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ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

D - Distance
EPL - English Premier League
FIFA - Fédération Internationale de Football Association (International Federation of Association Football)
FTA - Face threatening act
H - Hearer
KANU - Kenya African National Union (The name of a political party in Kenya)
MP - Member of Parliament
ODM - Orange Democratic Movement (The name of a political party in Kenya)
P - Power
Rx - Rating of imposition
S - Speaker
TV - Television
Wx - Seriousness (weightiness) of FTA
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Ethnic community: cultural grouping which is associated with a sense of linguistic distinctiveness, region of origin, food and folklore

Local language: any of the indigenous languages used in Kenya

Politeness: A culturally defined practical application of good manners or etiquette in speech.

Sex: Biological and physiological characteristics that define men and women.

Social network: A social structure made up of individuals (or organizations) connected by one or more specific types of interdependency, such as friendship, kinship, common interest, financial exchange, dislike, sexual relationships, or relationships of beliefs, knowledge or prestige.

Social places: any place where men meet for social events and pastime activities.

Speech community: a group of people who share a set of norms and expectations regarding the use of language.

Vernacular: The least self-conscious style of speech used by people in relaxed conversations with friends, peers and family members.
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ABSTRACT

Over the last few decades, face and politeness have been among the most heavily debated notions in pragmatic and sociolinguistic research (Vilkki 2006). Researchers have also focused on politeness and its relationship to gender. From such studies, it has been argued that men always dominate the mixed conversations they are involved in and rarely observe rules of politeness. However, such studies focused majorly on differences between men’s language and women’s language giving statistical tendencies of both genders. This study focused on men’s use of language in social places where they are not constrained by the rules of formality, status, and profession. The research purposively sampled male football viewers in social places that show live broadcasts of football matches from the English premier league. Through audio recording and participant observation, the researcher used the social network approach (Milroy 1987) to collect recorded data of conversations among male football viewers in social places in Eldama Ravine town, Kenya. The data analysed proves that men’s language in casual conversations has a pattern. The analysis shows that not all the men dominate and interrupt the conversations they are involved in. By use of the politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1987) the study provides a quantitative analysis of the politeness strategies used in the conversations which shows that men use more of positive politeness strategies than negative politeness strategies. The study also gives a detailed qualitative analysis of the conversations to make conclusions on how men exploit linguistic structures to create, maintain and manage particular identities and stances. The qualitative analysis shows that men’s choice of language in these conversations is motivated by the nature and purpose of the conversation, the context, the network strength and the desire to maintain their masculinity. The research, therefore, provides further insight into the way men use language in social contexts. It is therefore an application of Brown and Levinson’s Politeness theory to men’s conversations in social places.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the Study

Interest in studies on the relationship between language and gender increased considerably in the last decades of the 20th century (Creedon, 1993; Coates, 1986, 1998). This was especially fueled by the spread of the feminist movement to address gender related issues such as sexism and gender stereotypes. Consequently, research in language and gender has tended to follow the general development of feminist thought moving from the essentialist paradigm where speakers were categorized in terms of their biological sex through a period where the significance of the cultural concept of gender was recognized, together with its social psychological dimensions to a more dynamic social construction approach (Holmes, 1997).

Despite the fact that a lot of research has been done on the relationship between language and gender, there is still need for further research in different contexts and using different approaches to gain further insight on the topic. According to Paulston and Tucker (2003), gender is a social construction influenced by socio-historical criteria and cultural conditioning and will vary from culture to culture, and from community to community. This justifies the need for further research in different contexts to verify the findings from contexts that have been previously studied. It should also be noted that much of early linguistic research on language and gender was done in monolingual western settings and mainly looked at phonological and grammatical variation (Labov, 1966; Shuy et al, 1968; Wolfram, 1969; Trudgill, 1974; Macaulay, 1977; Milroy, 1980; Cheshire, 1982). There is, therefore, need for further studies in multilingual societies focusing on other levels of linguistic analysis like semantics, pragmatics, discourse forms and patterns and speech acts.
Research on language and gender has highlighted differences in language used by men and women (Labov, 1966; Shuy and Wolfram, 1969; Macaulay, 1977; Milroy, 1980; Horvath, 1985; Imam, 1997; Njoroge, 2006). These researches have one finding which is most consistent: that women speakers of a given language produce, on average, linguistic forms which more closely approach those of the standard form or have higher prestige features than those produced by men and that they use fewer nonstandard forms than men speakers do (Labov 1966, 1972; Trudgill, 1974; Chambers and Trudgill, 1980). The studies have found that both women and men use prestige forms but that all other things being equal, women tend to use more of the prestige forms than men do. This finding was earlier explained by linguists to be caused by women being more socially insecure and status conscious than men (Lakoff, 1975; Trudgill, 1974).

Recent studies have disputed some of the explanations for findings of earlier linguists in the study of gender differentiation in language (Paulston and Tucker, 2003:200). For example, Trudgill’s (1974) claim of women’s ‘status consciousness’ has been the subject of much criticism because of absence of convincing independent evidence that women are more status conscious than men. Swann (2000) points out that such studies only represent statistical tendencies and that correlational data does not imply causality. In the light of such findings and debates, there is need for further research that will go beyond correlational data to investigate the reasons and motivations for differences in the use of language by men and women.

Two approaches, dominance and difference (Cameron, 1992), have been used to give explanations as to why society may accentuate or de-emphasize distinctions between the sexes and how language is used to mark out the distinction. The difference approach holds that men and women have different conversational norms as a result
of interacting in single sex peer groups as children. Different socialization patterns cause boys to be concerned with status and self-assertion while girls are more geared to involvement and understanding (Coulmas, 2005). The resulting conversational styles of males and females have been described as Competitive and Cooperative respectively (Eckert, 1989; Tannen, 1991). On the other hand, the dominance approach focuses on power and inequality and holds that sex specific variation in language behavior expresses and re-enforces power differentials (Zimmerman and West, 1975). There is therefore need to find out from further research if this claim that men are socialized to be concerned with status and self-assertion holds true for men in other contexts.

Although the initial focus of language and gender as an area of research was on generalized gender differences, more recent studies have acknowledged and began to explore diversity among men and among women and also on the way language is used in different contexts (Leap, 1996; Cameron, 1988; Sunderland, 1995; West and Zimmerman, 2002; Sturtz-Sreetharan, 2006; Ford, 2008). For example, Urchida (1992:547) in *When Difference is Dominance*, a critique of the anti-power based cultural approach to sex differences writes:

"The dichotomization of 'power' and 'culture' as two separate independent concepts is inappropriate, because social interaction always occurs in the context of a patriarchal society. As a direction for future research I propose that the relationship between gender and language should be approached from the viewpoint that we are doing gender in interaction."

This argument is valid because language does not take place in a vacuum, it is used for interaction purposes and therefore gender identities can be brought out well within interaction. This is why further studies should focus on language in interaction and not simply on gender differences in spoken language.
Furthermore, Mesthrie et al. (2000:224) in a review of studies by Nichols (1979) and Milroy (1980), conclude that the authors’ methods and findings suggest that in order to understand gender differences in language, it is important to look at men’s and women’s lifestyles, whom they interact with, and what might motivate them to adopt certain varieties. Therefore, it will not be plausible to use the findings of one speech community and generalize them to other speech communities as the language of the members of the speech community will vary with their lifestyles. This calls for further research in different speech communities not only to explain the differences that may occur between women and men but also the way different groups of men and of women use language in different contexts. As Mesthrie et al (2000) put it; language is being linked to some social interaction practice, which is, in turn, related to gender.

Research has also found that sometimes women and men use different linguistic variables to express integration into the local community. For example, Milroy (1980), Eckert (1989) and Horvath (1985) found that the vernacular was used as a sign of both integration into the community and masculinity. This study investigates if the forms men use help them integrate into groups they want to identify with and distance them from groups they do not want to identify with.

Empirical studies in gender and talk have documented several specific features of conversational style that are said to differentiate between female and male speakers. These can be summarized in the following quotation from Janet Holmes, a New Zealand linguist:

"... Women and men talk differently. Research in Britain, America, and New Zealand reveals similar gender based patterns of discourse. Women appear cooperative, facilitative participants demonstrating in a variety of ways their concern for their conversational partners, while men tend to dominate the talking time, interrupt more often than women, and focus on the content of the interaction and the task at hand, at the expense of the attention to addressees." (Holmes 1995:156)
This conclusion that men are competitive and women cooperative in their talk has also been made by other linguists like Coates (1993); Graddol & Swann (1989) and Holmes (1995). The present research, therefore, attempted to find out what principles governed men’s conversations and how they were able to establish social relationships with one another despite their talk which focused on “the content of the interaction and the task at hand at the expense of the addressee”. Furthermore, the research sought to find out if the dominance perspective could hold true in exclusively men’s conversations in a multi lingual African setting.

As seen above, much of language and gender literature discusses the differential use of language by men and women. It is, therefore, necessary for research to provide a deeper understanding into how men, and in extension women, exploit linguistic structures such as politeness, at everyday local level to create, maintain and manage particular identities and stances. This study took the challenge of Paulston & Tucker (2003: 201) that “the next decade promises to be very exciting in this line of research with new conceptualizations and new questions” and looked at gender as an enactment, a discursive construction and product of social interaction (Stokoe, 2005) by focusing on men’s use of language to interact with one another.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

StutrzStreetharan (2006:70) argues that men’s linguistic practices are generally considered to be less polite in degree and kind than women’s linguistic practices. Just how frequently and in what kinds of contexts men’s practices are less polite than women’s remain unexplored (StutrzStreetharan 2006). There is, therefore, need to investigate the language of single sex conversations in an attempt to find out how men use language while interacting with one another. This study, therefore sought to
collect spoken data from respondents watching football matches in social places in Baringo County with a view of establishing men’s linguistic behaviour patterns. In addition, attempts were made to determine the factors motivating men’s choice of language and to evaluate these choices against the backdrop of politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1987).

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1) To establish the emerging patterns in men’s linguistic behaviour in casual conversations in social places.

2) To find out how the emerging patterns in men’s conversations compare or contrast with the tenets of the Politeness Theory.

3) To determine the reasons and motivations for men’s choice of language patterns in their conversations.

1.4 Research Questions

This study was guided by the following questions:

i. What are the emerging patterns in men’s linguistic behaviour in casual conversations in social places?

ii. How do the emerging patterns in men’s conversations in social places compare or contrast with the tenets of the politeness theory?

iii. What are the reasons and motivations for the choice of language by men among themselves in social places?

1.5 Research Assumptions

This research proceeded on the following assumptions:
1) Men’s language of discourse in casual conversations in social places has a pattern.

2) Men always flout rules of politeness in conversations among themselves in social places.

3) When in social places men exploit linguistic structures such as politeness to create, maintain, and manage particular identities and/or stances.

1.6 Rationale
This study looks at language in interaction and shows how men manipulate language in their interaction with one another in casual conversations in social places. Many studies in language and gender have focused on monolingual western settings and on comparing women’s and men’s speaking styles (see literature review section). These studies have focused on the differences in language use between men and women and how these differences are used to define their gender perspectives. The findings of such studies have to a large extent applied to western industrialized countries in which one language is dominant. There are not many studies on language and gender in countries in which the majority of the people are multilingual or countries with large rural populations (Mesthrie et al, 2003:143). This study, therefore, focuses on a multilingual Kenyan town where Kiswahili, Kukuyu, Kalenjin, Luo, Luhya, Kisii, and Nubian languages among others are spoken to gain further understanding of language as used by men in casual conversations. To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, this is an area that has not been focused on in language and gender studies. The research is, therefore, intended to fill the gap in knowledge on men’s language of discourse in social places.
Because language and gender research has concentrated on phonological variation, the use of quantitative methods of data analysis has been emphasized and used in these studies. Swann, (2000:223) says “such studies only represent statistical tendencies, correlational data do not imply causality . . .” This study combines both quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze the findings from the field of study. This is necessitated by the fact that the research goes beyond quantitative differences and looks at discourse organization and interpretation by looking at language in interaction and shows the fluidity of the meanings of utterances in different contexts. In this way the study widens the scope and methods to be used in language and gender studies.

Moreover, by incorporating the Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson 1978; 1988), the study identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the language of interaction used by men and by so doing, suggests ways of improving interactive talk among them. It also seeks to redress the gender inequality in language as exhibited in the language used by men. In this way the study has the practical implication of improving the image of women in men’s conversations and men’s reputation in their own conversations.

1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study
This study falls under discourse analysis and looks at language use in an urban setting. It focuses on language used by men watching football in social places in Eldama Ravine town which is situated in the central part of the Rift Valley region of Kenya. The town is chosen because of its uniqueness in terms of a wide range of ethnic groups that reside in it. It has also been a political hot spot in recent political events in Kenya. Both the diversity of ethnic groups and the effect of recent political events in Kenya have had an impact on social relationships in the town and
consequently on the linguistic behaviour of the residents. The town, therefore, provides a rich source of data for linguistic analysis.

The study focuses on pubs, restaurants, hotels, video-show rooms/halls, eating places and other social places that show live broadcasts of football matches in the town to provide adequate data for analysis. Although some of the social places in the town may also have female viewers and waitresses, the study only concentrates on men's linguistic behaviour with one another and the network ties that exist among them. The study looks at the language they use before, during and after viewing the football matches in the social places. The study concentrates on identifying the linguistic forms used, quantitatively analyzing them, explaining them and giving a detailed discussion of their patterns and relevance.

Although the context is multilingual, the study does not focus on the use of a specific language. Instead it studies all the languages used in the conversations and translates them to English for analysis. In cases where speakers use local languages, the researcher relied on research assistants who speak these languages as their first language to provide native speaker intuition and interpretation of the speech. In this way there is a possibility of wrong interpretation because of a native speaker's personal limitations on competence in the native language. Grammatical errors and pronunciation differences are not put into consideration in the study as the study only looks at the communicative aspect of language, discourse structure and meaning. The study seeks to describe the organization of discourse patterns, the choice of words and expressions and the application of the tenets of the Politeness theory.
In most social places the television was very loud and the viewers also made a lot of noise. This is a limitation to the clarity of the recording of the conversations. In such instances, the researcher relied on parts of the recorded data that were audible and could be analysed.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I review the available literature that is relevant to the present study. The chapter begins with a review of literature on Variation in language, then narrows it to gender and lastly gives a review of work done in gender and politeness. Secondly, the chapter gives an overview of the Variationist theory of linguistics and the Politeness Theory both of which form a basis for this study.

2.1 Review of Related Literature

The links between gender and language have provided a research agenda for over three decades. Language and gender is a massive field that has been characterized by interdisciplinarity, with valuable contributions from anthropology, various forms of discourse analysis, education, literary theory, media studies, social psychology, sociology, women’s studies as well as sociolinguistics. This review will concentrate on some of the studies on language and gender that form the basis for this study and show how they have informed this study in its objectives, conceptual framework and methodology.

2.1.1. Early Research on Language and Gender

The field is best thought of as having began as part of the much larger women’s movement that fought against the ever present inequality between the sexes (Paulston and Tucker, 2003). In 1973, Robin Lakoff, a feminist linguist, published “Language and a Woman’s Place”, the first article in a major journal devoted entirely to a discussion of women’s language. She claimed that there exists a distinct ‘women’s language’ (which she defines as a collection of speech styles that girls are socialized
into using) which reveals their relative powerlessness and lack of authority in a male-dominated society. Although most of her claims were later found not to be valid empirically, she is the author who is credited with establishing Language and Gender as a topic for research (Stokoe, 2005:118).

Work carried out in the 1970s to the 1980s generally considered the ‘classic’ studies of ‘difference’, ‘dominance’ and ‘deficit’. They focused on answering the question “Do women and men talk differently?” This was done by attempting to identify speech styles and correlate them with gender variables (Shuy, 1970; Trudgill, 1974, 1983; Macaulay, 1978; Gal, 1978, 1979; Nichols, 1979; Milroy, 1980; Gumperz, 1982; Cheshire, 1982; Cameron et al, 1988). The most strikingly consistent finding from these studies is that women tend, on average, to use more prestigious variants than men speakers and are more sensitive than men speakers to overt sociolinguistic values such as politeness. Moreover, Trudgill (1974) found that even when women use extreme forms of an advancing sociolinguistic variable in the casual speech, they correct more sharply than men in formal contexts do. This he explained by claiming that women are more socially insecure and more status conscious than men and so more aware of the social significance of language; and secondly, that working class speech has connotations of masculinity (and associated qualities such as ‘toughness’) which make it more appealing to men.

As much as it has been agreed upon by researchers that there exists a pattern of gender differentiation in the speech, Trudgill’s (1974) claim about women’s status consciousness has been the subject of some criticism because of the absence of convincingly independent evidence (Swann 2000:23). Scholars have pointed out that earlier studies only represent statistical tendencies and do not give much explanation
for the gender differences. Terms such as “women’s language” and “men’s language” imply homogeneity among men and women; however, more recent researchers have emphasized diversity between women and between men as social groups (Mesthrie et al, 2000). This diversity within groups of men is what the study set out to investigate.

Milroy’s (1980) Belfast study focused on how close-knit social networks could act to maintain vernacular varieties and found gender differences in the expected directions with men, overall using more vernacular forms of language than women. She argued that differences in social networks could help explain differences in women’s and men’s language. She also found that sometimes women and men use different linguistic variables to express integration into the local community. The vernacular pronunciation was a sign both of integration into the community and of masculinity. This was also the finding of Eckert’s (1989) study of Jocks and Burnouts in a high school in Detroit and Horvath’s (1985) study in Sydney.

During the 1990s, research began to examine the social production of gendered identities and ideologies (Fasold, 1990; Cheshire, 1991; Urchida, 1992; Cameron, 1992; Coates, 1993; Burton, Dyson and Arden, 1994; Mbilinyi, 1994; Finlayson, 1995; Holmes, 1995; Okamoto, 1995; Sunderland, 1995; Freeman and McElhiney, 1996; Leap, 1996; Gordon, 1997; Wango, 1998). Earlier work was criticized for treating ‘gender’ as a property of individuals and/or an unproblematic variable that could be correlated with assorted language behaviours. Research began to focus on women’s and men’s lifestyles and interaction patterns. Fasold (1990) suggests that women use a higher proportion of standard variants than men because this allows them to sound less local and to have a voice, therefore, with which to protest against the traditional norms that place them in an inferior social position to men. His views
are supported by Gordon (1997) who argues that middle class women may avoid using non-standard forms in order to avoid being associated with stereotypic association between local accents, non-standard syntax and promiscuity.

James (1996:119), however, argues that the fact that women appear to be universally granted less power than men will not cause all women and all men to act alike, given all other factors involved. She says local economic conditions, the employment and educational opportunities available to each sex, social conditions affecting network strengths, the amount of status and respect accorded women and men in particular communities and the extent to which they can participate in public life are just some of the factors that may account for the choices that women and men make in the speech forms they use. These social factors form an important part of the analysis of data in the present study.

Empirical evidence has associated working class speech with masculinity and middle class speech with femininity. For example, Edwards (1972) asked listeners to evaluate the speech of children and found that working class girls were sometimes misidentified as boys and middle class boys as girls, and also that middle class voices were perceived as higher, smoother and more feminine and working class voices as low, rougher and more masculine. The masculinity and femininity aspect in language has therefore been associated with the lifestyle of the social class members (Cameron, 1992; Coates, 1993; and Graddol and Swann, 1989).

2.1.2. Recent Research on Language and Gender

Recent work on Language and Gender has adopted performative notions of gender as an enactment, discursive construction or product or social interaction (Swann, 2000; Eckert and McConnel-Ginet, 2002; West and Zimmerman, 2002; Holmes and
Meyerhoff, 2003; Tannen, 2003; Chambers, 2004; Stokoe, 2004, 2005; SturtzSreetharan, 2006; Tagliamonte, 2006; Baker, 2008; Reid et al, 2009). They all promote discourse rather than cognition and minds as the proper site for the study of language variation and gender. This has moved research away from experiments, surveys and statistical analyses to qualitative study of talk and text (Stokoe 2005). This study therefore attempts to follow the same line of research to qualitatively analyse language in context.

In addition, Holmes and Meyerhoff (2003:9) reject ‘essentialist’ understandings of gender in favour of ‘constructionist’ ones noting that most recent studies have shifted their focus from gender differences to the way a gendered dimension to interaction emerges rather than being assumed at the outset. This is in line with what Urchida (1992) proposes that the relationship between language and gender be approached from the viewpoint of doing gender in interaction.

