with God.

(Tells the story of Daniel)

Daniel had midnight trouble. People planned to trap Daniel.

God will allow midnight trouble to come. You haven’t clapped.

Trouble is coming, Prepare. You better listen.

If you don’t know, it may come through your marriage, business.

People you think are very good to you, they begin to hate you and do all sorts of things.”
Appendix 2

Sermon by TLV2

Topic: Ingredients for Victorious Living

TLV: This is my day, my season.

You know the problems, the challenges you have been facing.

Turn to five people and tell them, “I bless you”

Tell your neighbour, “I have a story to tell”.

I looked bad when I was *parared*

when I came from that place. So you can’t tell me to go back.

Tell somebody “I’m not alone, I’m going places”.

How are yuuni?

Tell someone, “I’m better today than I was last Sunday.

You must be humble.

Walk without fear.

When Christ comes in you, you don’t feel inferior.

Somebody say ‘I’m born again’.

What does that mean?

Ask your neighbour, ‘How are you?’

‘Where do you come from?’

Talk, talk, talk.

Are you ready for the word?

I will never be the same again.
This family operates by faith x2 (uses a rising intonation)

You are blessed in the city, you are blessed in the village.

(This is talking about me). By your stripes, I am healed.

Whatever you touch shall prosper.

Declare it is about me (pointing at self).

Do your business by faith and you are ahead of you competitors.

You see things before they see.

May you know what prosperity; good health is (holding hands)

See what others are not seeing,

Go places where others have not gone.

Somebody declare, “I am not limited”.

Don’t allow sickness, wife or husband,

To have or not have any children, history to limit you

Don’t speak such kind of language.

I’m not limited.

The bible says, “all things are possible with those who believe.”

If you can only believe, business will prosper.

You won’t die but live.

Your spouse will come.

Bad situations will be finished because you are not limited.

Don’t allow form four certificate to limit you.

Are you rising up x2

Your friends may write you off, but you are not finished or finishable.
I prophesy to you that if five businesses have collapsed, that was the last one to collapse.

You are not limited.

We also discover that this family is the household of faith.

We are the household of faith

What do we need to do? *(Raises tone/volume)*

*Tumesoma, mstari watatu unasema,*

One Lord, one faith, one baptism *(in a tone)*

*(Sings in dholuo)*

To each one of us, grace was given.

*(moves to and from the audience to the dais)*

Are you with me?

*Wacha mimi niuze mafuta ya taa*

Unaanza kuuza shirt na hujui kama

Enablement yako niya kuuza shirt.

Each one of us, there’s a gift put in us.

*Wewe umepewa enablement ya kutengeneza*

cake. Baadala ya kuuza vitabu, unauza gari.

You hear kwa T.V. “ukituma, zitapitana”.

*(explains and demonstrates how blessing and money)*

*will by-pass each other)*
Sema Te...eh.

Kuna wakristo havataki kuweka bidii
Wewe ndiye utakaye tambua gift yako ni gani.
Ukijua kama ukiimba ndiyo gift yako
Hakuna ndege itakushinda"
Appendix 3

Sermon by TLV3

Topic: Lameness

TLV3: (In a loud voice)

A story is told of a man who was born lame.

The men brought him in the house of God,

not to worship but to beg.

Sin is not about things you have done.

(People in the audience raise their hands)

I stand to be corrected, I want you to know friends,

When a man is in Christ, he is a new creation.

If you are not in Christ, nothing has changed,

You will steal, cheat.

Tell your neighbour, I told you, (pointing at self)

in Christ everything is new” (gestures)

(Raises hands) I have a testimony that Jesus saves.

(People in the audience clap and others applause)

Tell your neighbour, you are in the right place.

If you are not born again, you are in the right place.

Not to the night club or to the witchdoctor.

In the house of God is gateway to heaven.
Nyumbani kwa Mungu, you are in the house of God
And the house of God is the gateway to heaven.
It is not a lameness that can be taken to hospital but
Can only be taken to the house of God.
Sin is not about things you have done.
was with sin in your mother’s womb.
(African English mangoes) is not in the fruit but in
in the tree.

Mangoness is in the root not the fruit.
When a man is in Christ, he’s become a new creature
Can you say Amen?
I was lame in my father’s womb.
You were lame in your mother’s womb
Listen, there are reasons.

Let me tell you something, I have not
Stolen anyone’s money.
I have not even beaten my mother (pauses)
(repeats)
(Leanin forward).Am I correct?
Excuse me, this is American English
Are you catching hat I am trying to say?
Tell your neighbour x2
When we talk about sin, you were lame from your
Mother's womb (Moves to the audience)

If you are not born again, you are still lame

Let me tell you this.

I thank God you came to this service.

That God will make you a new creature

If you are in Christ, everything has become near.

If you not in Christ, nothing has become new

I was lame from my mother's womb

(pointing at self)

I was blind but now I see (Waves hands in the air)

(audience waves back)

Are you getting what I'm saying?