Cheshire (2002:438), drawing on Keisling’s (1998) study of individual fraternity men’s use of ‘-ing’ variants while speaking at a meeting, says, “investigating how individuals express or construct their gender identities in specific interactions in particular social contexts is a way of going beyond a simple binary classification; it makes it possible to integrate qualitative and quantitative approaches in a single analysis”. She adds that people construct different identities through their discourse therefore when a sex difference in the use of a specific form is identified: it can point to further ways in which speakers construct gendered identity in discourse.

Eckert and McConnel-Ginet (2002) focus on this shift from searching for correlations between linguistic units and social categories of speakers to analysis of the gendered significance of ongoing discourse. They stress working through a gendered identity in
discourse, rather than assuming that people simply possess their gendered identity. Instead of analyzing language use of individuals or groups of individuals they show the importance of analyzing the elements beyond the individual, which are rooted in social practice, which are gendered and with which individuals negotiate the parameters of their own linguistic practice. They analyze the way gender informs the choices which individuals make about the variety they use within a particular environment. This form of analysis and theoretical approach is bound to lead to a much more productive research in language and gender (Mills 2003) and therefore the present study adopts it.

Recent ‘post modernist’ models of language tend to see the functions or meanings of any utterance as highly fluid and context-dependent. Meanings are not simply ‘in the language’ but are negotiated between speakers. In this way utterances are multifunctional and often ambiguous because of the affective or interpersonal aspects of language (Mesthrie et al 2000:238). It is this fluidity of the meaning of utterances depending on their context that this study focuses on to understands the principles that govern men’s conversations in social places. By looking at the social factors that affect language use, the way language is used in specific interactions in particular contexts and the construction of identities in ongoing discourse, the present study tries to be much more productive than studies that have focused on the language per se.

2.1.3. Gender and Politeness

Research in language and gender has identified politeness as one of the salient variables in gender differentiation in language. Ayodabo (2007) argues that politeness is a pervasive phenomenon in all communities, and its meaning is elusive due to the different definitions available in literature. To begin with, Lakoff, who is considered
the mother of modern politeness theory (Eelen, 2001:2), defines politeness as 'a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential conflict and confrontation inherent in human interchange (Lakoff, 1990: 34).

Despite giving this definition of politeness, she gives greater treatment to the hearer's part in her consideration of politeness. Other definitions of politeness have also been centred on the hearer (See Fraser, 1975; Ferguson, 1976; Holmes, 1995; Grundy, 2000). It seems then that politeness is substantiated by the concerns and needs of the addressee which are to be taken into consideration by the speaker. Lakoff (1975:53) typifies certain behaviours as markers of politeness, adding that some forms are linguistic and some are purely non-linguistic. In her opinion, three rules of politeness suffice: Formality, through keeping aloof; Deference, by giving options (hesitations, hedges, euphemisms and lack of assertiveness); and Camaraderie, by showing sympathy. She further develops her view of politeness by positing that linguistic politeness is concerned with verbal communication while non linguistic politeness is concerned with other aspects of communication such as body language or a variety of both (Lakoff,2004:2).

Brown and Levinson (1978) recognize two types of politeness: positive politeness and negative politeness. Positive politeness is used to satisfy the speaker’s need for approval and belonging, while negative politeness has the minimizing of the imposition of a face threatening act as its main goal. The significance of their work in politeness theory is paramount. Eelen (2001) has argued that, “the names Brown and Levinson have become almost synonymous with the word ‘politeness’ itself” and Mills (2003:57) states that ‘their model of politeness has influenced almost all the theoretical and analytical work in this field’. This is echoed in their own words that their model pioneers a new way of looking at politeness, arguing ‘for a shift in
emphasis from the current preoccupation with speaker identity, to focus on dyadic patterns of verbal interaction as the expression of social relationships' (Brown and Levinson, 1987:2). (For a further discussion of Brown and Levinson’s theory, see the theoretical framework section of this study).

Brown (1980), in her research in Tenejapa, drew on the Politeness Theory she developed with Levinson and found that the women of the Tenejapan community used extremes of positive and negative politeness, while men spoke more matter-of-factly. She also found characteristic masculine styles like ‘sexy joking’ and preaching or declaiming style. She relates these findings to the social positions of women and men in the Tenejapan society – women’s powerlessness, their vulnerability in relation to men and their need to protect their reputations.

Adegbija (1989:58) in a study of politeness phenomena in Nigeria describes politeness as ‘a property associated with a communicative situation by virtue of which a person speaks or behaves in a way that is socially and culturally acceptable and pleasant to the hearer’. The study reveals that utterances are interpretable as polite or impolite, within the framework of a particular pragmatic context or situation. The study also shows that politeness phenomena, in the language system studied, constitute a complex microcosm of the spirit of the socio-cultural milieu that produced them.

Finlayson (1995) discusses the practice of Hlonipha, women’s language of respect in South African languages using the politeness theory (Mesthrie et al, 2003). Hlonipha refers to avoidance by married women of any syllables that occur in the names of their in-laws by deleting consonants, replacing a word by another or use of a paraphrase or borrowing from Afrikaans. This ensures someone who is a relative
stranger in the household and who also enjoys low status does not draw attention to herself by uttering someone’s name. She also associates the practice with women’s relative powerlessness in traditional societies. It reflects women’s inferior social status but it also upholds traditional status differentials.

In the same vein, Okamoto (1995) found differentiation in several features of Japanese phonology, morphology and lexis. The overall impression of his study is that women are relatively more polite, gentle, soft-spoken, non-assertive and empathetic than men. This, according to him, reflects the different roles and statuses of women and men.

Most recently, SturtszSreetharan (2006) examines the Japanese men’s use of clause final politeness in casual conversations as marked by the presence or absence of the verb ending ~masu [+ politeness]. The data provides a deeper understanding into how men exploit linguistic structures such as politeness, at the everyday local level, to create, maintain and manage particular identities and/stances. She found that young people use clause final politeness the least followed by retirees while middle-aged-salary men exhibit the highest frequency of clause final politeness. She concludes that men’s linguistic practices are not static across age groups: men exhibit great variation across topics and across interlocutors. Older people exhibit more polite forms because they spend the most time in their respective communities of practice (Eckert and McConnel-Ginnet, 1992; SturtzSreetharan, 2001) or by their social networks (Milroy, 1987) while young men spend most of their time with other students where they have freedom to act and to speak more or less as their social network demands.
Although the area of linguistic politeness has grown considerably since the works of Lakoff in the 1970s and those of Brown and Levinson in the 1980s, questions still remain, largely in the area of politeness and gender (Gibson, 2009). Later works in politeness call for a shift of attention from politeness to both politeness and impoliteness. This stems from the opinion by many scholars that impoliteness is a necessary attack on the ‘face’ of the interlocutor(s) and that ‘certain impolite’ speech acts, such as reproaching, threatening and insulting are performed by speakers with the intrinsic purpose of attacking or undermining the hearer’s face (Haverkate, 1988:394).

Beebe (1995:154) suggests that rather than seeing impoliteness as a reflection of ‘pragmatic competence’, it should be seen as achieving certain aims in a conversation, firstly to get power, and secondly, to give vent to negative feelings. Kienpointner (1997: 267) adds that in motivated impoliteness, the speaker is assumed to have intended to be rude, whereas unmotivated impoliteness is a result of insufficient knowledge of some kind. He further suggests that we should try to consider linguistic behaviour along a continuum, as a matter of degree rather than absolutes. Eelen (2001) has also argued for the shift towards investigating the evaluation of utterances as either polite or impolite in the context in which they occur. This is why the present study identifies a social context as an important factor in studying politeness in men’s language.

The difference approach to gender as propounded in Variationist research has also received much criticism in recent research on Gender and politeness. Tannen’s(1991) categorical observations about the different speech styles of men and women and Holmes’(1995) sweeping generalization that women are more polite than men have
received a lot of criticism. Mills (2003:215) dedicates a large portion of her *Gender and Politeness* to the argument that Holmes' assertion 'is in fact based on a stereotypical view of women's language'. She argues that Holmes has formed generalizations from a small sample of women and criticizes 'the problematic tension between the specificity of her interpretation of her data and her wish to make generalizations from those data' (2003:215). Instead, Mills proposes that gender, and everything that goes with it, is merely a performance. She argues that certain practices that are considered to be polite are in fact stereotypically gendered (2003:202), and not necessarily based on the truth. The present study examines some of these utterances among men to find out how polite they are.

Locher and Watts (2005) also re-think the politeness model choosing to use the term 'relational work' when discussing politeness. In their critique of Brown and Levinson's model, they say that 'human beings do not restrict themselves to forms of co-operative communication in which face-threatening is mitigated' (2005:10). They argue that the strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson should be looked at as possible realizations of 'relational work' and that all forms of verbal interaction should be looked at in their own right rather than by use of an objective, solid model.

In conclusion, Burt (2005:235) posits that pragmatics needs to be sensitive to the differences in world view, and the differences that will result in an individual speaker's estimation of cultural contexts, of social distance, power and other relationships. According to Ayodabo (2007) it is only then that pragmatics and politeness studies can be sensitive to situations of language context and language shift. The context determines both what one can say and what one cannot say: only the pragmatics of the situation can give full meaning to one's words (Meyerhoff
This is why the present study adopts a qualitative approach as it allows us to look at people's world view and how the cultural and social context affects the meaning of utterances. This offers a better way of interpreting the level of politeness in utterances.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The background to the study, the analysis of data, together with description and explanation of the emerging patterns were based on two theories: Variation Theory and Politeness theory. The two theoretical bases of the study are discussed below.

2.2.1. Variationist Theory of Linguistics

The Variationist Theory of linguistics was propounded by Labov (1972) and developed and used by other linguists such as Trudgill (1974), Chambers and Trudgill (1980, 1991), Milroy (1992), Milroy and Gordon (2003), Chambers et al (2004) and Tagliamonte (2006). The Variationist paradigm is essentially and foremost the study of the interplay between variation, social meaning and the evolution and development of the linguistic system itself (Tagliamonte 2006:5) and depends on three facts about language.

The first fact is that language has orderly heterogeneity. This is the observation that language varies and so speakers have more than one way of saying the same thing. It encompasses choices between languages, different constructions, different morphological affixes, and goes down to differences in pronunciation of individual vowels and consonants. Heterogeneity is not random, but patterned to reflect structure and order within the grammar. In the words of Paulston and Tucker (2003), "Variationist linguistics seeks to correlate a linguistic variable with externally
preselected social variables, like age, gender, race or ethnicity, social class and networks in order to identify and describe structural heterogeneity in language”.

Secondly, language changes perpetually. Variationist linguistics recognizes the fact that language is always in a flux and aims to characterize the nature of this complex system.

Thirdly, language conveys more than simply the meaning of its words. In fact language communicates abundant nonlinguistic information. Language is seen to serve a critical purpose for its users that is just as important as the obvious one of transmitting information. Language is also used to make statements by a speaker about who he or she is, what his group loyalties are, how he or she perceives his or her relationship with hearers, and what sort of speech event he considers himself to be engaged in. This can only be done because language varies and a speaker can make choices among alternative linguistic means to communicate the same information. In this way language gives a speaker a social identity.

Variationist linguistics also rests its method and analysis on a number of key concepts namely the vernacular, speech community, the form/function asymmetry and linguistic variables. The vernacular refers to ‘the style in which minimum attention is given to the monitoring of speech’ (Labov 1972c), ‘every day speech’ (Sankoff, 1974, 1980:54), ‘real language in use’ (Milroy 1992:66) or ‘spontaneous speech reserved for intimate or casual situations’ (Poplack, 1993:252). In order to tap ‘the vernacular’ in Variationist analysis the analyst should immerse himself or herself in the speech community, entering both as an observer and a participant so as to record language use in its socio-cultural setting (Labov et al., 1968, Trudgill, 1974, Milroy 1987, Poplack, 1993). The form/function asymmetry rests on the fundamental view in
variationist analysis that there is a possibility of multiple forms being used for the same function and a single form for different functions (Sankoff, 1988b, Poplack, 1993, Mesthrie et al., 2000). Finally, the Variationist paradigm recognizes and uses in its analysis the different ways of saying more or less the same thing which may occur at every level of grammar in a language, in every variety of a language, in every style, dialect and register of language, in every speaker, often in the same sentence in the same discourse and call this the linguistic variable.

The Variationist theory is important for the study as it addresses language in use and specifically explains why there are variations in language (Njoroge, 2006:65). Gender being a social variable in variationist research, the theory helps to place the present study in its rightful paradigm and to identify the linguistic features to be studied. Despite the fact that the theory has basically been used in phonology, the researcher attempts to apply the key concepts of this theory i.e. the vernacular, speech community, the form/function asymmetry and linguistic variables to a different level of linguistics by using them in the study of the pragmatics of the conversations of men in a social place. The theory, therefore, provides the study with a background and by its use we are able to identify the gap in the studies in this area of study as they tend to a quantitative approach to their analysis.

Because of criticism of the theory for its correlational data which is said not to indicate causality, and because the research is both quantitative and qualitative in nature, another theory, The Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson, 1978), is introduced for the analysis interpretation of data. The variationist paradigm is used for analyzing data quantitatively and therefore will not be able to answer the question on what motivates the choice of language by men in social places. Finally because no
sociolinguistic variables are identified for study in this research the Variationist Theory will not be helpful in the choice of the methods of sampling, data collection, analysis and interpretation. The study therefore moves from variation to the analysis of the forms of politeness used by men in social places.

2.2.2. The Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson 1978, 1988)

The Politeness Theory, published in 1978 by Brown and Levinson, has been the most influential framework of politeness so far (Vilkki 2006:324). The theory is based on the notion of face which they define as “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself or herself” (1978:66). The theory distinguishes two aspects of face: ‘positive face’, the desire for appreciation and approval by others; and ‘negative face’, the desire not to be imposed on by others and a person’s want to be unimpeded (Tracy 1990). The notion of face comes from earlier work by Goffman (1967).

In interaction, people are expected to balance a concern for other people’s face with a desire to protect their own (Mesthrie et al 2003:189). When an act of verbal or non-verbal communication runs contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/ or speaker this is called a “face threatening act” (FTA). Speakers will draw on politeness strategies as a means of paying attention to another person’s face and avoiding ‘face threatening acts’. An example of a FTA to the speaker is an offer, which would be meeting a hearer’s wants and not necessarily his or her own. Others would be confessions, where a speaker is admitting that he or she has done something that is not expected (Fasold1990:161).
Brown and Levinson base their theory on the acceptance of the assumptions that everyone has both a negative face and a positive face, and both of these aspects of face are sometimes threatened by another (Brown & Levinson 1978:63). They also claim that a speaker is “endowed with... a precisely definable mode of reasoning from ends to the means that will achieve those ends” (Ibid). Because of these assumptions, a person will consider the best politeness strategy possible before performing an FTA.

Three main strategies for performing speech acts are distinguished by this theory: positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record politeness. Positive politeness aims at enhancing the addressee’s positive face, whereas negative politeness aims at softening the encroachment of the speaker on the addressee’s freedom of action or freedom from imposition. The third strategy, off-record politeness, means flouting one of the Gricean (1975) maxims on the assumption that the addressee is able to infer the intended meaning. This is because Gricean model of cooperative Principle is another building block in Brown and Levinson’s theory.

The kind and amount of politeness that a speaker applies to a certain speech act is determined by the weightiness (Wx) of the speech act. Speakers calculate the weight of their speech acts from three social variables: the perceived social distance (D) between the hearer and the speaker, the power difference (P) between them, and the cultural ranking (R) of the speech act. The latter is perceived to be the degree to which the FTA is perceived to be threatening within a specific culture. On the basis of the outcome of the calculation speakers choose the appropriate type of strategy and sub-strategy to be employed. Next they select the appropriate linguistic means by which to accomplish the chosen sub-strategy (Vilkki, 2006).
This study draws on the strategies of the politeness theory to analyse the recordings of men's conversations. The theory is used to judge the type and level of politeness in men's conversations. The research looks at the extent to which men draw on these strategies in their conversations with one another and attempts find out what strategies are used to maintain order in their conversations and build social ties if/when the strategies of the politeness principle are not used. The theory is relevant in the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data collected from the recordings of conversations and interviews carried out after the recordings.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The chapter describes the methods that were adopted in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data in this research. The first section outlines the research design adopted in the study, followed by details on the area of study, research variables and the sampling procedures employed in determining the sample frame. Information on sample size, data collection procedures, data analysis and data interpretation is also included in the chapter.

3.1 Research Design

The research adopted both quantitative and qualitative approaches in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data. The use of both approaches enabled the researcher to explain men’s use of language more deeply and exhaustively. Quantitative approaches alone, which are mainly used in variationist research, cannot yield sufficient and in-depth information on the motivations for the choice of language by men in social places. This is because they represent only statistical tendencies and as Swann (2000:23) argues, statistical tendencies and correlational data do not imply ‘causality’. There is, therefore, need to go beyond the statistical results of the quantitative classification of elements of speech in language into an in-depth study of the social network and the motivations for their choice of language. This argument is also supported by Urchida, (1992); Mesthrie et al (2003) and Paulston and Tucker (2003). When the relationship between gender and language is looked at from the viewpoint of ‘doing gender in interaction’ (Urchida, 1992:547), then the qualitative aspect of the research cannot be ignored. Such views provide the rationale for
adoption of quantitative and qualitative approaches in the present study. The study provides statistical representations of the language patterns used by me and then gives a detailed qualitative analysis of these patterns showing what motivated men to choose the patterns.

3.2 Area of Study

The research was carried out in Eldama Ravine town. This is a cosmopolitan town in the Rift Valley region, Baringo County in Kenya. This area was purposively selected because the social network approach was used in data collection. The researcher, being a resident of the town and a member of the social network of men who watch football matches in social places targeted, was able to collect data easily from the men in the town. This saved on time and also made it easier for the researcher to be accepted in the network as an insider (Labov 1972). The town being a representative of the complex language situation in Kenya provides an interesting site for the study because of the diversity of principles of conversation that come into play in such a setting.

Watching football has become a popular social pastime activity that brings people together all over Kenya. The research was done mainly in hotels, pubs, eating places and video show rooms in the town that broadcast live football matches from the English Premier League (EPL). The choice of the English Premier League matches was made because the league is very popular in the Kenyan society and has provided a source of entertainment for Kenyan football enthusiasts lately. It was, therefore, easy to get a representative sample of football viewers by concentrating on this league.
3.3 Sampling Procedures

This research adopted non probability sampling procedures outlined by Kombo and Tromp (2006). The researcher purposively sampled the social places for data collection. Purposive sampling was used because the town is small and has a small number of social places that show live football matches from the English Premier League hence probability sampling would not be possible. In addition some of the social places in the town were not reliable in terms of consistency in showing the football matches and, therefore, had few respondents. This called for the researcher to use his judgement to select places that best enabled him to answer the research questions and meet the objectives of the study. As Mugenda and Mugenda (1999:43) argue, purposive sampling technique allows a researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of his/ her study, in our case, male subjects who frequent social places to watch football matches. Thus all the respondents had to meet these criteria.

3.4 Sample Size

Milroy (1987:21) says that socially sensitive studies of language depend on good data, which entails the provision of sufficient types and quantities of language. She adds that large samples tend not to be as necessary for linguistic surveys as for other surveys because they tend to be redundant, bringing increased data handling problems with diminishing analytical returns.

Small samples do appear to be sufficient for useful accounts of language variation. This study therefore sought for small but sufficient samples for analysis. The research purposively sampled seven social places which broadcast live football matches from the English Premier League. In each social place the researcher recorded two conversations of between five and fifteen minutes for analysis. It was believed that a
sample of seven social places would produce the salient characteristics of the accessible population of football viewers in Eldama Ravine to an acceptable degree.

After recording the conversations, the researcher purposively sampled seven conversations out of all the fourteen recorded to be analysed. The sampling of the conversations was guided by the following:

i. **Audibility**: Some of the recorded data was not clear enough for transcribing because of the much noise in the places it was recorded. Thus the researcher selected the recordings that were audible enough to be transcribed. In some cases the conversations had to be amplified to be clear enough for transcription.

ii. **Content**: To avoid duplication of the same content, same politeness strategies and the same type of conversation, the researcher picked conversations that offered new information from the ones already sampled.

iii. **Features to be studied**: The researcher sampled conversations to capture the beginning of a match, the end of a match, a time when there was a blackout, a tense moment in the game, different moods at the venue, and different network strengths so as to provide a rich source of information on men’s casual conversations.

Data samples were therefore picked because they were informative and possessed the required characteristics namely males frequenting social places that broadcast live football matches (Mugenda, 1999).

3.5 **Pilot Study**

The researcher carried out a pilot study before embarking on the actual study. Pilot study is a survey methodology recommended by Milroy (1981:69). According to
Gimode (2006:40), it guides a researcher to obtain a representative sample of opinion and attitudes from the enumerated population. The researcher pre-visited the social places to identify the men who patronize them frequently and pick them as participants. The researcher then informed the participants beforehand about the recording but decided at what point in the conversations to start the recording. The researcher first of all explained to the informants of the recording and agreed on the days and time of the recording but decided at what point to start the recording. This helped to minimize the tendency by the subjects to be careful about their speech in the presence of an audio recorder. The researcher was also able to identify how many social places would give a representative sample of the population and also to decide how long a conversation would last.

3.6 Data Collection

Data collection entailed audio recording of conversations, and participant observation. Audio recording was the major instrument of the study. Two conversations were recorded from each of the sampled social place, each lasting between five and fifteen minutes. In total, fourteen conversations were recorded. Audio recording was used as it offers the advantage of gathering massive data that can be reviewed later with precision. It also gives the opportunity to seek for clarification and native speaker intuition where the data is not clear.

Participant observation was used by the researcher to get supplementary information that could not be tape recorded like the actions of the speakers, their proximity to one another, and other paralinguistic reactions of the listeners. This information was noted down to assist in the transcription and interpretation of the recorded data.
Despite the fact that the participants had been informed beforehand of the recording, those who joined them at the time of recording became part of the participants and were informed of the research at the end of each recording.

3.7 Data Management and Ethical Considerations

This research followed the ethical guidelines set out in Mugenda and Mugenda (1999). First the research was done for purely academic purposes and therefore the researcher did not use it for personal or financial gain. The informants were notified beforehand of the researcher’s intentions and their consent sought. No reward or payment was given to any of the informants and they agreed to participate of their own free will.

Secondly, the researcher assured the respondents that the information given was to be treated as confidential. The recorded conversations were not revealed to anyone except the supervisors. The identity of the informants was further protected by the use of codes, letters, numbers and pseudo names. This is why the names in the transcribed data are not the same as those used by the speakers in the recorded data. Lastly, the researcher ensured that the research did not cause any harm to the respondents directly or indirectly, nor hamper their social activities.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the conversations recorded. The chapter begins with an analysis of the emerging patterns in men’s linguistic behaviour in casual conversations in social places. Secondly, the emerging patterns are compared to and contrasted with the tenets of the politeness theory by use of a statistical presentation of the politeness strategies adopted by the men and a discussion of these strategies. Finally, the chapter presents a discussion of the reasons and motivations for men’s choice of linguistic patterns in their conversations and compares them with related studies in the field of gender and politeness.

4.1 Emerging Patterns in Men’s Linguistic Behaviour In Casual Conversations

4.1.1 Introduction
This section covers the first objective of this study which is to establish the emerging patterns in men’s linguistic behaviour in casual conversations in social places. The seven conversations sampled were studied and analysed for the patterns that emerge in casual conversations among men in social places. The analysis examined the patterns used in turn taking and the level of dominance by the participants in the conversations and the level of interruption and overlapping speech.

4.1.2 Turn Distribution and Dominance
Table 1 below summarizes the level of participation of each speaker and shows the turn distribution among the speakers in each conversation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONVERSATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>TOTAL TURNS</th>
<th>AVG TURNS per speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>883</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A summary of Turn distribution in seven conversations obtained from 60 speakers in Eldama Ravine

Table 1 above gives a summary of the number of participants in each of the seven conversations and the total number of turns in each conversation. The conversations were labeled C1 to C7. On overall, C4 had the highest number of turns (209 turns) while C5 had the least (at 66). This means that the level of participation was high and the conversation was fast paced in C4. The average turns per speaker were also calculated to help in determining the level of dominance of the speakers. According to Table 1, C2 and C4 have the highest mean score (at 26) while C5 with an average of only 7 turns has the least mean score. This shows that the speakers in C4 are keener on participating in the conversation than those in C5. This was attributed to the combative and argumentative nature of the participants in C4.

Let us now focus on the linguistic patterns exhibited in each of the seven conversations. We begin with the first conversation coded as C1.
Figure 1 above shows that conversation 1 has eleven participants and 147 turns. It would therefore be expected that on average, each speaker would contribute 13 turns but participant C dominates the conversation with 44 turns. When the conversation begins, the turns are evenly distributed but as the conversation progresses C takes the centre stage and dominates most of the conversation especially after a goal is scored. His dominating of the conversations is an expression of excitement that his opponents' team has conceded a goal. J and K only contribute 2 turns each making them speakers with the least number of conversational turns. This is as result of their attempt to save face since they support the team that has conceded a goal. Their positive face has been damaged by their team conceding a goal as it subjects them to the taunts and criticism by their opponents which further damages their positive face.

A few contribute to the conversation sparingly and cautiously like participants F, J and K. The principle here is that when a person's team is losing, he keeps quiet as a way of saving face and also as a form of negative politeness by avoiding arguments and not resorting to verbal insults. Silence therefore cannot be taken as submitting to the person dominating the conversation but as a face saving strategy.
The turns in conversation 2 are distributed as shown in figure 2 below.

![Conversation 2 Turn distribution](image)

**Figure 2: Distribution of turns in Conversation 2 involving 4 speakers in Eldama Ravine**

Figure 2 above shows that the second conversation has a total of 103 turns and four speakers. On average, each speaker should contribute 26 turns. This figure presents speaker C having the highest no of turns (32) while D has the least (20 turns). The gap between the turns contributed by the 4 speakers is however not significantly different from the case in C1 as presented in figure 1. The 4 speakers are at a close level in terms of their contributions. This is because there is little excitement about the game except for the mention of a player the speakers know. This is also attributed to the weak network ties between the speakers. They are not close to one another socially so each person is cautious with his words and choice of politeness strategy. To add to this, the venue is not popular with football viewers and that is the reason why the participants are few and do not have strong network ties. This conversation is sampled to contrast with the others and show how other factors like the venue and the game being watched determine the nature and direction of the conversation.
The other conversation where a speaker dominates the conversation is C3 as presented in figure 3 below.
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**Figure 3: Turns distribution in conversation 3 involving 8 participants in Eldama Ravine**

Figure 3 above shows that in C3, the dominant speaker has 41 turns out of a total of 131 turns spoken by eight participants while two speakers have only 7 turns each. The gap between the highest scorer and the least is huge. C contributes about six times as much as the two speakers (E and G) with the least turns. It would be expected that if the turns are evenly distributed each speaker should have an average of 16 turns but four speakers (B, C, D and F) have turns above this average. C3 presents a different scenario from C1 as none of the speakers can claim the lofty position of the one whose team is winning. They are not watching a game but are having a discussion as they await power and still speakers C and F dominate the conversation. Their dominance is because they are both fans of the team that was aggrieved by the application of the offside rule in an earlier game. Therefore they are trying to show that their disappointment is justified. F’s dominance can also be attributed to the fact that he wants to display his knowledge of the offside rule. Speaker E and G have the smallest percentage of turns in this conversation at 5% because both of them support
the team that was favoured by the application of the offside rule. Because they are not aggrieved by the referee’s decision, it can be concluded that they let the aggrieved parties vent their frustration in the conversation without interrupting.

Secondly, it may also be a strategy to protect their positive face because speaking much would mean supporting their team and the referee’s decision. In so doing they would be disagreeing with their opponents and subject themselves to FTAs by the opponents as the opponents would then vent their frustrations on them. Speaker H comes later into the conversation and only asks for a seat. He does not join in the conversation after sitting down.

C4 is a clear example of one speaker dominating a conversation while the others submit as summarized in figure 4 below.
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**Figure 4: Turns Distribution in Conversation 4 involving 8 participants in Eldama Ravine**

Figure 4 above shows that C4 has a total of 209 turns contributed by 8 speakers. The average number of turns per speaker according to table 1 should be 26 but two speakers (A and E) dominate the conversation while the rest have turns below the average. The reason for this is that speaker A raises sensitive subjects like politics and
tribalism and inappropriate topics like siring of children which put off the other participants. He outrightly brings a tribal angle to every topic he raises in a bid to attack members of one ethnic community who are the majority in the site of study. He taunts them for getting a few children yet they have a lot of natural resources unlike other ethnic communities that have no resources yet have a high population (C3:T1-23). Secondly he raises a sensitive political issue of a break up between two prominent political leaders Kenya (C3:T27) because one of the leaders is from this ethnic community and has majority support from his community. He taunts them that in the previous election they all supported these two leaders and fought the community he (A) comes from yet the two leaders have now parted ways. He also raises the issue of post election violence which affected this community so much in the year 2008 after the general election of 2007 in Kenya. By doing so A performs a number of FTAs that damage the positive face of his conversational partners, hence their minimal participation in the conversation. His FTAs have gone beyond the norms of proper communication among members of this social network of football viewers. The atmosphere is so tense and about to get out of hand as the other speakers feel humiliated by A.

It should be noted that this is a strong network of friends who are not just brought together by football but also interact at work places and other social fora. Therefore the network bonds are quite strong among them. They are used to making fun of one another and taunting and criticizing each other whenever they meet to pass time and watch a game of football. This is why despite the fact that A has humiliated the others the situation does not get out of hand and degenerate into a fight but only gets to the point where A receives threats which he ignores. Moreover, the other speakers are caught off guard as they did not expect the conversation to take the direction it has
taken. They are therefore caught in between their allegiance to their ethnic community and their social network of football viewers and friends, thus their choice of strategies to manage the situation.

The little participation of F, G, and H is also worth noting. B, C and D avoid much of the conversation because they are targets of FTAs from A as members of the ethnic community he is criticizing. On the other hand, F is a member of a community that has broken political ties with the one being attacked by A. This is why when E tries to draw him into the conversation (C4:T88-90); he avoids answering as it is also a provocation that damages his positive face. The message here “is that your community leader in Kenyan politics has a spokesman here”. He only responds when asked to change the channel on the TV (C4:T52). F can be said to be socially insecure because of the ethnic animosity by most of the men towards his ethnic community. G only joins the conversation when asked a direct question by A, he supports A’s assertions to avoid disagreeing and by so doing damages E’s face (C4:T82-86). H is a waiter at the hotel and so he is busy serving patrons. This limits his contribution to simply answering questions. He is asked a question at T173 but because has offered an answer to the question already, he continues with his work.

The other conversation in which one speaker dominates is C5. The turn distribution in C5 conversation is shown below:
Figure 5 shows the turn distribution in conversation 5. C5 is about personal argument between two speakers B and E. Speaker B is in a combative mood and tells off everyone who opposes him (C5: T2, T6, and T14). He dominates the conversation to provoke E but E is so annoyed that avoids much of the conversation. The other speakers try to pacify them and control the argument so that it does not degenerate into a fight.

On the other hand, C6 brings together men who do not often watch football matches together, though they are all football fans. Because of this the social network ties are weak among them. This affects the course the conversation takes. It leads to an even distribution of turns as they all participate in discussing the interesting game they are watching. No speaker is eager to dominate the conversation because of the distance.

The figure below summarized the distribution of turns in conversation 6.
Finally, C7 does not have one speaker outrightly dominating it. The distribution of turns in C7 is summarized below:

Figure 7: Turn distribution in Conversation 7 involving 10 speakers in Eldama Ravine.

In figure 5 above, five speakers (B, E, F, G, and H) have turns above the average; C has an average number of turns while A, D, I and J have turns below the average. Speaker J arrives late (C7: T94) and this is the reason for having few turns in the
conversation. This conversation is recorded just before a match is aired live on TV
and as it progresses. It captures the sense of belonging and pride that men have
towards a team they support when it is winning a game. They involve each other in
their fears and joys about the game. The majority of the speakers in the conversation
(A, B, C, D, E, F and H) support the same team and therefore there is little opposition
to their sentiments and celebrations. The few who do not support the team (G and I)
give little criticism as the team is excelling on this occasion.

A feeling of solidarity and togetherness is created throughout the conversation from
the beginning, where they have misgivings about some of the players in the lineup, to
the point where they celebrate two goals scored in the space of five minutes, and then
to the end of the conversation, where they express reservations about the referee. The
mood of the conversation shifts from apprehension at the beginning to a happy mood
when goals are scored, as opposed to the combative and angry mood in other
conversations.

I is part of the group from the beginning but only makes a few comments and remains
silent. This may be because he is not supporting the winning team and so avoids
arguments with the majority. D is engrossed in watching the game and so makes a few
statements and then joins the rest in celebrating the goals. We can therefore conclude
that no speaker is denied an opportunity to participate by those who dominate; they
choose when to participate or remain silent. A few of the turns are addressed to the
TV (T127, T131, and T133). They are either exclamations or expressions of what the
speaker wishes the players on the screen would do.
4.1.3 Speaker Interruption

The level of speaker interruption in the seven conversations is summarized in table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONVERSATION</th>
<th>TOTAL TURNS</th>
<th>NO. OF INTERRUPTIONS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE INTERRUPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL Cs.</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>20.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: A summary of Interruptions in the seven conversations from 60 speakers in Eldama Ravine

The interrupted turns in each conversation were also analysed into the percentage of the turns in each conversation as summarized in figure 8 below.

Figure 8: Level of interruption in 7 conversations in Eldama Ravine
Table 2 and figure 8 above show that C4 had the highest percentage of interruptions at 32.06%. Out of 209 turn in C4 67 of them were interrupted. This is attributed to the combative and argumentative nature of the participants. It is also because of the close network ties among the speakers and the fact that the norms governing the conversations in this social network are broken by speaker A. The nature and content of the conversation also contributed to the high number of interruptions.

Interruption was found to be either positive or negative depending on its contribution to the conversation and to saving or threatening the positive face of the hearer. Positive interruption is seen clearly in C2 where the weak network strength does not stop the participants from interrupting, though they interrupt for positive reasons. The speakers interrupt to agree with their partners and to encourage or clarify a point. This is also seen in C1 where it is used to give conversational support to a speaker by showing agreement with what he is saying. For example in C1 (T10-11), A and D interrupt B to agree with him that the player mentioned is a liability.

\[ B: \text{Kwanza hasara ile iko hapa ni Gary Neville} \ldots \]
\[ A: [Na ni kama Everton hawajaona. Hapo kwa Neville, hiyo wing ya Neville]… \]
\[ D: [Mmm.] \]
\[ A: Ah! Hapo uneza pata bao mzuri sana. \]

Translation:
\[ B: \text{First of all the liability there is Gary Neville} \ldots \]
\[ A[\text{and it seem Everton haven't noticed. That part where Neville is, his wing} \ldots \]
\[ D: \text{Yes.} \]

In C3 (T50-51), D agrees with F and offers supportive explanation by interrupting him.

\[ F: \text{hata timu kama imefungwa bao nane wakifanya makosa penalty inapeanwa.} \]
\[ \text{[Makosa ni makosa] (even if a team has conceded eight goals if they commit a foul, a penalty should be awarded.)} \]
\[ D: [\text{hata kama ni red mnapewa. (Even if it is a red card, it is given.}} \]
The moment the listener gets the point of the speaker’s argument he takes the opportunity to offer his supportive contribution without waiting for him to finish. This is also seen in C3 (T89) where B decides to take over G’s explanation and complete it. In C7 (T9), F interrupts G to ask which player they are talking about. B also interrupts G to support his claim that the player used to be so good (C7:T21). E and B agree with F that the midfield players will be overworked. They express their agreement by interrupting him. When the men get the point of the speaker’s comment, they do not wait for him to finish what he is saying; they go ahead and give their views.

Secondly, positive interruption is used to give encouragement to a speaker who is expressing disappointment as seen in C1 (T80) where A interrupts C to encourage F that more goals will be scored.

F: *Mimi nataka security.* *(I want security)*  
C: *Ah! We usijali [tuka kifua mbele]* *(Ah! Don’t worry, we are leading.)*  
A: *Bado! Usijali, mabao inakuja.* *(not yet, more goals are coming)*

This is also seen in C2 (T3-4). When Speaker C and A interrupt B to display their interest and knowledge of Kenyan football and to encourage him to watch it. They are telling him that Kenyan football is not as bad as he assumes and they go ahead to prove that. Speakers also interrupt to prompt another speaker about something he wants to say but has forgotten. For example, in C7 (T5-6), C says,

"*Unaona hii jamaa anazunguka zunguka tu hapo?* *(Do you see this guy going round and round there?)*

E interrupts him and tells him who the player is. By doing this he is helping by offering information that the speaker does not have.
On the other hand negative interruption, though used in a number of conversations, is seen clearly in C4 where the conversation is very argumentative. The speakers interrupt one another for the following reasons:

i. **Urgency and impatience:** C interrupts B in the middle of a heated discussion to talk to the waiter C3 (T10). This is because he is getting impatient with staying in the hotel without power yet he wants to watch a game. Speaker C does not take it kindly and so does not wait for him to finish what he is telling the waiter. He cuts him short to continue with the argument C4 (T11).

   B: (To a waiter) we Sebit utamaliza wateja, wateja wanaenda... (Sebit customers are leaving...)
   C: [mi nakwambia ile game naogopa iko mbele. Ile naogopa ni Tottenham, hakuna ingine. (I am telling you the match I fear is yet to come. I only fear the Tottenham one.)

ii. **Disagreement:** When a participant feels what the speaker is saying is wrong he interrupts him to disagree and say what he feels is right. Examples are seen in C4 (T24, T40, T48, and T58.) This is performing an FTA baldy as shown below.

   E: Nyanza.
   A: Aii! Kwetu kisii uneza fikiri ni kwao. [maduka yote...]
   E: [Ah! Ah! Kwenu ni nyanza. [P1] Kisii hakuna kwa [hesabu
   A: [hata kisii sisi ndio tunaleta hiyo ( ) huko.
   (C4.T40-43)

   Speaker A speaks of his home being in Kisii but E interrupts him saying his home is Nyanza and not Kisii, A interrupts once again insisting his home is in Kisii.

iii. **Seeking clarification:** A speaker also interrupts to seek clarification for what he has not heard clearly. This is seen in C4 (T46-47) where D interrupts B to seek clarification about the person he is talking about.
iv. **To express strong emotions:** In C4 (T44) speaker C is angry and cannot wait for his conversational partner to finish speaking. He simply interrupts to express his anger at the referee. It can also be seen as a lack of politeness and expression of strong emotions of anger as used in C1 (T43, T57) or excitement C1 (T2). In C6 some of the interruptions are also an expression of excitement. When celebrating a goal the speakers are carried away by their emotions and keep interrupting one another (T75-82).

v. **To end an argument:** In C4 (T101), D feels the argument has dragged on for long and no agreement is in sight so he decides to conclude the argument philosophically by saying “all referees are human”. Interruption is also a way of cutting short a speaker who is saying the obvious or repeating himself C1 (T117-119). In this way, it is not polite and so it is performing an FTA baldly. When a speaker is repetitive, the listeners decide to interrupt him. It is an impolite way of saying “I get your point; you do not have to belabour it”. This can also be looked at as a way of damaging his negative face off-record because they simply interrupt but do not tell him to stop repeating himself.

It is therefore clear from this analysis that the network strength determines the level and nature of interruptions. The stronger the network, the more the men interrupt one another’s turns to express their sentiments. The nature of the conversation also contributes to this. When a conversation is combative and argumentative, there is more interruption of other speakers as seen in C4 and C5.

4.1.4 Silence

In each of the conversations there were some speakers who kept silent for long spells in the conversation or did not say anything when prompted by their partners by
questions, suggestions or provocation. Silence was therefore looked at as a decision not to participate in the conversation or a form of non-verbal communication.