If you are not born again you are here.

If you are not born again, I'm glad you are here

If you are here today I want you to know the house of God

Is the gate-way to heaven.

Sijui kama mmenielewajameni

This is when Kiswahili becomes sweet). (Moves to audience)

Medicine for lameness is red in colour – the blood of Jesus

David said, "I was born in iniquity (points at chest)

Today I got a song because I met a man (greets someone in the audience)

Tell them you are in the right place.
Who carried you here? (Greets another from audience)

Tell your neighbour, ‘that’s why I am next to you’.

Do you understand friends?

When you are in the house, you are not far from the Kingdom of God

Do you know there are men here who never slept in their houses but they never miss a church meeting?

They come from a brothel but go to church (*points at someone*)

The man who was brought in the house of God – the guy was looking for money.

I am a Pastor, I am not naïve, I’m not stupid.

Can I talk to you? (Gives the story of a woman came to church with a baby but she’s a pickpocket. (*Demonstrates how she holds hands but picks from ladies’ hand bags*).)

Tell them I hope the Pastor is not talking about you

Please check your mobiles.

Some came here to steal (*Rebukes the spirit*).

There are others who came here because the girl

I they are after came to this church,

So they followed her and are looking at her.

I know you are here.
I’m glad you came because you are not far from the Kingdom.

Others are here for business, the person they are after comes to this church.

(Changes accent to speak to the two white people in the front pew)
You come from Canada because you are lame from your mother’s womb.

Some are witches. (speaks Luganda)
I’m glad you came (point at the audience and they applaud)

Are you understanding me friends.

They want to go to India, U.K. for the wrong reasons.

(Sits down and demonstrates how Peter looked at the lame man)
Tell your neighbour, ‘are you a disciple of Jesus Christ?’

Your life must be a testimony of Jesus Christ

Some of you cannot tell your neighbours, ‘look at us’.

Can we help you?

If your neighbour beats his wife, and you do the same, can you tell others look at us?(Raises one hand)

Can you tell your neighbour look at us?

One thing I like about forty years of Deliverance Church is that we can tell others, ‘look at us’.

I’m tired of preachers who start a church and the next day are holding An harambee to buy the pastor a car.
Brother, sister, tell your neighbour, 'your life must be a testimony to others'.

So, you don’t have to be a preacher to buy a Pajero.

There are prostitutes and smugglers driving hammers.
Appendix 4

Sermon by TLV3

Topic: Power of Unity

TLV: If you love God and not ashamed of him,
     put up your hands and clap. (People stand and clap)

Give him another shout (Audience shouts)

Do I speak for you?

We believe in esteeming those who have honoured us.

We esteem you and honour you.

If you are a father and proud to be, lift up your hands.

You may take your sit.

Give tithes and God will receive and you gonna be blessed.

Whatever amount you want to give.

Those watching, we have a Safaricom line. Talking about basics of
giving. Why it is important to give.

We thank God for you.

I would like everybody to redeem a pledge.

Just want to remind you that we have a Pay Bill number on the screen
Our M-Pesa Pay Bill No....... (Gives account Number).

When we receive, God will bless you.

Talk about reasons to give?
If you agree with me, say Amen. (People in the audience say Amen)

We your sons and daughters will support a vision (Raise your offering)

Everybody shout and say amen put your hands together

My Kikuyu tongue is twisted

*(Song)*

Lift up your hands, shout Halleluya

Are you ready for the word of God?

We couldn’t catch it in the word of God

Name Mbogo means money

Oh! Bring it!

I wanna acknowledge the presence of apostle Trend well,

come and say a word of greeting

Visitor: Thank you for this chance (Asante sana to the Pastor)

We love Kenya.

TLV5: Clap for them *(Audience claps)*

And we love America too. *(Laughs)* How do you gonna sit?

Bishop says he loves you *(Audience shouts)*

We love you.

I love you like Bishop

Visitor: I wanna say hello, we love Kenya

How do you just gonna sit?

I gonna preach to you today
I have a word for us.

He loves you so much.

I love you.

I acknowledge sons and daughters

But who raised you?

You know wherever.

Tell your neighbour, 'I don’t like gloomy neighbours”.

If you don’t smile in the house, where will you?

Show your teeth

If you mean to clap do a good job

Come one, talk. (Gestures)

Can I talk to you this morning?

Say Amen.

I want us to just stand

Can we talk today?

Are you hearing this, this morning?

Somebody say ‘unity.’

I wish I had a church in this house.

I’m I talking to somebody?

Talk, somebody.

No amount of legislation can bring unity.

Christ never intended for us

Cut yourself, blood is the same colour
Come on somebody, can you talk, where do you fall (*a delirious laugh*)

Why do we fight unity?

Yai my God!

Are you understanding what Pastor is preaching this morning?

Listen carefully church.

Just remove your masks and say, ‘she’s talking. to me’.