Firstly, in C1 those who support the team that has conceded a goal like I, J, and K remain silent to save damaged face. Their positive face has been damaged by their team conceding a goal as it subjects them to the taunts and criticism of their opponents which further damages their positive face. A few contribute to the conversation sparingly and cautiously like participants F, J and K. The person whose team is losing keeps quiet as a way of saving face and also as a form of negative politeness, i.e. avoiding arguments and not resorting to verbal insults. Silence therefore cannot be taken as submitting to the person dominating the conversation because in another instance the one dominating will be the one who is silent when his team has conceded a goal and/or is losing.

Silence as a face saving technique is also seen in C4 where A raises sensitive subjects like politics and tribalism and inappropriate topics like siring of children (this is discussed in detail in 4.1.1 above). Therefore, B, C and D make minimal contribution to the conversation and avoid the sensitive topics raised by A out of anger, humiliation and embarrassment. Their positive face has been damaged by A’s disapproval of their ethnic community, embarrassing them with talk of their inability to sire many children, introducing sensitive political issues like the post election violence and belittling D (C4:T17). They therefore choose silence as a politeness strategy as it saves them from further humiliation from A and also as a way of being polite and not performing FTAs against A in retaliation. To add to this, when G is rebuked by B (C5:T32-34) for asking for a chair, he remains silent throughout the conversation. Again, this silence can be interpreted as a politeness strategy: to first
understand what the conversation is about before joining in and to avoid subjecting himself to more of the bald FTAs of B.

Secondly, silence as a form of non-verbal communication is brought out in C3, where there are two turns directed at the waiter in the hotel. Speaker B (C3:T10) and D (C3:T17) tell the waiter to switch on the generator now that there is no power or else the customers will leave. The waiter ignores both calls. He does not switch on the generator nor participate in the conversation. This can be looked at as a form of non-verbal communication. The waiter is at work so he must maintain his position, status and distance or else he will not have any control over the patrons. He does not let the patrons dictate to him what he should do. His silence is interpreted by the speakers as a refusal and no one urges him to switch on the generator again. Non-verbal communication is also used in the same conversation when speaker F nods his head in agreement instead of answering C (C3:T118). In this way he attends to C’s positive face need for approval.

C6 presents a new dimension to the use of politeness strategies whereby a person’s social status prevents him from participating in a conversation. Speaker I comes in to find the conversation in progress and A welcomes him with a bald FTA (T77).

“Pastor, timu yako wamelimwa, wamelimwa na hiyo ingine.” (Pastor, your team has been beaten by the other team).

This damages his positive face as it humiliates him but instead of answering A he keeps quiet. By doing so he saves his face from further damage because answering would be showing that he was the target of the FTA (he hides in silence). He also avoids doing an FTA by answering A to counter what has been said. This may be attributed to his social status as a pastor. His vocation does not allow him to be rude and he has to maintain a good reputation in the society. It therefore shows that to
some people the nature of their social status does not allow them the freedom to mingle and talk freely with other men. The silence could however also be interpreted as performance of an FTA, a silent warning to A to leave him alone or a form of condescension that damages A’s positive face who expects a response.

Moreover, in C7 H asks a question that has just been answered by G, he wants to know which player they are talking about (C7:T12,) yet G had just said the player is called Arshavin (C7:T10). G ignores him and goes on with the conversation with E. H insists by asking the same question two more times (C7: T14 and 16). E concedes and answers the question at this point (C7:T17). By G ignoring H he is either avoiding to perform an FTA by telling him to stop asking what has just been answered or he is performing an FTA by refusing to attend to H’s positive face (embarrassing him by not answering the question).

4.1.5 Use of Abusive, Rude and Sexist Language

From the conversations analysed it was discovered that men use abusive, rude and sexist language in social places when the network ties are very strong and when emotions run high as seen in C1, C3, C4 and C7. Some of the insulting words are said lightheartedly and therefore do not carry the meaning they would have in another context. Among the men in this social network, a player who does not play skillfully or displays some weaknesses is looked at negatively and given feminine names. In C1:T67 the speaker calls a player Mamatov yet his real name is Berbatov. This is done by playing with the Swahili words ‘baba’ (father) and ‘mama’ (Mother) because the player’s name’s first two syllables sound like ‘baba.’ The connotation here is that because he plays badly, he is not good enough to be seen as being masculine and that is why he is called Mamatov. This implies that such weaknesses are for women and
not men. The speaker goes ahead and nicknames him Damaris Mamatov (C1:T69). This is repeated at C1:T105 when D asks about a player whose name is Louis Nani. C changes the name and refers to the player as Mama Loise, a feminine name. This is a chauvinistic way of saying that the player is not good on the pitch so he is ‘like a woman’. Here femininity is associated with weaknesses and failure. It can therefore be concluded that the men look down upon women and so associate any weakness in a man with women. It is a way of saying “don’t be weak, ‘like a woman’ ”.

Secondly, the term “Mjinga” (A fool) is used in C1(T68, T79 and T130) to refer to a player who, in the opinion of the viewers, is playing poorly. It is simply an expression of annoyance with the player. The speaker is angry that he (the player) is not doing well enough to earn his team victory and so is subjecting him (the speaker) to the FTAs of their opponents (C1:T79). It is therefore not an FTA as it is not directly or indirectly directed at the participants in the conversation. In C3 “Ujinga” (foolishness/stupidity) is also used once again but with lesser weight than its semantic meaning. At T45, C says,

“Referee alifanya ujinga...” (The referee did something foolish).

This is a term used by the viewers to express their disappointment and when a player or a match official makes a mistake that the speaker considers outrightly foolish and obvious and one that is not expected of them.

Thirdly, speaker C refers to someone as ‘mbunge’ (C1:T73), then another as senator (C1:T125). This prompts K to reply,

“hii ugovernor yako ya busaa hii” (this governorship of busaa drinkers).

This is a demeaning way of telling him he got the names from a ‘busaa’ drinking den. (Busaa is an illegal local brew associated with the lowest social class in the society).
It sounds abusive and the other participants laugh at C as he has met his match and his positive face is damaged. He does not respond, choosing to save face by remaining silent and waiting for another moment to hit back.

C calls a player "mzee" (an old man) (C1:T102) in reference to the fact that he is one of the oldest players still playing professional football. I responds rudely by telling him,

"Wazee wako nyumbani" (old men are at home) T103.

This is a rude comment that I uses to express his anger that his team has conceded a goal and C keeps making fun of them and damaging their positive face. By so doing he damages C’s positive face but C ignores this rude comment to minimize its threat to his positive face. It would be more embarrassing if he commented on it. Ignoring this comment is also a politeness strategy as he avoids damaging the speaker’s face by reacting to it. He understands that I is unhappy his team has conceded a goal and he therefore avoids provoking him more.

In C3 (T18) C refers to the fans of one team as "wakora". This is a common term in this network of football viewers used to refer to a team that is alleged to receive favours from referees and to use underhand methods to win some of their games. Therefore they are perceived as being crafty, thus "the crafty ones". The term is used to refer to the team and its fans. When used to refer to the fans it is an FTA that damages their positive face as it disapproves of them and their success.

Also in C3:T60 the speakers are not reaching an agreement about the offside rule so G offers to call "mwalimu" to explain it. B, C, and F reject the offer vehemently and B says "Mwalimu" is one of the false prophets (C3:T63). It should be noted here that the person referred to as "mwalimu" (the teacher) is a teacher who is a trained football
referee. That is why G wants to call him to offer his professional explanation of the
rule. The others reject him and call him a "false prophet" because he supports the
team that was favoured by the rule. They believe he will just say the rule was applied
correctly and that will not help their damaged face.

In C4, A and E use abusive language in T112-117 by referring to each other using
words with no equivalent in English (i.e. 'Kumpaff, kumanina, kumanyoko'). The
effect of these words is lessened by the fact that they say them laughing, therefore
they are taken by each other jokingly. Strong network ties and the setting play an
important role in this interpretation. E is also abusive when he refers to a political
leader as "marehemu" (the late) (C4:T60). This is a reference to the fact that the
leader no longer enjoys support from E's community after breaking ties with one of
their leaders. There is also a lot of rudeness from A; this is done by ignoring the pleas
of D C4(T12-13) to give him a newspaper, telling off the others at T57 and T77.

In C7 There are two instances where players are referred to using abusive names. A
calls a player in the lineup "Nyang'au" (a beast) at the beginning of the conversation
(T1). This is an expression of his dislike for the player that he feels is not going to
contribute positively to the team. He is angry that the player is included in the team.
Secondly, E calls another one "Nguruwe" (A pig) at T6 and this is repeated by F
(C7:T87) and H (C7:T88). This is a nickname that the men have given a player
because of his appearance; in their opinion he looks like a pig. It is also an expression
of their dislike for the player and his skills. That is why they claim the two players,
'Nya'ngau' and 'Nguruwe' are a liability to the team (C7:T6). These vulgar terms are
not directed at the listeners so they are not a performance of FTAs but an aspect of
social conversations among men with strong network bonds as seen in other conversations analysed.

4.1.6 Use of Jokes and Nicknames

The speakers in social places also use jokes and nicknames in the conversations to create humour and make fun of their conversational partners. This relieves the tension created by the games being watched and the arguments they engage in. Again, jokes are used mostly among speakers who have strong network ties as seen in C1, C4, C5 and C7. In C1 the speakers make fun of their conversational partners to draw them into a conversation when they resort to silence as a face saving strategy. They do this by making jokes and giving them nick-names. Speaker C does this in C1(T 73, T125-126.) He refers to a fan of the losing team as “mbunge wa Sirwa” (the MP for Sirwa.) and to another as “senator”. Ironically, Sirwa is a village and not a constituency therefore it cannot have a Member of Parliament. This is a way of propping up the person referred to by saying he is an important person from Sirwa. It attends to his positive face needs of approval and therefore attempts to draw him back into the conversation, but it should be understood as a joke.

In C4 jokes are used as a face saving strategy. E finds the topics raised by A inappropriate but he does not shy off. Instead he is able to keep the conversation going by joking about the sensitive and inappropriate topics raised by A (C4:30, 90). This lessens the impact of A’s attacks on his opponents. Moreover, when A realizes he is losing his conversational partners especially E, he saves their positive face by joking about his assertions (C4:T19-21 and T91-106) and is able to draw them back into the conversation.
In C5 the personal argument between B and E is about to degenerate to a quarrel. The other participants realize this is getting out of hand and can lead to a fight. F takes over the role of a pacifier by making a joke about the argument (C5:T20) and A offers E a seat (he was standing) to calm him down (C5:T23). These politeness strategies try to address the positive face wants of B and E. Though E is very annoyed, he sits down and avoids any more confrontation with B by remaining silent. The joke is about forming an alliance, an allusion to the formation of political alliances in the country as this was a time when Kenyans were preparing for a general election. It is ironic that the two are asked to form an alliance yet they are at loggerheads. This humorously captures situations where leaders who had been hitherto perceived as enemies politically joined forces to form political alliances before the elections.

The jokes in these conversations are, therefore, used to relieve tension, to remind the speakers that this is just a game and arguments should not degenerate into serious quarrels and to also entertain the speakers.

4.1.7 Reference and Group Identity Markers

The terms used by the speakers to refer to each other in the conversations also play a role in strengthening the ties among them. In C1 the statement “tuko pamoja” (We are together) used at T60, T62, T145, and T147 is another important principle used in the conversations. It is a group identity marker used to attend to the positive face needs of the hearers whose face has been damaged by earlier FTAs. The speaker uses it to ensure that he does not lose his conversational partners because of his continued performance of FTAs that damage their face and as an encouragement that despite the fact that their team is losing, they are still friends. It is also a reminder to them that it
is just a game, and the taunts, jeers and criticisms should not be taken personally. The divergent talk does not, therefore, affect their network ties negatively.

In C2 the men refer to themselves and others as ‘sisi’ (we/us), nyinyi (you) hao (they). (eg. T8, T9, T14-15). This form of reference is also used as a group identity marker. Those who support the same team feel they are one and the team is ‘their team’, while their opponents are looked at together as ‘you’ or ‘they’. They celebrate the victory of their team together; they feel the loss of the same team together and are subjected to the same treatment by their opponents when their team loses. This creates a sense of belonging and togetherness and strengthens their network ties. In this way, those who support a team form a smaller social network within the bigger network of football fans. We can therefore conclude that this is a network made up of smaller networks that bring all of them together for the same purpose. This form of reference is a form of positive politeness as it includes the hearer and makes him feel part of the group.

The solidarity and unity in celebration of victory is also captured clearly by the way the speakers refer to themselves in C7. The speakers refer to each other as “We” and to the team as “Our team” or also as “We”. E (C7:T31) says

“...tumemaliza hao. (We have finished them),”

and B says,

“Tumelose three midfielders bwana! (We have lost three midfielders, man!)”

(C7:T46).

Also C says,

“Tuchunge tu hapo kwa box yetu. (Let us just be careful in our penalty area)”

(C7:T126).

This attends to the hearers’ positive face as it is a statement of friendship and solidarity that includes both the speaker and the hearer in the suggestion. It is also
important to note the sense of pride and ownership the speakers have for the team that they refer to the team as “We”. They consider themselves a part of the team and therefore part of its losses and its victories.

4.1.8 Sarcasm

It is common for speakers to perform FTAs by use of sarcasm. In C1:T26 the speaker is indirectly saying an opponents’ player’s weakness will play into their hands. He says this by calling it “uzuri ya Evans” (the good thing about Evans). To him it will be a good thing for the player to commit a foul and in so doing assist the opponent. The use of “uzuri” sarcastically is repeated when the speaker tells his opponent,

“The good thing about you is hitting back when under pressure” (C1: T57).

It is a way of saying; you don’t have to hit back just because you are under pressure.

Also in T29 C taunts A indirectly by responding to his complaint sarcastically. He asks,

“How will they score and he is a Man U. player?”

This is based on the fact that the player played for the opposing team before his move to the current team. So it is a way of saying that though he has moved to another team, his allegiance is still with he played for previously (the current opponents) and so he cannot help his team score against his former team.

Lastly I who is supporting the losing team is not happy that the others are making fun of them. He asks,

“Kelele ya nini? Mtu angoje timu yake.” (Why all the noise, everyone should wait for his team). (T93)

By saying this he performs a direct FTA (baldly) by telling the opponents to keep quiet. This does not make them keep quiet as F answers him sarcastically in T94,
"Uliza kwanza vuvuzela ilienda SouthAfrica?" (First ask if the vuvuzela was taken to South Africa).

He is alluding to the World cup games held in South Africa in 2010 where the fans were allowed to use 'vuvuzelas' in the stadia despite the fact that they were so noisy. In other words F is saying, if 'vuvuzelas' were allowed in the games in South Africa then they are also free to speak.

### 4.1.9 Pauses, Exclamations and Interjections

Sometimes when the game being watched is so engrossing and the speakers cannot hold a cohesive conversation because their attention is on the TV screen, the conversation is punctuated by pauses, interjections and exclamations to express their emotions. This is clearly seen in C6. Exclamations/interjections are used to express the excitement brought about by the game, and anticipation for goals, or disappointment at missed chances and mistakes made by the players. Examples of this are when A applauds a player in C6(T68), C expresses disappointment with a player at C6(T84), and D exclaims in shock when a player fouls an opponent and is in danger of being cautioned (C6:T85). There are several pauses in C6. These are brought about when attention is switched to the TV in anticipation of a goal (T5, T20, T46, T47, T48, T55 and T84) or during a tense moment in the game. Pauses are also a sign of weak network strength because caution is exercised by the speakers in such instances before making a comment or replying to what the other speaker has said.

### 4.1.10 Address to the TV

Turns addressed to the TV are seen in C1 and C6. I CI the address to the TV is an indirect attack at the speakers who support the team being talked about. C addresses a player sarcastically encouraging him to keep going in an offside position (C1:78). This is meant to annoy the other participants who support the team. It is also repeated
when a player fouls another one and C and F reprimand him calling him “mzee” (an old man) in C1:98-100). This annoys I who replies rudely,

“wazee wako nyumbani” (old men are at home).

It is clear from these turns that they are not meant for the players on TV but for the fans of the team. It is a way of making fun of them because of the mistakes the team they support is making.

On the other hand, turns addressed to the TV in C6 are an expression of what the speaker wishes the players on TV would do or not do on the pitch as opposed to C1 where they were meant to indirectly attack their opponents. At T32, C urges the player to change the wing; at T58 D asks a player to use his stamina, at T63 G tells the player to play wide on the pitch, and at T82, D encourages the player that he is alone. On the other hand, at T49, A is not happy with a player and exclaims,

“Ah! Wewe! (No! You!).

This is his way of showing disapproval of what the player is doing. He gets the support of C (T50) who says,

“Hii watu watolewe!” (These guys should be substituted!).

C agrees with A’s disapproval and offers a solution that they should be substituted. As much as these turns are addressed to the TV, they are also meant for the other listeners and they are therefore obliged to respond either by agreeing or giving their varying opinion. It would be impolite not to respond even if the speaker addresses the TV. The turns are therefore a way of the speaker telling the other speakers, “In my opinion, this is how the player should play”.
4.1.11 Compliments

Compliments are another strategy used by speakers primarily to save face. C has been at the centre of the conversation because his opponents’ team was trailing by a goal. But when the team equalizes he is swift to compliment the team for the score (C1:T88).

"Ameweka poa, hapo hatuna maneno" (He has placed it well; we have no problem with that).

He says this to soften the expected backlash of FTAs against him from those he has been hitting at. It is their turn to celebrate and damage his positive face but he minimizes that damage by accepting the goal and praising the scorer. By praising the goal, he attends to the Hearer’s positive face by making them feel good and therefore they cannot hit back at him and damage his face. We can therefore say that when the speaker attends to a hearer’s positive face, it may be also a way of attending to his own face. He then makes a joke that no team is leading as both are tied at one goal apiece (C1:T92). By so doing he avoids being toppled from the central role he has assumed in this conversation.

4.2 A Comparison of Emerging Linguistic Patterns with the Tenets of Politeness Theory

The data collected agrees with the politeness theory that everyone has both a negative face and a positive face, and both of these aspects of face are, at times, threatened by another (Brown and Levinson 1978:63). Being polite, therefore involves attempting to attend to the face wants of a listener or speaker. Men in this study also have a desire to be liked, admired, affirmed, and related to positively (positive face) and the desire not to be imposed upon (Negative face). They expect their need for self esteem and freedom to act to be addressed.
The performance of face threatening acts (FTAs) is sometimes inevitable depending on the nature of the conversation. The five super strategies of performing FTAs were used to analyze the data collected. The FTAs were classified as follows:

i. **P1**: An FTA performed baldly.

ii. **P2**: An FTA performed using positive politeness strategies.

iii. **P3**: An FTA performed using negative politeness strategies.

iv. **P4**: An FTA performed off record or indirectly.

v. **P5**: Avoidance of performing an FTA.

The use of politeness strategies in the conversations is summarized in table three below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONVERSATION</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The use of politeness strategies in the 7 conversations collected in Eldama Ravine

Table 3 above clearly shows that the men use positive politeness strategies more than negative politeness strategies. The politeness 1 strategies used in total were 173 while politeness 2 was used 136 times. On the other hand politeness 4 was used 60 times and politeness 5 used only 23 times. This shows that even when the network ties are not strong men still use impolite forms as shown by the frequency of FTAs performed baldy (P1). The data is also analysed in form of a graph to compare the use of the strategies in the seven conversations as shown in figure 9 below.
Figure 9 above shows that in five conversations, the speakers used politeness strategy 1 most. The speakers used language baldly and did not mind about polite behaviour.

In conversation 4 the performance of FTAs baldly is at its highest point because of the argumentative and combative nature of the conversation. In C2 and C7, the speakers use more of positive politeness strategies. Because of the social distance, speakers in C2 use more negative politeness strategies. Avoiding to perform an FTA, which was classified as P5 is seen to be the least used strategy in every conversation. The politeness strategies employed by speakers in all the conversations are summarized in the chart below.
SUMMARY OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES

Figure 10: A summary of politeness strategies in the conversations

From figure 10 above, we can conclude that the men in this social network of football viewers in Eldama Ravine are a positive politeness group and that men in social places are not sensitive to norms of polite language because they use more of P1 and P2 strategies than the other strategies. They use more of the impolite forms by impeding on others and do deliberately endeavour to attend to the face wants of their hearers. The politeness strategies used by the speakers are further discussed below.

4.2.1 Strategy 1: Doing an Act Baldly

According to Brown and Levinson, this strategy involves doing an FTA “in the most direct, unambiguous and concise way possible” (Brown and Levinson 1978:74). The speaker makes no attempt to acknowledge the hearer’s face wants by means of redressive action. From the analysis above, this is the strategy that is used most by men in this study. The men utilize the close relationship and strong network ties with one another to employ this strategy. This strategy was brought out clearly through the use of abusive language, sexism, rudeness, shouting, openly celebrating the loss of an opponent’s team, direct disagreements and quarrels. The strategy was used most when
emotions ran high and the conversations tended to be argumentative as seen in C1 and C4. At such moments the speakers had little or no desire to maintain the hearers’ face.

For example, C1 was recorded in the middle of a very tense football match where the participants are glued to the TV screen and the emotions are high. Men in this conversation utilize the close network ties among themselves to speak baldly, sarcastically, abusively; to use sexist language, and to interrupt one another.

On the other hand the strength of the social network ties and the context of C4, allows men to raise sensitive topics, be abusive and vulgar, openly air their chauvinistic opinions, break the norms of conversation, dominate the talk and interrupt one another freely without the fear of destroying social bonds and relationships or compromising their social network ties as seen below.


Translation
79. A: Water is here, ask for a glass. (Handing him a jug of water) (5sec)[You usually take maize to Ukambani and Kisumu= 80. E:(holding the jug) [Chebii do you know I will put this into your eyes?] 81. A: = What are you telling us? ((Laughter all over)) A: Haven’t you been seeing...You Tum! (Calling) 82. G: Yes! 83. A: Is there any maize that comes from Rift Valley and goes to Kisii? 84. G: No. 85. A: It goes to Nyanza! Kisumu and ukambani. You will not threaten us here!
In this conversation Speaker E has just asked the waiter for water as a face saving strategy after A has attacked him from an ethnic point of view. He asks for water to change the topic but E is adamant and goes on with the talk as gives him the water in a jug on the table. A threatens to pour the water on the face of A but A is not moved. He stands his ground and continues to perform his FTAs baldly. This does not break up the conversation nor degenerate into a fight because of both speakers’ interpretation of the talk as part of the entertainment and majorly because of the strong network bonds between the speakers.

4.2.2 Strategy 2: Positive Politeness
Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat of FTAs to the hearer by attending to his positive face, “the desire to be appreciated and approved of by selected others” (Tracy, 1990:210). They are mostly used where the speakers know each other well. The speakers in these conversations also used this strategy to maintain their friendship by using group identity markers, compliments, involving each other in the conversation, prompting a speaker, agreeing with a speaker, showing interest in what a speaker is saying through back channels, making jokes, and encouraging those whose teams were losing. Such strategies strengthened the network bonds and were a sign of strong network ties.

This is exemplified in C4 where E is able to keep the conversation going by joking about the sensitive and inappropriate topics raised by A and exaggerating interest in the talk (C4: T30-43).

30. E: Umenifurahisha! Ati Rift Valley ni yetu yote na hatuko! ((calling))We Chebiil
32. E: Chebiil huoni central?
33. A: Cental nini?
34. E: Central province.
35. A: Imefanya nini?
36. E: Ni kidogo lakini wa[meja
37. A: [kamepasuka kako, kanapasuka kanaanguka Molo, kanapasuka kanaanguka hapo[Nakuru kanasema ni kwao, na hakatoki.
38. E: [Na huko kwenu kwani hawako?
39. A: wapi?
40. E: Nyanza.
41. A: Ai! Kwetu kisii uneza fikiri ni kwao. [maduka yote...
42. E: [Ah! Ah! Kwenu ni Nyanza. Kisii hakuna kwa [hesabu
43. A: [hata Kisii sisi ndio tunaleta hiyo ( ) huko.

Translation
30. E: You have amused me! That the whole of Rift Valley is ours and we are not there! ((calling))You Chebii!
31. A: =See the padlock ((Demonstrates)) [They had put on the state house door.
32. E: [Chebii don't you see central?
33. A: Central what?
34. E: Central province.
35. A: what has it done?
36. E: It is small but they [have filled it.
37. A: [It has burst and is in..., it bursts and lands in Molo, it bursts and lands there [Nakuru they say is their home, and they are not leaving.
38. E: [You mean they are not where you come from?
39. A: Where?
40. E: Nyanza.
41. A: No! In our place in Kisii you may think it is their land. [all shops...
42. E: [No! No! Your home is Nyanza. Kisii is not in the [equation
43. A: [even in kisii we are the ones who bring that ( ) there.

In this section of the conversation, E attends to A's positive face and therefore encourages him to continue with the conversation. When A realizes he is losing his conversational partners especially E, he saves their positive face by joking about his assertions (T19-21 and T91-106). The same is seen in C5:T36 where the speakers joke about a serious argument that is about to get out of hand and by so doing they avert a fight.

A feeling of solidarity and togetherness is created throughout C7 from the beginning, where the speakers have misgivings about some of the players in the lineup, to the point where they celebrate two goals scored in the space of five minutes, and then to
the end of the conversation, where they express reservations about the referee. They are able to do this by use of positive politeness strategies like group identity markers, agreement and support, encouragement, showing interest in a speaker and use of greetings.

4.2.3 Strategy 3: Negative Politeness

Negative politeness strategies are used to attend to a speaker’s negative face, “the desire to be unimpeded and free from imposition” (Tracy, 1990:210). The strategies include indirectness, hedging and questions, being pessimistic, use of obviating structures like the passives and general rules, and apologies. These strategies were mostly used in conversations where the network ties were weak and therefore the speakers try as much as possible not to impede on their partners freedom. C2 is good example of this use.

In C2, Participant A, C and D, are persuading C to be watching Kenyan football but he has no interest in it. They use negative politeness strategies like hedging, questions, and indirectness which bring out the social distance among the speakers. B uses hedging, pessimism, hesitation and asks questions to show his lack of interest in Kenyan football. He has been urged by the others to watch the game as they await an English Premier League match and he accepts it albeit grudgingly. So instead of being impolite with his criticism of the quality of the game and the players, he uses these negative politeness strategies to bring out his negative attitude towards Kenyan football (C2: T1-4, 9, 12, and 20, 66).

2. B: Aah! Sasa Kenya bwana, unaskia kwa nyumba wanapigana mawe.....[
3. C: [hii season ni moto! [Wamenunua players mingi sana.
4. A: [Lakini wamejikaza sahii wameanza kuamka (C2:T1-4)
Translation
1. A: Yes, Ulinzi are the ones in Red. They are playing against Zamalek. Be watching Kenyan football, don’t just be watching Arsenal.
2. B: Ah! Now Kenya football really? You will hear they are pelting one another with stones...
3. C: [This season is tough! [They have bought so many players.
4. A: [But they have put effort, they have started waking up.

Negative politeness strategies are also used in instances of uncertainty, and when a speaker seeks to understand something he was not sure of. This is seen in C3 where the speakers exploit the strategies of negative politeness because none of them is confident of his knowledge of the offside rule (C3:T71-76, T82, T95 and 111).

71. C: Ati mwalimu ya Man U alisema ile bao ya Everton [haikuwa offside=  
72. A: [Aai! Hata...  
73. C: =Ati team ya, team yenu ilipeana pass?  
74. A: Si ndio.  
75. C: ilipeana pass ama ilikuwa deflection?  
76. A: hiyo ni kama backpass.  
(C3:T71-76)

Translation
71. C: That the Man U teacher said the Everton goal [was not an offside=  
72. A: [No! Even...  
73. C: =That the team, your team passed the ball.  
74. A: Yes.  
75. C: Did they pass the ball or it was a deflection?  
76. A: That’s like a back pass.

From this conversation, the offside rule is a difficult and often controversial rule in football and therefore none of the speakers can confidently say he understands it. They are all seeking to understand the rule. This is the reason why negative politeness strategies are used by the speakers in this conversation.

4.2.4 Strategy 4: Performing an FTA Off Record

This strategy entails use of indirect utterances whose precise meaning has to be interpreted. The use of this strategy makes utterances have “more than one unambiguous attributable intention” (Brown and Levinson, 1978:73). Brown and
Levinson go on to argue that this strategy affords the speaker the opportunity to evade responsibility for the FTA by claiming if challenged by claiming that the interpretation of the FTA is wrong (1987:73). We can therefore argue that this strategy not only attends to a hearer’s negative face but also protects the speaker from being accused of impoliteness.

In C3, Speaker H comes in later into the conversation and only asks for a seat. He does not join in the conversation after sitting down. His way of asking for a seat can be interpreted in two ways: as an FTA performed baldly or off record. He asks in T69: “Nani anakaa hapa?” (Who is sitting here?). If taken baldy it is simply an impolite question, “Who is sitting here?” But if looked at as performing an FTA off record, then the interpretation of the question is that he is asking to be allowed to sit on the chair. He is asking “Can I sit here if there is nobody sitting there?” This therefore calls on the listener to use his ethos (Brown and Levinson, 1978:248) to interpret the question appropriately. This study interpreted it as an FTA performed off record.

4.2.5 Strategy 5: Avoiding Performing an FTA

This is the last strategy in the Politeness theory and is considered the most polite. It involves simply not performing an FTA. From the conversations analysed it was noted that this strategy was least used and sometimes it is debatable whether in fact a speaker avoids performing an FTA or performs an FTA by avoiding to perform another. The only evidence for this strategy is silence. In C1, those who support the team that has conceded a goal like I, J, and K remain silent when C dominates the conversation and taunts them. They do this to save damaged face because of their team conceding a goal but by doing so they avoid performing FTAs that would threaten C’s face. The same is repeated in C4 where a number of speakers (B, C and
D) are annoyed with A for the attacks on their ethnic community, but instead of arguing with him, they remain silent.

In C3 Speaker B (T10) and D (T17) tell the waiter to switch on the generator now that there is no power or else the customers will leave. The waiter ignores both calls. He does not switch on the generator nor participate in the conversation. This can be looked at as a form of non verbal communication, a politeness strategy of not doing an FTA. The waiter is at work so he must maintain his position, status and distance or else he will not have any control over the patrons. He does not let the patrons dictate to him what he should do but he does not tell them this; he simply goes about his work in silence. His silence is interpreted by the speakers as a refusal and no one urges him to switch on the generator again. From these examples, it is clear that some men avoid joining in parts of the conversation to save their damaged face and also to avoid performing FTAs.

4.3 Reasons and Motivations for the Choice of Language Patterns

SturtzSreetharan (2006:71) posits that the motivation for employing polite forms varies widely across contexts, topics and speaker aims. This research found that men’s choice of language and politeness strategies in social places is governed by the following principles:

4.3.1 Nature and Purpose of Conversation

The fact that men in this study view the conversation as simply part of the social pastime contributes to the choice of language made. The conversations are viewed as small talk and part of the football entertainment. Because of this, the FTAs used do not carry the same weightiness they would carry in a more serious conversation. The speakers are expected to interpret the language as lighthearted and humorous.
Therefore, men either use positive politeness strategies more or perform the FTAs baldly. Negative politeness strategies are used in cases where a speaker is uncertain of his claims in an argument or discussion as seen in C3. This is in agreement with Meng et al (2007:198 who posits that what is perceived as rude, disruptive and impolite by women may be acceptable and normal in male interaction.

4.3.2 Context
The nature of the context in which the conversations are done contributes to the nature and the direction the conversation will take. As Adegbija (1989:58) argues, “utterances are interpretable as polite or impolite within the framework of a particular pragmatic context or situation.” The informal and casual context of the conversations studied allows men to use language that would be otherwise considered impolite and indecorous in another context.

4.3.3 Network Strength
When the network is strong and there is minimal distance among the speakers, the conversations are competitive, argumentative and the least politeness strategies are used as seen in C1, C4 and C7. The speakers exploit the closeness among themselves to dominate the conversation, use abusive and sexist language, to be rude and sarcastic, to ignore other participants in the conversation, to use names and nicknames, and to interrupt negatively. The strong network ties are also marked by the use of group identity markers and a reference to one another using the plural “we”. On the other hand, social distance is marked by evenly distributed turns, negative politeness strategies, positive interruptions and absence of abusive, rude and sarcastic language.
4.3.4 Masculinity

Men express their masculinity by the choice of language. Sexist language, rudeness and abusive language are an expression of this masculinity. The men want to be seen as tough and strong and therefore associate any weakness and failure with women. This masculinity is also expressed by avoidance of personal topics like the family and home.

4.3.5 Current Political Events

Current and recent political events in the society provide a rich source of conversational topics for making jokes and taking stances. Men avoid personal topics and concentrate on politics and sports as an expression of their masculinity. The current political events also lead to ethnic stereotyping as seen in C4. Silence is used as a politeness strategy to save both a Speaker’s and a Hearer’s positive face in cases of ethnic stereotyping. In such instances silence is sign of social insecurity by a participant. The speaker feels insecure because his ethnic community is viewed negatively by the majority in the setting of the study. This ethnic stereotyping denies him the right to participate in the conversation from a level point with the other speakers. As Lakoff 2005:178 posits, politeness is said to be useful in deciding whether others are in or out, (In Ayodabo 2007). We can therefore conclude that ethnic stereotyping in conversations is a way of deciding who is in and who is out socially.

4.3.6 Content

Men always avoid personal topics, feelings, home and the family in conversations among themselves. This is in agreement with Meng et al. (2007:196) who conclude that when men talk to men the contents focus on competition and testing, sports, aggression and doing things. The reason why a sport remains one of men’s favorite
topics, they add, may be found in the qualities people cherish in playing sports. Historically, sports have been the formation of male identities, glorifying the qualities of aggression, determination, control, leadership, teamwork and physical fitness. They go on to say that men usually avoid sensitive topics of emotion and personal feelings. They rarely mention their wives and family. The findings of this study attest to the validity of this argument. The choice of topics is therefore a sign of masculinity.

4.3.7 Form and Function Asymmetry
The study data agrees with post modernist models of language which see the functions or meanings of any utterance as highly fluid and context dependent. Swann (2000:239) argues that meanings are not simply 'in the language' but are negotiated between the speakers. She develops her argument from earlier studies by Holmes (1988) and Cameron (1988) who discovered that utterances are multi functional and there is no one-to-one relationship between form and function. This is true of men's conversations in this study. For example the use of sarcasm is looked at by Brown and Levinson (1978) as a performance of an FTA indirectly and considered more polite than a joke. But in these conversations sarcasm is quite biting and not an expression of politeness at all. The use of abusive language is also to be interpreted by the hearers as lighthearted expression of masculinity and not a deliberate intention to hurt others.

4.3.8 Knowledge
Knowledge of a topic of discussion determines the level of participation of a speaker and the choice of politeness strategies in the conversation. Some speakers avoid participating in a conversation about a topic they have little knowledge about. C4 exemplifies this. The conversation is about the off side rule in football and how it was applied to favour a team in a previous game. The speakers exploit the strategies of
negative politeness because none of them is confident of his knowledge of the offside rule. It is a difficult and often controversial rule in football so none of the speakers can confidently say he understands it. They are all seeking to understand the rule. This is the reason why negative politeness strategies outweigh the positive politeness strategies in this conversation.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.0 Introduction
This study was set out to explore the use of the language by men in casual conversations in social places in Eldama Ravine town in Kenya and has identified the emerging patterns in men’s linguistic behaviour in casual conversations, analysed how the emerging patterns compare and contrast with the tenets of the Politeness Theory and determined the motivations for men’s choice of language patterns in these conversations. The general theoretical literature on this subject and specifically in the context of Africa is inconclusive on several vital questions about intragroup dynamics in casual conversations. These questions on men’s politeness, dominance and participation in conversations motivated this study to endeavour to shed light on the dynamics of men’s conversations in social places and specifically in places where men watch live broadcasts of football matches as a social pastime activity.

As a conclusion to the study, this chapter ties together, integrates and synthesizes the various issues raised in the previous chapters and provides answers to the research questions. It also identifies the theoretical and policy implications of the study with respect to the overall study area and finally provides directions for further research on the area of language, gender and politeness.

5.1 Summary of Findings
The main empirical findings of this study are discussed in details in Chapter 4. This section will synthesize the empirical findings to answer the three research questions:
i. What are the emerging patterns in men's linguistic behaviour in casual conversations in social places?

ii. How do the emerging patterns in men's conversations in social places compare or contrast with the tenets of the politeness theory?

iii. What are the reasons and motivations for the choice of language by men among themselves in social places?

The study has established that men's language in social places, and specifically in Eldama Ravine town, follows certain emerging patterns. To begin with, some men dominate the conversations or sections of the conversations they are involved in while others remain silent. Dominance in the conversations studied was seen as an expression of emotions or a way of celebrating victory or the defeat of an opponent (C1). It was also a way of displaying knowledge that a speaker believes the other speakers do not posses (C3). When personal arguments were raised, a few speakers participated and therefore they ended up dominating the conversation (C5). Moreover some speakers raised sensitive and taboo topics and this put off other speakers and gave them the opportunity to dominate the conversation (C4). (cf chapter 4).

Some speakers remained silent throughout the conversations or for some parts of the conversations while some declined to reply to questions asked. During the conversations, silence was interpreted in two ways. Firstly, it was a form of non verbal communication used by speakers to avoid performing an FTA and also to save the hearer's face. It was also interpreted in other instances as an FTA to the speaker because it is a way of refusing to indulge him and therefore threatens his positive face.
Men also interrupted one another in all the conversations studied. Interruption was found to be an inevitable weakness in men’s conversation regardless of the network strength or social distance although there was more interruption in cases of strong network ties. Interruption was viewed as either negative or positive. Positive interruption was used to offer conversational support to a speaker by way of agreeing, correcting, prompting or stressing his point by agreeing with him. It was therefore a form of positive politeness as it attends to the hearer’s positive face. On the other hand negative interruptions damaged the hearer’s face as they were used to express negative emotions, to disagree, to seek clarification, to end an argument, or change a topic of discussion. Negative interruption therefore impeded on the speaker’s desire to express himself.

It was also discovered that men use abusive, rude and sexist language in social places when the network ties are very strong and when emotions run high as seen in C1, C3, C4 and C7. The men associated everything negative or weak with femininity. Most of the times the insulting words are said lightheartedly and therefore do not carry the meaning they would have in another context but what remains clear is that to the men, weaknesses and failure should be associated with femininity.

The speakers in social places also use jokes and nicknames in the conversations to create humour and make fun of their conversational partners. This relieves the tension created by the games being watched and the arguments they engage in. Again, jokes are used mostly among speakers with strong network ties as seen in C1, C4, C5 and C7. In times of happiness, the men would compliment one another for the good performance of their teams and use reference terms that created solidarity and oneness in the group. Sarcasm was also used to perform FTAs off the record.
Some of the conversations were not addressed to the other listeners but to the TV as an expression of emotions and their wishes about the match being watched. Some parts of the conversations were punctuated with pauses, exclamations and interjections which also communicated the speakers’ strong emotions and their concentration to the engrossing game.

The strategies used above by men in the conversation agree with the tenets of the politeness theory. By use of the strategies, men endeavored to choose from the five politeness strategies the strategy they considered appropriate for the moment in the conversations. The men used politeness strategy 1 (performing the FTA baldly) most frequently in the conversations especially in strong networks and in moments when emotions run high because of the nature of the conversation as seen in C4. When men chose to be more polite in such instances, they attended to one another’s positive face by use of strategy 2 which is the use of positive politeness strategies like group identity markers, compliments, involving each other in the conversation, prompting a speaker, agreeing with a speaker, showing interest in what a speaker is saying through back channels, making jokes, and encouragements.

Negative politeness strategies like indirectness, hedging and questions, being pessimistic, use of obviating structures like the passives, general rules, and apologies were mostly used in conversations where the network ties were weak and therefore the speakers try as much as possible not to impede on their partners freedom. This is clearly seen in C2.

The speakers rarely performed their FTAs off record and a very few avoided performing the FTAs. This was only done in instances where the speakers were not
well known to one another or where the speakers avoided being part of the conversations to save face.

In conclusion, the speakers' choices above were motivated by certain factors. The nature and purpose of the conversation which is purely small talk as a social pastime activity and part of the football entertainment played a major role in these choices. The context and the strength of the network were also relevant because the rules of conversation were relaxed in cases of strong network ties and also because of the conversations taking place in a social place.