Listen to me church

Where are JCC members? (*laughs*)

Talk baby, talk in Jesus’ name.

Tell your friend, “I don’t talk about people, I talk about events

Do you know you can sit next to somebody in church but you are not one? Let those saying Yahweh, say, ‘Yahweh’. What is unity?

I’m I communicating to someone?

We are sitting together smiling at me but cursing

Tell your neighbor, “you dare not curse me”

Say, “Halleluyah Jesus”

Mega church is brought up by who? (*Jumps up*)

We gonna be united for real.

Tell your neighbors, “I love mum more today”

There’s no limitation to what we can receive.

I’m I talking to somebody?
Someone say ‘unity’.

We have a small Orchestra here but Jesus is Lord

Listen to me and listen carefully

If we can unite (becomes emotional) (shouts)

Have you ever heard orchestra? Talk to me

Listen to me.

Are you getting the word of God honey?

What are the benefits of unity?

I’m glad you are asking me this.
Topic: The Tabernacle

TLV5: I feel anyone who had any pain is healed in Jesus name.

Pastor, hiyo mafuta ulete hapa na bakuli zote. Sit down for a while.

When you read carefully you will notice,

it is your prayers God is waiting for. We have been sacrificed
but we have now come to the holy place. But now,
if you don’t say Amen, you will miss the greatest opportunity.
A powerless Christian is one powerless in prayer.
and can end up disgracing or embarrassing God.
Wacha niseme kwa Kiswahili unielewe,
Are you hearing me somebody? she comes with oil and fills her bow.
(Demonstrates filling a bow).
Some of you, I’ve gone fast you haven’t understood.
(Turns to Kiswahili).
There are two kinds of prayers where you bring prayers
That’s not a prayer. You’ll not reap anything until it becomes
of the spirit’. For that marriage to work, HIV, Cancer etc.
Tell your neighbor, ‘I need divine intervention’.
You must come beyond to the holy place.
Hapa ni kama nitamguza Mungu.
(Moves across the dais)
Let me remind you, you can never obey the ten commandments
In the flesh. Must be walking in the spirit, friends.

(Appendix 5

Sermon by TLV5

Topic: The Tabernacle

TLV5: I feel anyone who had any pain is healed in Jesus name.

Pastor, hiyo mafuta ulete hapa na bakuli zote. Sit down for a while.

When you read carefully you will notice,

it is your prayers God is waiting for. We have been sacrificed
but we have now come to the holy place. But now,
if you don’t say Amen, you will miss the greatest opportunity.
A powerless Christian is one powerless in prayer.
and can end up disgracing or embarrassing God.
Wacha niseme kwa Kiswahili unielewe,
Are you hearing me somebody? she comes with oil and fills her bow.
(Demonstrates filling a bow).
Some of you, I’ve gone fast you haven’t understood.
(Turns to Kiswahili).
There are two kinds of prayers where you bring prayers
That’s not a prayer. You’ll not reap anything until it becomes
of the spirit’. For that marriage to work, HIV, Cancer etc.
Tell your neighbor, ‘I need divine intervention’.
You must come beyond to the holy place.
Hapa ni kama nitamguza Mungu.
(Moves across the dais)
Let me remind you, you can never obey the ten commandments
In the flesh. Must be walking in the spirit, friends.)
I have several salaries. Three are the main ones.

One as minister from gava, one from the church and another for parliamentary work as MP.

That money is not small, but when it comes to tithe,

I tell the lady in charge priority number one:

I have seen people tithing when it is two digits, three;
when it comes to four, eight, ten, they are totally off.

Pay money for tithe in full.

When I was going for parliamentary contest,

I told God, "I am a tither, he is not, I am a worshipper, he is not.

So God has to make a choice between the righteous and wicked.

On September last year, God drew a clear line.

Never mind that my opponent had called a conference
that the glory had departed. I told God, 'you will know where the glory is, 10% of all income belongs to God.

If you withhold the little, he will hold the much he has.

If you are broke, follow me today

Oh! I want to repeat you cannot stand before god and still say, 'I'm suffering', I don’t preach somebody else life, I preach mine.

(Gives a story about her church, how it had gone under).

Friends, I wend and prayed. Let me tell you a story, friends.

My driver took me to a friend. This doctor friend had a mind
That was snapping. When I got there, the doctor asked me,

"Are you ok or not?"
He introduced me and said, ‘this is my Pastor’
I'm very proud of her because she is doing great things for God
Give her all the money she wants, documentation later.
I was asked how much I needed. I got a bankers cheque.
Believe you me, it took God to deliver me that day.
Prayers for the holies are not for the lazy Christians.

Let me tell you, I came out of the world and demons harassed me.
I would go to the house and lights go off.
Tables begin to shake; I was in a church that believes
In deliverance but they have never come out.
Nobody can pray for you but yourself.
Food is all over the table and we are ready to eat
and the table begins to dance.
They said, “My sister, God blesses you”.
They left and didn’t eat.