In their endeavour to maintain and express their masculinity, men also made certain choices like the use of sexist and abusive language. Current political events in the country contributed to the content and direction of the talk. Because form and function are not always symmetrical, certain forms of language were used for different functions. Lastly, a speaker's knowledge of the topic of discussion determined their level of participation and in very few cases, a speaker's vocation dictated their contribution to the conversations.

5.2 Theoretical and Policy Implication of Findings

The findings of this study are consistent with the tenets of the politeness theory and other research on language, gender and politeness. The study agrees with Sturt Steetharan (2006) that the motivations for employing polite forms vary across contexts, topics and speaker aims. As discussed above, men’s choice of politeness of politeness strategies was informed by the context, the topic and their varied aims. In their choice of politeness strategies they were either performing or avoiding performing FTAs. This study further offers insight into the dynamics of men’s
conversations in social places and therefore improves our knowledge of what motivates men's choice of language.

The study has helped shift the focus of gender and politeness research from individual utterances to the constructed nature of talk within a particular context, (Mills 2003) and therefore provided greater insights into the way men's conversations are constructed in social places. The results of this study form a basis from which further research on intra-group dynamics in men's conversations can be carried out. As Kiesling (2007:653) has argued, most empirical and comparative work on language and gender, men are not the gender that is focused on in explanations; rather it is women whose behaviour is explained or whose perspective is taken. This study therefore offers explanations on men's language from which further research can be built.

Despite the fact that the feminist movement began decades ago and a lot of efforts have been made to improve the place of women in the society, this study is proof that women are still looked at as the weaker sex and looked down upon in men's conversations. The study is therefore a challenge to the society to work on improving the perception men have of women. Sports and politics are still considered men's fields in this area of study. Women should therefore be given more opportunities to participate in these fields and change this perception.

Lastly, this study can also be used by the National Cohesion and Integration Commission and Kenyans at large to fight the ethnic stereotyping that is still prevalent in men's conversations. As seen in some of the conversations, some speakers felt threatened because of their ethnicity and political affiliations. The study
can therefore offer insight into ethnic based politics for the Kenyan nation to learn from and seek better and inclusive ways of carrying out political business.

5.4 Recommendations

Men need to make efforts to increase their knowledge of the other gender and develop gender sensitivity. There is therefore need to improve the perception of women by men in their conversations. The recent past has seen a lot of improvement and involvement of women in sports. This is proof that weaknesses in sports are not a preserve of women. It is therefore important for men to look at women positively and see their strengths too. This can be done by men also taking interest in women’s sports.

Secondly there is need to acknowledge the validity of different cultures and to accept them. The effect of tribal politics is still seen in the conversations. When men’s conversations go to politics, ethnicity springs up and destroys the strong social bonds. There is need for a change in this. Men should not look at one another from a tribal point of view as this does not help the national integration cause. Ethnic stereotyping should be overcome through civic education.

Learning to control emotions and therefore avoiding vulgar language is also necessary in men’s conversations. Men should learn not to vent their negative emotions through vulgar language. Being other-oriented or listener oriented and paying more attention to the other people’s feelings and face needs is necessary in men’s conversations.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

Mills (2003) says that the area of linguistic impoliteness has rarely been analysed in its own terms. It has always been studied together with politeness. There is need for further research on this area of impoliteness. Secondly, both verbal and non verbal
FTAs affect the face of a Hearer and a speaker. Research has dwelled so much on verbal politeness and left out non verbal politeness and impoliteness. Research should focus on the non verbal aspects of politeness.

Thirdly, “Sarcastic politeness” or camouflaged politeness where a speaker does not explicitly violate politeness principles of politeness is a rich area for a qualitative research.

In addition, much of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory dwells on how a speaker addressed the face needs of a hearer. Little has been done on how a speaker addresses his own face needs. There is therefore need to focus more on the speaker.

Lastly, research should adopt modern theories of politeness (Eelen 2001, Mills 2003 and Watts 2003) that have been critical of the Politeness Theory and attempted to improve on it. Such studies would provide more insight on the topic of politeness and impoliteness in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis.

5.6 Conclusion
In spite of generalizations that have been made from previous researchers that men always dominate conversations they are involved in, interrupt more often and are less polite than women, this study has clearly shown that not all men dominate conversations they are involved in and that men also show politeness in different ways and forms from those used by women. The study has also shown that men who allow others to dominate conversations are neither feminine nor weak but do so because of the intra-group dynamics that govern the nature and direction of the conversation. The study therefore concludes that men’s conversations have a pattern and have forms of politeness peculiar to the social networks men belong to.


APPENDICES

A.1 TRANSCRIPTIONS OF CONVERSATIONS

CONVERSATION 1
LENGTH: 12 MINS

PARTICIPANTS: MORE THAN 10

((Men watching a football match. Purely men audience. A very tense and animated conversation.))

((Murmurs all over))

1. A: Everton wameanza (  )
2. B: [Nani, bure hii kabisa. (Several speakers shout: Sawa, bure, haya, sawa)]
4. B: Nani?
5. A: Valencia?
6. B: [Ameumia. [P2]
7. C: [Hapo sasa kosa ni coach= (Inaudible murmurs) =hiyo ndio idea yake. Anambia watu watoe ball mpaka inje. Kwani hao ni defenders? @ Si unaanza hapo kwa box? [P1]
8. D: Wanaogopa. [P2]
9. B: Kwanza hasara ile iko hapa ni Gary Neville ...
10. A: [Na ni kama Everton hawajaona. Hapo kwa Neville, hiyo wing ya Neville... [P2]
11. D: [Mmm. [P2]
13. D: Aail
   (Silence) [P5]
   Several speakers exclaim in surprise: Yes. Sawa, Sawa, sawa Sawa. ( In Reference to a player whose short is torn and is forced to change into another on the touchline.)
   @
16. C: Wacha, na ya Rooney ya kwenda usiku? [P1](in Reference to A player’s alleged relationship with a prostitute)
   @
17. D: Nyeusi ni namna hiyo. ( Refering to the player’s genitals)
18. C: Wapi coach, watu wanaenda mchana, sio usiku. [P1]
20. E: Hiyo ni yellow.
22. E: Kujifanya amegongwa. [P2]
25. C: Kumbe hata Evans ako?= xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
27. A: Ah! Huyo amenini ...
   (pause)
   ((Several speakers shout:Oh! Ah!)) xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
29. C: Alikuaga Man U. Sasa nashindwa venye watafunga na yeve mwenyewe ni Manchester. (United) [P4]
30. E: Anahepa mtu anabakisha mkono.
31. C: Huyo!
32. A: Twende!
   (Several speakers shout GOAL!) xxxxxxxxxxxx
33. B: Ndiyo hiyo! Ndiyo hiyo!
34. D: Ndiyo hiyo!
35. F: Sasa bado ngapi? [P1]
36. C: Kama wewe ni mtu wa Man U inua mkono. [P1]
   (I lifts up his hand)
38. D: Ya kwanza ikakua miss, ya pili?
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
41. F: Amen.
42. C: [Tumetafuta sana.]
43. E: [Pateni! [P1]
   (Several speakers exclaim: Waal Waal! Waal!) xxxxxxxxxx
44. D: Hii timu ni kali!
45. A: Huyo Pienaar ameguzwa mguu.
46. B: Eeeh ((Seeking clarification)) [P3]
47. A: Ameumia mguu lakini ...
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
48. C: Hii kitu tumetafuta sana bwana! Ilikuwa ni aibu tufungwe na venye tumetafuta hii kitu.
   @
49. D: sasa ni kutandaza boli.
50. C: Sasa ni tupige mtu ngeta.
51. F: Mtungi tatu imefuata hivi.
   (inaudible chatter from all around)
52. C: Hata leo hatutaki Man U. Tunataka Chelsea. [P1]
54. B: [Watakujua mbele eee.][P2]
55. F: Ah!
56. E: Hakuna hasira hapa ... [P1]
57. C: [Huyo ndio uzuri wa Man U. When they are under pressure ni kutupa mawe. [P4]
58. H: ((Calling)) Kibet!
59. C: Eee
60. H: Tuko pamoja [P2]
61. C: lakini uliza watu wa Man U. ni wangapi. [P4]
64. H: Eee. ((Agreement)) [P2]
65. C: Sasa Van Der Saar ako anaweka wapi?
66. B: Ameshindwa.
67. C: Huyo ni Mamatov. [P1]
68. A: Huyu ni mjinga. Wapi Rooney?
69. C: Anaitwa Damaris Mamatov [P1]
90. B: Leo town imenyamaza mzuri. [P4]
91. C: We Koross!
92. G: Eeh
93. C: Mahali unaona Sang, Mbunge wa Sirwa, Mpe salamu zangu. [P2]
94. B: Kibet usichokoze Sang. [P1]
   @ (6 sec)
95. A: Saa hii hawezi haribika. Umejua saa hii ameumia hawezi ongea. Wakati game
   imeisha...
96. C: [Ako under pressure, @ hawezi sema kitu. [P2]
97. A: =Wakati game imeisha usimwambie kitu. Saa hii uneza ongea lakini wakati game
   imeisha achana nay eye.
   (Laughter and murmuring)
98. C: Endelea kuotea tu Damaris. Hakuna shida. [P1]
100. F: Mimi nataka security.
101. C: Ah! We usijali [tuko kifua mbele][P2]
102. A: [Bado! Usijali, mabao inakuja.[P2]
103. C: Aai Pilato, tupa mawe.[P1]
   (5sec)
104. C: Ah! Mtu anasukumwa na nani hasemi kitu.
   (15 sec)
   Several speakers: xxxxxxxxxxx GOAL!
105. D: Ndio hiyo!
106. A: ilikuwa nzuri!
108. C: Ameweka poa. Hapo hatuna maneno. Uzuri ... we Koross((calling)) [P2]
109. G: Eeh
110. C: Kwa hii meehi nani aka mbele? Si ni one one. [P4]
111. G: Eeeh ni one one. [P2]
   @
   Kumbe ni one one. Ah! Sina wasiwasi. [P4]
113. I: Kelele ni ya nini? Mtu angoje timu yake. [P1]
114. F: Uliza kwanza vuvuzela ilienda South Africa?[P1]
115. C: Mose ujue nimestuka sana kukomboa kumbe ni one one.[P4]
116. I: hata hiyvo munyamaze saa hii. [P1]
117. C: Hatuwezi nyamaza na tunajitetea. [P1]
118. F: Eh! [That's a foul.
119. C: [Weka kitu, patia yeye kitu. Mzee kauka amekuja sana. Yes, We referee patia
   yeye kitu. [P1]
   ((Clapping as a player is booked))
120. C: Mzee kauka amekuja sana. [P1]
121. F: Mzee kama wewe with experience na hauna adabu! Tabia mbaya. [P1]
122. C: Mzee kauka, Mzee kauka kuja polepole. [P1]
123. I: Wazee wako nyumbani. [P1]
   (6 sec) [P5]
124. D: Louis Nani ako wapi?
125. C: Ah! Mami Loice? Loice hayuko.[P1]
   (10 secs)
126. E: Hata hiyo referee haoni?
   (5 secs) [P5]
107. D: Dakika mbili
108. H: Two minutes!
((murmurs))
110. J: Unajua mabao yote inatoka kwa hii wing, [hii [P2]
111. D: Eee [P3]
   (7 sec)
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
113. D: Wewe!
114. B: Alikuwa ameiona
115. A: Alikuwa ameweke ndani [P2]
117. A: Central defender hapo. [Central defender anaacha mtu hapa.]
118. C: [Hangeona, [hangeona.
119. A: Hata hiyo bao ingine unaona imetoka hapo katikati. Central defender ndio ana 
   hiyo shida.
120. G: Hii timu inanifurahisha. [P4]
121. C: Eeh [P3]
123. C: Hii timu inakufurahisha? [P2]
124. G: Eeh
125. C: Najua hata senator anaumia. [P1]
   @
126. K: Hii ugoingovern yako ya busaa hii. @ Hii ugoingovern yako umelete ya busaa. [P1]
128. E: Ni mbaya, kwa nini unasema sii mbaya?[P1]
129. G: Chapa yeye kof 
   ((To a player who is angry with an opponent for hurting him))
130. B: Eeh hiyo mjinga auende kinyozi. [P1]
132. B: anakaa kitu kama forest. Anaona anakaa vizuri kukaa hivyo? [P3]
133. E: Ni design. [P2]
   @
134. E: hiyo game sii mbaya.
135. G: hakuna game imechezwa hapa. [P1]
136. H: Wameangukia. [P1]
137. E: hakuna kitu ya kuangukia, tumecheza classic. [P1]
138. C: na ni ngapi kwa ngapi?[P4]
140. A: penye Man U watawashindia, kuna central defender 
   hapa kama ingekuwa
   Rooney angekuwa amefunga. Kuna mtu hapa katikati anaacha striker. Mko na 
   striker na anapata mpiira. Na akasimama nyuma ya huyu striker.
141. D: Ama alikuwa anataka kuweka off? [P3]
142. A: ((Demonstrating))Unaona anasimama hivi, Yeye ako hivi, na striker ako hapa.
   [Sasa huyo akapata mpiira na kuweka ndani.] 
143. B: Saa ile tutatoa Neville na Berbatov... Hii wajama tutashinda.
144. A: ... Defender mwengine angekaa mbele, yeye akuje nyuma.
145. F: Tuko pamoja ((To E)) [P2]
146. H: Si unaona hata Kibet amenyamaza. [P3]
147. C: Tuko pamoja.[P2]

END
CONVERSATION 2
PARTICIPANTS: BELOW 5
LENGTH: 6 MINUTES

((Men In the middle of a conversation))

7. C: [hii season ni moto! [Wamenunua players mingi sana. [P4]
8. A: [Lakini warnejikaza sahii wameanza kuamka[P4]
9. D: Imerudi kama kitambo siku ya kina ...[P4]
10. C: [Enzi ya 96/97 FC Leopards na Gor.
12. C: [lakini 2000 ililingia vibaya sana...
13. B: [Sioni kama nitarudi game ya Kenya [kabisa. [P3]
15. D: Sofapaka?
17. C: ((Reading from the TV screen)) J. Odhiambo.
18. A: Kenya iko mpaka na professional players, wananunua wachezaji kutoka congo, ...
   [Nigeria
19. C: [Uganda, Nigeria. [P2]
20. B: Oh! Wako hapa? [P2]
22. C: At least mmoja ako FC leopards na wengine wako Sofapaka. Kuna congo wawili...
23. D: [Kuna ya Uganda tena...
24. B: [Mbona basi wanachukua nguo yenye, yani Jesrsey ya kuchezea ni ile ...!
   ((Exclaiming)) [P3]
25. C: nakuambia hii season wamechanuka, wamenunua wengi.
26. B: Aail
27. C: Off side wote! Ulinzi ni kali.
28. B: Na hii sasa ni rounding ama bado...? [P3]
29. C: Eeeh rounding.
   (6 sec)
30. D: Wamechezewa trap ingine kali!
   (6 sec)
31. A: Hapa ni nyumbani sasa lazima tushinde. Wasiposhinda...
32. B: [Hapa ni Nairobi? [P2]
34. C: Unajua misri ni theatre.
35. A: Hiyo imerudishwa kwa cech.
36. B: aah! Aah! -
38. B: Arab contractors.
40. C: piga inje basi.
41. A: huyu ndio Scholes wao. [P2]
42. D: Apul.
43. C: Apul.
44. B: Hakaoni.
45. A: alikuwa anatafuta mtu huko kwa wing. [P4]
46. C: wanaandika majina ya players?
47. A: Wakienda kucheza ya Africa ni kama wanaandika.
48. C: Sasa wanaandika hata ya kuenda inje.
49. D: hey!
   ((Silence))
50. B: Mbona defenders wako confident sana? [P3]
   (8 sec)
52. B: Oh! Eeh!
53. C: kaka huyo alikuwa macho bangi bangi?
55. B: Ako Ulinzi?
56. A: Eeeh.
57. B: At least you are making it interesting! [P2]
58. A: Eeh! Kijana alikuwa kwa hii na alicheza ligi ya last season yote, alikuanga kwa hii nini...
59. B:[ulinzi.
60. A: amecheza hata saa hiirado ako ulinzi.
61. D: lakini hakuwa anajiita kaka. [P1]
62. A: Anajiita kaka Brian, ni hivyo anajiita hapa. [P1]
63. D: huyu jamaa alikuanga ya hapa?
64. C: sasa uzee imemaliza yeye?
65. A: Saalii ni mzee hata huwezi...eeh...((pause)). Kwa premier league udefend hivyo si hiyo mpira inachukuliwa?
   @
68. B: Defence iko comfortable pia. [P2]
69. C: Ona venye atapenya.
70. B: na si hawa ni wazee? [P3]
72. A: Si hii ni karibu half ya team ya Egypt? [P3]
73. D:[ nine, nine, nine. [P1]
74. C: Sio half[P1], ni wote, si ni Ten? [P3]
75. D: wamesema Nine. [P1]
76. C: ni nine?
77. D: Nine wenye wana...
78. C: [wanachezea Egypt.
79. D: umejua team ya Egypt wengi hawachezi inje. Wanachezeanga club yao tu.
80. C: Mido alipotelea wapi bwana? [P2]
81. D: Mido nafikiri akooo... hiyo team ingine ya Egypt.
82. C: hapana. [P1] na si alikuwa amekua hapa? [P3]
83. D; alirudi.
84. C: na alikuwanga wapi? Middlesbrough ama wapi? [P3]
85. D: eeh alikuwa Middlesbrough.
86. B: Na huyu ni nani? [P1]
87. A: simjiui.
89. D: Gor Mahia! ((surprised)) [P2]
91. B: Eeeh! [P2]
92. C: nah ii ya leo? [P3]
93. A: sijaona gazeti ya leo.
94. C: Leo wamechora kwa nyuma tena, na hii shati ya red.
95. A: ((Watching the game)) Aiil! ((disapproval))
96. C: Kenya wajichunge kabisa.
98. D: [Watabreak. [P2]
99. C: Mmmh!
100. A:Ama angerudi ule mwingine aende. [P3]
102. A: hii uwanja ni ndogo.
103. B: ((laughs)) Sii ndogo. [P1]
104. A: inapigwa na keeper mpaka huko inje.
105. B: mpira ikigonga flat surface inaruka. - Ikigonga nini... hard surface. [P2]
106. D: Jama anamiss ball!
107. C: Ulinzi wako faster sana.

END.
CONVERSATION 3

PARTICIPANTS: BTN 5 AND 10.

DURATION: 11 minutes

((There is a blackout and conversations begin as viewers await power))

1. A: [Tottenham tu.
2. B: [na Liverpool.
3. C: Na hiyo mbili ... 
4. D: [ Bado Man U wako na kibarua.
5. E: Na Man City.
7. D: [ Na ... ( 
8. C: Tunalinganisha Tottenham na Man City kwetu. Man City walitucheza. [P2]
9. E: man city walijitetea ati tumefungwa ((tuko nyumbani))
10. B: (To a waiter) We Sebit utamaliza wateja, wateja wanaenda... [P1]
11. C: [mi nakwambia ile game naogopa iko mbele. Ile naogopa ni Tottenham, hakuna ingine.
12. E: Man U ni joto. [P3]
13. C: Tottenham ndio mi naogopa.
15. C: si tunakutana nao next week. [P3]
17. D: [(To waiter)) Si generator iko? [P4]
22. B: Aah! Watakuwa Stamford ... 
23. C: [lie game ya kwanza muli ...
24. B: [Hawajacheza na Chelsea. [P1] (Hawajacheza na Chelsea)
25. D: Aah Chelsea hawajacheza nao, walicheza na Man City.
26. C: Game ya kwanza walidraw one, walienda ...
   Several Voices: [Walikuwa na Man City.
27. C: Basi hiyo game wanezalazimisha, wako nyumbani wakora.
29. D: [Kama uko nyumbani ama away ni sawa. Tuone ya leo kwanza. [P1]
30. C: tunataka tuone. [P2]
   Unajua hata hao managers anaangalia bado game kumi na tano. Anasema nataka point ngapi kutoka hii game. Sasa ni muhimu uangalie mbele. Inaitwa forward planning.
32. C: nataka tu wapee Man City bao mbili alafu wafuate hao nyuma. Umejua wamezoea kunyangânya watu mabao.
33. D: nani? [P1]
34. C: Man U.
35. A: Kupea Man U [bao mbili?
38. B: Blackpool, Blackpool, ilikuwa blackpool.
    ((inaudible talk))
39. E: Kama ni Arsenal watalipisha...
40. B: [Hapana! [P1]
41. E: sababu arsenal wanaendelea kutafuta .
43. B:[Hiyo ni ya kuua hao sasa.
44. C: [referee alifanya ujinga. Mtu anakatwa kwa box na anasema play on. Na angepeana hiyo penalty Man U kwisha.
45. B: Imagine huyo jamaa alisukumwa literally...
46. D: [Nani?
47. C: Ati wajama wakasema ati rules ya referee inasema ukipeana penalty wakati team ingine iko iko down ni ku-demoralize [team.
48. B: [hakuna kitu kama hiyo. [P1]
50. F: hata timu kama imefungwa bao nane wakifanya makosa penalty inapeanwa.
    [Makosa ni makosa] [P3]
51. D:[hata kama ni red mnapewa. [P2]
52. C: unajua ilikuwa ni penalty clean?
54. F: Ni makosa na inapeanwa. [P1]
55. B: ((to H)) ujue kuna kitu hata kwa roho yako haiwezi toka. [P4]
    ((Laughter and inaudible talking))
56. D: ukiniambia nani achukue league nitaadhaliwa Chelsea kuliko Man U. [P4]
57. C: Na referee ya Arsenal ni nani? Kwa sababu wanakazwanga na watu.[Kwanza Heya juzi]
59. C: [Mtu anapewa red na alikuwa flanks huko!
60. G: Wacha mwalamu akuje aongee... [P3]
61. B: [Aaah! Mwalimu ni ya... [P4]
62. C: [mwalamu anasema nini?
63. B: Hiyo inaitwa mashahidi ya uongo. False prophets! [P1]
64. F: Hakuna offside kama hiyo. Yaani... [P1]
65. D: [Ati anasema nani akuje aongee? @ [P3]
66. F: hiyo sheria yao hakuna. [P1]
67. A: Hakuna. [P1]
68. C: Hiyo sheria ya juzi tulikataa, unless alete rule book nisome. [P1]
69. H: nani anakaa hapa? (pointing to a chair) [P4]
71. C:Ati mwalimu ya Man U alisema ile bao ya Everton [haikuwa offside=
72. A: [Aail Hata...
73. C: =Ati team ya, team yenu ilipeana pass? [P3]
74. A: Si ndio. [P1]
75. C: ilipeana pass ama ilikuwa deflection? [P3]
76. A: hiyo ni kama backpass. [P3]
77. C: hapana hiyo ni... [P1]
78. A: [Ni kama ile Arshavin alijifunga.
79. G: bass, bass, Macho, Mtu wa Arsenal amesema. [P2]
80. B: Mato wacha nikuambie kitu moja.
81. G: Mato, macho, Wel
82. B: Saa zile wanapima off, the moment wanarelease ball hivi, kama hajakufikia na uko off, firimbi inapigwa. Sii lazima ikufikie ndio waseme uko off. The moment wakikurilisia ball... [P3]
83. G: [We macho (Calling). Ni kama ile ball...
85. B: [Yes, sikatai. [P2]
86. C: Sawa tu, mi nakubali. [P2] Lakini initially, initially mpira ikitolewa likuwa wapi? Si alikuwa offside? [P3]
87. A: [alikuwa offside. [P2]
88. G: [alikuwa offside we. Kabla hiyo ball hajendekana akapeana. ..
89. B: [Mpira kupigwa tu hivi, offside.
91. A: si bado alikuwa offside? [P3]
93. A: Defender ya Arsenal.
94. F: That is the problem, ndio sababu sio offside. [P1]
95. G: [Wacha nikuulize, na kuna mampira yenye ikifikia ule jamaa ndio firimbi inapigwa?]
96. F: [so hapo wanafuata the last time iliguzwa. [P3]
97. C: kama kuna sheria kama hiyo then the offside rule is useless.
98. F: Aah ni hivyo,( ) [P1]
99. C: hiyo inakuwa, it gets now much complicated.
100. F: offside ni kama...
101. D: [All referees are human. [P4]
102. F: ingekuwa ni player wa everton ingekuwa offside.
103. C: na kama hiyo freekick haikuguswa. [P3]
104. F: Free kick?
105. C: hiyo free kick ilipigwa na hakuna mchezaji aliguza.
108. F: Hiyo ni offside. Lakini freekick ikienda mpaka ndani hakuna off. [P3]
109. D: [No interference.
110. F: [Eh! Hakuna.
111. C: Hiyo sheria haijasink kwa akili yangu. Naona kama ni kunyang'anya mtu goal. [P3]

112. D: Si hata Moyes alikubali ilikuwa ni offside.

113. C: Kwa sababu sababu alikuwa anajaribu kuclear, si alikuwa akijaribu kuclear. Si keeper aneza shika hiyo ball. [P3]

114. F: Eeeh. [P2]

115. C: so why do you count it as a backpass kama keeper aneza shika? [P2]


117. C: [Haikuwa backpass sababu alishika hivi ikaenda deflection. [P1] Si sasa goal keeper akashika hiyo ball. Si ndio? [P3]

118. F: ((Nods in agreement)) [P2]

119. C: Itacountiwa si backpass. Now why do you count that backpass whenever a player is interfering? [P1]

((Inaudible conversation as power comes back and TV is switched on))

120. F: Lakini kawaida yea, kuna zingine wanafanyanga makosa kwa kila sheria kuna loophole. Sasa kuna ule mwenye atatumia hiyo mwanya kwa hiyo sheria na inafavour mtu Fulani. [P4]

121. C: Si ndio. [P2]


123. D: si unaona anajribu kuleta slow motion mpaka penye, hakuwa amefika. [P3]

124. F: Sasa ni ile fifty fifty, hapo huyo atajudge hiv, i huyo hivyo.

125. D: Hapo ndio huyu jamaa alitufunga.

126. B: Hee[P2]

127. C: Ako na dude bwana! Huyo ndio ameuzwa thirty five million pounds.


130. A: [Liverpool wako sawa.] [P4]

131. F: [Ujue shida ya Chelsea sii hata mbele. Shida ya Chelsea ni midfield. ::}
CONVERSATION 4
PARTICIPANTS: BTN 5 AND 10
DURATION 12 MINS

(The participants are waiting for a game to begin and start a conversation on a sensitive topics of politics, post-election violence and ethnicity.)

2. B: Eeh! [P5]
3. A: Kalenjins! [they are too many, lakini hakuna kitu wanatoa= [P5]
4. B: [Eeh! [P5]
    @
5. A: =Hamutoi.
7. A: Nyahururu huko [ sikia ...
8. C: [hakuna mtu huko. [P1]
10. D: hebu nipeane hii gazeti. [P3]
13. A: Oh! ( ) [P3] ((Gives the newspaper))
14. D: [Ya hapa ni ile. [P2]
15. A: [watoto wawili wawili ni kama mumetibiwa. [P1] @
17. A: Kwanza mtu kama wewe huwezi toa watatu. @ two, two [three! [P1]
20. E: Sita [P2]
    @
21. A: lakini sasa [wacha tu niachie mahali [nimeona...
24. E: Na...
26. E: [ Akuku danger ni wa wapi? [P3]
28. B: [mmmh! [P5]

30. E: Umenifurahisha! Ati Rift Valley ni yetu yote na hatuko! [P2] ((calling))We Chebii!


32. E: [Chebii huoni central? [P3]

33. A: Cental nini? [P1]

34. E: Central province.

35. A: Imefanya nini? [P1]

36. E: Ni kidogo lakini wa[meja[ [P2]

37. A: [kamepasuka kako, kanapasuka kanaanguka Molo, kanapasuka kanaanguka hapo[Nakuru kanasema ni kwao, na hakatoki.

38. E: [Na huko kwenu kwani hawako? [P3]


40. E: Nyanza.

41. A: Aii! Kwetu kisii uneza fikiri ni kwao. [maduka yote...

42. E: [Ah! Ah! Kwenu ni nyanza. [P1] Kisii hakuna kwa [hesabu

43. A: [hata kisii sisi ndio tunaleta hiyo ( ) huko.

44. E: sisi tutaenda forest. Tunachukua ( ).

45. A: hapana[P1] nyinyi mko na mahindi munawapea wakulie ugali. Wakulie samaki. Watakuja kuchukua...

46. E: [Na nyinyi? Si munapatia hao matoke? [P3]

47. A: imani nini? [P1] (10 sec) Sasa hii ndio hutaki kusema hawa ni watu,-

50. A: Si ndio hiyo alikuwa? [P3]

51. B: (To F) Unafinya tu OK. [Pl]

52. F: OK?

common ... Hawa ni watu wenu. Wakati mlituchapa viboko kweli kweli mkisema mumeweka [( ) hamukuwa munaona? [P3]

54. E: [enyewe hatukuwagusa, hatukuwagusa. [P1]


56. C:[Wewe! [P4]


58. E: [ Nani? Nani?

@
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59. A: Chepkeres. [ alikuja nyumbani akawaambia ...

60. E: ((hitting the table)) [mimi najua mzee rafiki yako ni Raila [ule marehemu. [P1]
62. E: yetu ni chepkeres.
64. E: [yetu ni chepkeres.] Si ulionia juzi alisema katiba ni mbaya tukaunga yeye mkono. [P3]
65. A: Ah! Ah! Ni juzi muliona wakati mumefuata upepo mkaanguka kwa, mkaanguka kwa bahari ndio... @ [P1]
66. E: [yes] hii sasa hatuwezi kubali . kama hatungekuwa tunajua kuogelea. [P2]
67. A: sisi tangu zamani...
68. E: [nani?
69. A: sisi tangu zamani...
70. E: [Nyinyi kama nani? [P1]
71. A: sisil Wale ambao unajua! [P1]
72. E: Eeh! [P5]
73. A: sisi tunajisimamia.
74. E: Eeh! Ok. [P5]
75. A: Na hiyo njaa yetu.
76. E: Eeh! [P5]
78. E: ((To waiter)) [P5] [Manu! Niletee maji nikunywe.] [P1]
79. A: Maji ndio hii, omba glass. [P1] ((Handing him a jug of water)) (5sec)[Mahindi munapelekanga ukambani na kisumu=
80. E:((holding the jug)) [chebii unajua nitakuweka hii kwa macho?] [P1]
81. A: = unatuumbia nini? [P1] ((laughter all over)) kwani huonangi...We Tum! ((Calling))
82. G: Eeh!
83. A: Kuna mahindi inatokanga Rift Valley inaenda kisii? [P3]
84. G: Hapana.
85. A: inaendanga nyanza! Kisumu na ukambani. Haututishitishi hapal [P1]
86. G: [na Lodwar. [P2]
87. A: [Tutalima barabara na ndizi inatoka.
88. E: ((calling)) We, Timo!
89. F: Eeh!
91. A: [Nilichukua nafasi ya ule jamaa ule mzungu. [P2] Alikuwa anaitwa nani?
92. C: nani huyo?
94. C: [Lone]
95. E: Leon, Leon ilikuwa ya national...
96. A: [ama uninite Karoli Omondi.
97. E: [yako uzuri ni ya hapa Koibatek.] Ni mtu ya Koibatek. [P2]
98. A: We unajua bodyguard ya Raila sasa ni nani?
100. A: ule jamaa alikuwa boxer. Allimba wakati ingine...
101. E: [Conje?
102. A: Ah, ah. Kuna jamaa alishikwa wakati ingine akiimba Dandora ati 'kibaki ameshindwa na kazi' akawekwa ndani.
103. E: @ Siku hizi yeye ndio bodyguard? [P2]
105. E: [sasa kumbe ndio unang'ang'ana uache kuuza maziwa [ungekuwa bodyguard? [P3]
106. A: [mimil! Kinyume na nyinyi munafuata hawa watu ...[P1]
107. E: [Mmmh! [P5]
108. A: Nyinyi ndio mulilazimisha sisi, mukachapa sisi kiboko tukasema wacha tuweke nusunusu. [P1]
109. E: Ndio. [P2]
110. A: [lakini (-) ni nyinyi]
111. E: [ saa hizi munaweka full] [P1]
112. A: ((jokingly)) kumpaf! Kumanina hiil [P1]
113. E: Kumanynoko! [P1]
114. A: Mulijua.
115. E: Eeeh! [P5]
116. A: hamukuwa munajua. [P1]
118. A: @ Hii jama ndio... Kuna msemo wa Kisii...
119. E: [Angalia Newcastle wako number nine. [P5]
120. A: Si hawajacheza mpira moja. Ni kama nyinyi.
121. E: Everton wako number ten. Wolves wako number ngapi?
122. A: si unaona? [P1]
123. E: Ati Man U Wako na twenty three? (-)
124. A: msipochunga, haitabadiliika. Wigan Athletic!
125. E: Wolves...
126. A: [MacCarthy alijua anataka point moja akue...
127. E: [Manul, saidia glass Manu. [P3]
128. A: Westham kidogo karibu ishinde jana. llishindwa? [P3]
129. B: Jana?
130. E: si walifunga dakika ya tisini na mbili.
131. A: wolves?
132. E: Eeh Bwanal! [P2]
134. E: ( ) alipiga bwana, [P2] aliokoa jahazi dakika ya tisaini...
136. E: Wapi?
137. A: Hawa wakina Sambili ni watoto, Kosgei hawa ni watoto= 
138. E: lakini uzuri tunajua...
139. A: =[Magerer Lang’at, Hao ni matunda(laughs)
140. E: [2012, kuja utuulize 2012]
141. A: Hao ni matunda ya ODM huwezi geuza. [P1]
143. A: sisi tuko na chama yetu Ford People...
   ((B Laughs))
144. E: [najua huwezi badilisha mkondo ya... [P4]
145. A: Na watu ambo wana msimamo ni sisi.Sababu mpaka saa hii [tumeamua ,
tumeamua, tunamaintain KANU. Tumeshikilia mzee! Kama sio sisi. @
146. E: [sasa, sawa. [P2] Si usikie Chebii. Si usikie chebii nikuambie[P3]. Unakumbuka
kina mwalimu wakitaja hapa, kina Emanuel wakitaja hapa De Jong, sijui nani?
147. A: Eeh!
na...
149. A: [aih! Hakuna kitul [P1] Hata kama iko, hata kama haiko. [sasa munakaa tu]
haujui mahali unaelekea.
150. E: [Yes] [P2]
152. E: [Mimi nimejitolea, kama Chepkeres hasimami, siendi mahali. Niko na
Chepkeres! [P2]
153. A: Chepkeres ni mwerevu kukuliko sababu alikuambia last [time ukafuata watoto.
[P1]
154. E: [Yes basi yes]. Na sasa si nilifuata watoto...[P2]
155. A: [Afadhali sisi na Ongeri tuliona...
156. E: [nyinyi sasi ni kina nani.] [ nyinyi sasa ni kina nani na hamko? [P1]
157. A: [sisi na Ongeri tukasema basi] tusimame na KANU. Mkasema Ford siko, sijui
ODM. Mtu akiongea kwenu munamwambia...
158. E: [Saa hizi mimi niko na Chepkeres. Na mtu yeyote ambaye anaanza na jina ‘O’
hatutampee [kiti.
159. A: [Hata Ocampo?] hata Ocampo? [P4]
tofauti?
161. A: Ogeto, ONgeri, Omogeni, Eeh! [P4]
162. E: Siku hizi taja ingine. Onyancha. [P2]
163. A: Hiyo!
164. E: [ingine
165. A: [utatuma] Onyancha ( ) [P2]
166. E:ingine? Ongeri, [Obure
167. A: [Onyanchae. (5sec) ((looking at the TV screen))Hawa watu kweli, wameharibu
hii studio kabisa=
168. B: Eeh! [P2]
169. A: = Na sura za chafu chafu!
170. E: kwani hajajika four thirty? [P3]
171. C: Saa hii ni three thirty.
E: (Calling) Manu!

H: Yes!

E: Ball ni saa kumi na moja? [P3]

B: saa kumi na nusu. Saa kumi na nusu. [Four thirty.

E: [ Na kwani saa hii ni saa ngapi? [P1]

C: Three thirty.

A: Kuna moja inaanza mapema.

B: Yenu ndio four thirty. Alafu ingine...[five. [P2]

A: [eeh kuna moja inaanza five ingine four thirty, ingine hiyo six ni... [P2

B: [Ya Chelsea ni saa moja.

A: eeeh saa moja hiyo. [P2

B: yenu si ni four thirty? [P3] Alafu kuna yenye inaanza sijui [ni... six ni ya Man City.

A: [kuna hii inaanza saa hii. Kuna saa hii ingine.

B: kuna ya, Yenu ndio inaanza halafu Man City halafu Chelsea.


B: Mmmh!

A: kabla ya yetu kuna moja inaanza.

(5sec)

B: lakini ya Wednesday=

A: Mmmm

B: = Chelsea ndio wanaanza dakika , fifteen minutes kabla ingine yote. Halafu Ya Man U na Arsenal zote zinaanza pamoja.

A: Mimi nataka kuweka TV ya Chelsea peke yake.

B: Enyewe tuwekee. [ wapi? [P2

A: [unalipa mia] [P1

B: Hakuna shida [tutalipa. [P2

A: [Unalipia watu watano juu hakuna customers. Ni huyu na Limo.

E: ((counting)) Huyu, Limo, Oti, (Pause) Ah! Na kemboi?

A: Ya! Na [kemboi. [P2

E: [Na jamaa ya Fabisch.

B: Kemboi alihamia huko? [P3

A: Kemboi atakuja saa ngapi [na anaenda kuangalia kazi? [P4

E: Na ndugu ya huyu, ndugu ya huyu. Goal keeper wa Chelsea.

B: ((proudly)) Tuko. [P2

E: Na nani wewe. Umesahau iko mwalimu mmoja anatokanga Poror anakuja siku [hizi sana.

A: [Lakini hakujiangi] [P3

E: na iko jamaa moja ya Poror anakujanga wakati ni Man U na Chelsea.

C: Oh! [P2] Huyo mrefu?

E: ((On phone))Eeh! Eeh! Mi ano ((where are you))?

END.
CONVERSATION 5
DURATION: 5MINS
PARTICIPANTS: 10

((The men are watching a game and one team has conceded a goal))

1. A: wasipate zawadi @
2. B: sisi tunaongea mwalimu. Watu wa Arsenal wako na right ya kuongea. [P1]
3. C: Ndio nasema... = [P2]
4. B: [Wanakuanga namba tatu kwa ( )] [P1]
5. C: = [Ndio nasema ukiskia] mtu wa Arsenal akiongea wacha aongee. [hiyo ni kawaida.]
6. B: [wacha kutuambia ati wacha aongee! [P1] Hata mulianguka kale ka last season
   tuone kama rnutachukua mwaka huu.
7. C:[ @] [P5]
8. D: [nyinyi musimamie hii...= 
9. A: wacha! [P1]
10. E: Ah, Ah. [P1]
11. B: Namba tatu!
12. A: Muliwaomboa?
13. D: = sisi wacha tuanguke, nyinyi musimamie hii. [P2]
   [P1]
15. A: kwani mulikuwa mulet Almunia anashikia Chelsea? [P1]
16. B: Anafungwa ama ...
17. D: Almunia!
18. E: hiyo shida yote imeletwa ju tumefungwa, [kufungwa ndio shida yako? Jingal [P1]
19. B: ( to E) [ unaongea mbaya na wewe! Usituletee. [P1] ((Calling)) Koech!
20. F: Mi naskia mnataka alliance. Nyumba inachomewa na munatafuta alliance. [P2]
   @
21. B: Amos!
22. F: Nasikia munatafuta alliance. Kaa na Amos. [P1]
   ((E Sits down))
24. F: sisi tumeamua kwenda ( ) we tafuta alliance.
25. B: Watu kumi? [P3]
27. B: si uwache kwanza nitafute mahali watu wako wengi niingie huko? [P2]
28. F: Tunajua hiyo ndio kazi yako. [P1]
   @
29. B: watu wengi unaingia hapo...
30. F: [tunajua hunanga msimamo. [P1]
31. B: Aai! Msimamo ufanyie nini Kenya hii. Unataka chakula ama alliance ya msimamo?
   [P2]
32. G: <L2 atepe yu? L2 > [P3]
34. B: ((To G))aa unataka kunikasirisha mzee [( )] [P1]
35. H: [Ah we shika we! [P1]
36. B: Ule alikuwa anauza zeruzeru angeuza Amos [( )] [P2]
37. D: [waunde chama. [P2]
38. B: Nani?
39. D: Muunde chama.
41. D: [chama ingine...
   Several speakers interrupt: [Ah wengi sana!]
42. I: ili watu wakusupport ( )
43. B: hata nyinyi Moi alikuwa wa mwisho. Mtakuwa mkisupport [milele.] [P1]
44. D: [tuko mpira, nani amesema siasa hapa. [P4]
45. B: Ah! Tunaongea na mwalimu. [P4] Mwalimu anasema...
   @
46. D: [kwani Koech, Koech mumeongea nini hapo?
47. B: kwanza Koech!
   ((Several speakers call Koech.))
48. C: Koech, hii kituo inatoanga, inatoanga kura hii kituo ya Poror?
49. E: [wapi? Hawana kura. [P1]
50. F: [Haitoangi, si ni kama ile ya ( )
   @
52. D: Koech hii alliance kwani ni ya nini? [P2]
53. F: Sijui, uliza Cherutich. [P1]
54. B: Amekataa kuface ball. Hiyo likikuwa bao. (-) Mtu kama anataka kuhama aende Chelsea( )
56. D: Si mutuuzie Gallas? [P3]
58. D: apana! Mimi nataka mtuuzie. Sasa munatoa huko mrudishe mahali alikuwa. Si mulimuuza ( ) akasema atamfunga. [P1]
60. B: Munakuja kushikilia hapa ati Wigan ishinde Chelsea. [P1]
62. B: Si ni Amos anasema ndio unaona nimekasirika. [P4]
63. D: muundeni muungano. Hiyo tu, eeh [hiyo tu]. [P2]
64. B: [Muungano ya kusupport Chelsea.
   @
CONVERSATION 6
DURATION 8 MINS
PARTICIPANTS: 9

((Silent watching))
   ((B laughs))
2. C: Ah. ( ) akanyamaza.
4. E: hii sasa ingekuwa two nili.
   ((Pause))
5. C: unaonahii jamaa anazunguka zunguka tu [hapo.] [Pl]
7. A: Mi sipendangi hii jamaa [kabisa.] [P1]
8. B:[Lakini huwezi mlaumu, unaona game yenye huyu amecheza (-) hawezi hiyo game.
   [P3]
9. E: [Hapati leo.] [P2]
10. C: [Eeh, eeh!] [P3]
11. B: game yenye Ferguson amecheza, Baloteli hawezi, nini hawezi, [Berbatov hawezi.]
13. B: Hata pattern ya nini leo, ya Ferguson...
14. C: [Ah! Unaona hii mpira!]
15. E: [si hiyo mpira amepeana, si ni [Carrick?] [P3]
   Several voices: Mmmh. ((affirmation))
17. F: Leo Van der Saar amewezwa akili kabisa. Umejua angeweka kwa flanks angetoa.
18. A: Eeh? [P3]
20. G: Labda amuwekee chini. [P3]
   ((pause))
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
21. F: [haoni]
22. C: [Haoni]
23. D: [hata huyo atoke. Scholes hakuna kitu anafanya. [P1]
26. D: Aweke Giggs. [P2]
27. C: Si Park ako ndani? [P2]
29. G: Haiyal
   ((surprise all over))
32. C: Badilisha!
34. C: Atoe Nani ...
35. D: [ Ah, Ah. [P1]
36. C: Carrick hapana. [P1]
39. B: Ukiona game kama hii ndio unajua Rooney huwa [anafanyaga kazi].
41. B: [Rooney anachezanga midfield yote.
42. D: Ah, Rooney [wachana nayeye]. [P2]
43. B: [Ye ndio anarudi midfield na anarudi mbele.
45. B: kwanza midfield yeye ndio anaenda kulete mpira, [anapeana, na anaenda anapewa.]
46. D: [ na na eeh!
   (pause))
47. B: Inje wapi. Hao vijana wanajua kuzipeleka.
   (pause))
48. D: ah, hiyo sii mbaya!
   (pause))
49. A: Ah wewe!
50. C: hii watu watolewe. [P1]
52. D:Ferguson afanye change. Otherwise hawa wajamaa [watatoka.] [P1]
53. B: [anahitaji midfield. [P2]
54. D: eeh. [P2]
55. B: Wakati alijua Rooney hayuko angecheza na midfield strong. [P1]  
   (pause))
56. B: ona kama hiyo sasa. [P2]
57. C: Wapikata moja.
59. B: Baloteli kama tu sii tabia, aneza kuwa mchezaji [mzuri sana.
60. C: [Eeh correct. [P2]
62. A: lala lala!
63. G: panua uwanja! Panual
64. C: Rudisha nyuma.
65. F: Vidic Leo! ((disapproval)) [P5]
66. D: Ah! Forwards hakuna ndio unaona leo midfield hakuna ndio defence inakuwa mzito. [P1]

((pause))

((pause))
67. G: wacha atoe corner. [P1]
68. A: huyo, huyo!
69. D: lIikuwa ndani! lIikuwa ndani! Van der saar amejaribu.
70. B: huyo kijana ni mbaya [huyo Silval]
72. G: Na Ingepita, ule jamaa angefunga.
73. F: Ingine hiyo, ingine!
75. B: Mmh. ((agreement)) = [P2]
76. B: = ah hii bado.
77. A: Pastor, timu yako wamelimwa, wamelimwa na hiyo ingine. [P1]
((I remains silent)) [P5]
79. C: [Berbatov. [P4]
80. D: Berbatov ndio alikuwa amezubaa. Oshea, hata hii Oshea hakuna kitu anafanyang. 
81. B: Eeh! Hiyo ingeonekana.
82. D: Yako peke yako ndio hiyo.
84. C: Fanya haraka! Weka katikati! ((Pause)) Ah!
85. D: Yellow card!
86. B: Sasa ameharibu. [P1]
87. D: Ameharibu. [P2]
88. C: Umejua akipata kadi ni risky. [P2]
89. D: alimtereeza kabisa!

END
CONVERSATION 7
DURATION 10 MINS
PARTICIPANTS: 10

((A few minutes before the game begins))

1. A: Hiyo nyan'gau lazima awekwe pale? [P1]
2. B: Rosisky hawezi [( ) anatakanga awekwe ( )] =
3. C: [ Hii uwanja inakaaje bwana? [P2]
4. B: =Rosisky unajua uzee imemzidia [hawezi.
5. D: [ hii uwanja msistuke[P2] ( ) ilikuwa hivi game ya blackburn.
7. F: We usicheze, jamaa aneza funga leo bao bwana. [P4]
8. G: kwanini hampendi huyu kijana na vile ni [mzuri? [P3]
9. F: [ Nani? Nani?
11. E: Akili ya kufungwa hanal hana akili ya kufungwa.
12. H: Nani?
16. H: Nani?
17. E: Arshavin.
18. H: Sijui akili yake ile alikuwa nayo [( ]
19. F: [Ni nini we unamuona kwa Arshavin? [P1]
22. E: Eee! [P2]
23. F: Jamaa hata anabaki na goli lakini hawezi [funga.
24. H: [Anafunganga bao zingine za maajabu=
25. G: Eeh! [P2]
26. F: anaweke kwa roof hivi, [ikienda kwa laini hivu, anapiga tu kwa roof]
   ((Attention switches to the tv))
28. H: Nolan, Best. ((Calling names))
29. E: Best, Nolan ako?
30. H: hii kijana anaitwa Best bwana amefunga ...[P2] ( ) haijajaribiwa kwa timu
   kubwa. (amidst murmurs)
31. E: hii mid tumemaliza hao. [P2]
33. E: [Ah! Mid hakuna! [P1]
34. B: [Wilshire ndio atafanya kazi.]
35. H: Diaby hakuna mtu hapo.
36. B: lakini sasa hii Diaby, akitolewa [nani ataininga? [P3]
37. D: [Rosisky.
38. E: [Rosisky] ndio ataininga kwa Diaby.
39. F: Afadhali Diaby [aanze. [P3]
40. E: Na Carlos Vela alienda wapi?
41. B: Carlos Vela alienda. Na huyo mwingine ako na injury=
42. H: Nani?
43. B: Hii Brazilian. [Denilson.
44. H: [Denilson ako na injury.
45. A: Denilson ako na injury. [P2]
46. B: Tumelose three midfielders bwana. [P2]
   ((murmurs))
47. C: ( )
48. B: Hapo tu nimekosa jamaa mmoja anaitwa Bendtner Nick!
49. E: [Eeeh hapa. [P2]
50. G: Huyu defender atacheza kesho?
51. I: Mmh! ((pause)) Lakini kujaribiwa tu. [P3] ((   )
52. G: [Pengine akuje kama sub. [P3]
53. I: Eeh.
54. G: lakini Torres ndio naona ataaanza?
55. B: Eeh! [P2]
56. G: Torrres ataaanza.
57. I: Torres ataaanza.
58. E: Ataaanza?
59. F: Atamaliza!
60. B: Ah, hawezi anza. [P1]
   ((Inaudible murmurs))
61. E: nilikuwa nafikiri ni Diego Forlan ama nani? [P3]
63. E: sii Diego? [P3]
64. H: huyu ni Kevin Nolan.
65. E: Diego Forlan ako wapi?
67. G: Ni timu gani walikuwa wanamtaka, Tottenham? [P3]
68. H: eeeh Tottenham. [P2]
69. E: Wanataka nani? [P1]
70. G: Forlan!
71. C: Angalia hiyo kiatu bwana! [P2]
   (6sec)
72. B: Diaby! (6sec) Lazima kijana acheze leo proper!
   ((murmurs)) (15sec)
73. B: Huyo jamaa hanyanganyangi mpira.
   (12sec)
74. G: makosa!
   Shouts all over: Goal! Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
75. F: pikipiki! Forty five seconds!
   ((murmurs and noise all over))
77. G: [Eeh! [P2]
78. D: alishield!
79. B: Eeh! Ali... angemgusa lakini aliogopa penalty.
80. G:Si penalty. Hapo ni red. [P1]
82. D: [Hiyo ni red. [P2]
((murmurs and tv noise))
83. E: (Walcot) anakimbia.
84. B: Huyo jamaa abadilishwe akue central striker na akae [hapo. [P3]
85. E: [central ndio mzuri, anafanya mzuri [sana. [P2]
86. B: Huyo jamaa akicheza central anakuanga nini sana. (3sec)
87. F: Nguruwe!
88. H: Huyo mtu amewekwa hapo sii nguruwe. [ sii nguruwe. [P1]
89. A: [Ameshika bwana. [P2]
90. B: Jamaa game yake imeanza kupanda juu.
91. F: Eeh imeanza. [P2]
92. B: Ya nani? Huyo sii Arshavin? [P3]
93. E: Fabregas.
95. C: Walcott.
96. F: pikipiki.
((murmurs))
Everyone shouts GOAL! Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
98. B: kaa chini bwana, [P2] vitu mingi itakupita. [P1]
99. J: We enda! [P1] ((at an opponent))
@ ((murmurs))
100. C: Djorou!
101. J: We ( ) hii ni dakika tatu na bao mbili!
102. C: Djorou mwenyewe!
104. J: Eeeh!
106. J: Afadhali uende. [P3]
108. F: hawa waneza amka bwana. [P2]
110. F: Hiyo ni mbaya.
((inaudible murmurs))
111. H: Ndio hiyo ingine.
((murmurs))
112. F: Si wacha waende na mpiira tu!
113. J: Yes, wacha nikusalimie ya mwaka mpya. [P2]
114. H: ((to G) Na kwani si ulikuwa unaenda? [P3]
115. G: Niko tu! Sasa tulilemewalemewa nikaamua wacha nipumzike. (10sec)
   xxxxxxxxxxxxx ((exclamation and shock))
116. F: Angalia! [P1]
117. C: Aii, alikuwa ana ...
118. E: [Ameingiwa katikati!
119. H: [si angefinyiwa katikati!
121. J: Alijioko, alijioko...
122. H: [Ni huyu referee? Huyu atapeana penalty!
123. B: Eeh huyu atapeana penalty. [P2]
124. C: Tuchunge tu. [P2]
125. B: Atatu ...
126. H: uchunge tu hapo kwa box yetu. [P2]
   ((1 min inaudible murmurs))
127. F: We!
128. B: Hiyo angepata!
129. C: Good, Diaby leo umejaribu!
130. F: Rafiki!
131. C: Inua!
132. J: Yaani Henry Bado ako kwa hii kiwanja? (4sec) [P3]
133. C: Aah! Shl [P5]
134. H: Hakuona. ((Murmurs)) Akipata player mwenye anamuekea hapo tu!
136. B: kellier pass [bwana. [P2]
137. C: [((
138. B: Ah, hakuna ... anafunga bwana. [P1]
   ((inaudible conversations))
END
A.2 TRANSLATIONS OF THE CONVERSATIONS

CONVERSATION 1 (Translation)
LENGTH: 12 MINS
PARTICIPANTS: MORE THAN 10

((Men watching a football match. Purely men audience. A very tense and animated conversation.))

((Murmurs all over))

1. A: Everton have started
2. B: Nani, this one is very useless.
   ((Several voices: ok, useless, hey, ok.))
3. A: Where did Valencia go?
4. B: Who?
5. A: Valencia?
6. B: He is injured.
7. C: There the mistake is the coach’s= ((Inaudible murmurs)) =that is his idea. He tells people to clear the ball out of the field. Are they defenders? Shouldn’t they start in the box?
8. D: They fear.
9. B: First of all the liability here is Gary Neville ...
10. A: And it is like Everton haven’t seen that. That side of Neville, that wing where Neville is...
11. D: [Mmh. ((Agreement))]
12. A: Ah! You can get a very good goal there.
13. D: Aai! ((exclamation of shock and disapproval))
   ((Silence))
   Several Voices: ((Exclamations of surprise)) Yes. Ok, ok, ok, ok. ((In Reference to a player whose short is torn and is forced to change into another on the touchline.))
15. B: He will lose his status.
16. C: No way, What of Rooney’s behaviour of going at night? ((in Reference to A player’s alleged relationship with a prostitute))
17. D: A black man’s look like that. ((Referring to the player’s genitals))
18. C: Where is the coach, people go during the day, not at night.
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
19. D: Put it there.
20. E: That is a booking.
21. B: Arteta holds someone then pretends to be hurt. Imagine!
22. D: He pretends he has been hit.
23. B: Yes, pretending he has been hit. Go away!
24. E: The players are controlling this game.
25. C: So even Evans is in the game? =
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
26. C: = The good thing about Evans is that if he is left with the goal keeper, he just fouls someone. No need of stress.
27. A: Ah! That one has ...
   ((Pause))
   Several spekers shout: Oh! Ah!)
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
28. A: There is a defender who made a mistake there. You see here, the way this one was passed, that defender should have taken the ball.
29. C: He was at Man U. So i wonder how they will concede and he himself is a Manchester. (United) player.
30. E: He evades a person but leaves his hand behind.
31. C: There he goes!
32. A: Let's go!
   ((Several Voices: GOAL! ))
33. B: That is it! That is it!
34. D: That is it!
35. F: How many are remaining now?
36. C: If you are a Man U fan, lift up your hand.
   ((One person lifts up his hand))
37. C: Thank you brother. The others are pretenders.
38. D: They missed the first one, the second one?
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
39. F: We have looked for this for long.
40. C: Kimani, we have looked for this thing for long in vain. Now we have got it.
41. F: Amen.
42. C: We have really looked for it.
43. E: Get it then!
   Several speakers exclaim: My goodness! My goodness! My goodness!)
44. D: This is a tough team!
45. A: Pienaar has been tripped.
46. B: Pardon !((Seeking clarification))
47. A: He has hurt his leg but ...
   xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
48. C: We have really looked for this thing! It would have been shameful for us to concede after really working hard to get a goal.
   @
49. D: Now it is just displaying football.
50. C: Now we just finish them off.
51. F: Three goals following each other.
   ((Inaudible chatter from all around))
52. C: Even today we do not want Man U. We want Chelsea.
53. A: Do you know what the goal will do? Man U. Will stop defending [and come forward to attack]
54. B: [Yes, they will come forward.]
55. F: Ah!((anger))
56. E: There is no anger here ...
57. C: [That is the good thing about Man U. When they are under pressure they start "throwing stones".]
58. H: ((Calling)) Kibet!
59. C: Yes!
60. H: We are together.
61. C: But ask how many Man U fans do we have?
62. H. ((Sarcastic)) We are together, we have put our differences aside. We are behind Man U. It's painful!
63. C: But we have also really looked for that goal. We have looked for that goal.
64. H: Yes.
65. C: Now where is Van Der Saar placing the ball?
66. B: He is defeated.
67. C: That one is Mamatov.
68. A: Where is Rooney?
69. C: He is called Damaris Mamatov
70. B: Today the town is quiet in a good way.
71. C: You Koras!
72. G: Yes!
73. C: If you see Sang, The MP for Sirwa, Pass him my greetings.
74. B: Kibet do not provoke Sang.
75. A: Right now he cannot get worked up. You know right now he is hurt and can't talk. When the game is over...
76. C: [He is under pressure. @ He can't say anything.
77. A: When the game is over don't tell him anything. Now you can talk but when the game is over, leave him alone. ((Laughter and murmuring))
78. C: Continue being off side Damaris. No problem.
79. B: Ah ((anger))! That fool has to be substituted.
80. F: I want security.
81. C: Ah! Don't worry [we are ahead]
82. A: [Not yet! Don't worry, goals are coming.
83. C: No, Pilato, Throw stones. ((pause))
84. C: Ah! Someone is pushed and he says nothing. ((15 sec Silence))
   Several Voices: xxxxxxxxxxx GOAL!
85. D: That is it!
86. A: It was a good one!
87. B: Ah! They have lost that one. Everton is finished now.
88. C: He placed it well. We have no problem there. The good thing ... You Koras ((calling))
89. G: Yes!
90. C: In this game who is ahead? Isn't it one-one?
91. G: Yes it is one-one.
92. C: I thought when Man U. Scored they have three points. That is what shocked me. So it is one. Ah! I am not worried.
93. I: What is the noise for? Everyone should wait for their team.
94. F: First ask if Vuvuzela went to South Africa?
95. C: Mose, Mose you know I got so worried when they equalized but it is one.
96. I: Despite that, you should keep quiet.
97. C: We cannot keep quiet yet we are defending ourselves.
98. F: Eh! That's a foul.
99. C: Put something, Give him something. The old Kauka is going too far. Yes referee give him something. ((Clapping as a player is booked))
100. C: The old Kauka is going too far.
101. F: An old man like you with experience yet you are not ashamed! Bad manners.
102. C: Old Kauka, Old Kauka cool down.
103. I: Old men are at home. (6sec)
104. D: Where is Louis Nani?
105. C: Ah! Mrs. Loise? Loise is not there. (10sec)
106. E: The referee can’t see even that? (5secs)
107. D: Two minutes.
108. H: Two minutes!
109. A: This is where they are beaten.
110. J: You know all goals come from this wing.
111. D: [Pardon.
112. K: All the goals that will be scored will come from the black guy. (7sec)

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
113. D: Wow!
114. B: He had seen it.
115. A: He had put that one in.
116. J: Man u will beat them because of experience.
117. A: The central defender there. [The central defender leaves somebody here.]
118. C: [He couldn’t have seen that, he couldn’t have seen that .
119. A: You can see even the other goal came from the middle. It is the central defender who has a problem there.
120. G: This team is making me happy.
121. C: Pardon? ((Seeking clarification))
122. G: This Everton team is making me happy.
123. C: This team is making you happy?
124. G: Yes.
125. C: I know even the senator is hurting.
@ 126. K: This governorship of yours that is given in a ‘busaa’ den! @ This governorship of yours that you have brought from a ‘busaa’ den.
127. G: Do you know we removed a short in the field? (6sec) Ah! That is not bad, that is a lie.
128. E: It’s bad, why are you saying it is not bad?
129. G: Slap him ((To a player who is angry with an opponent for hurting him))
130. B: Yes that fool should go to a barber.
131. E: slap him, why are you hesitating? Slap him and get into real trouble.
132. B: he looks like a forest. He thinks he looks good the way he is?
133. E: It’s a design.
@ 134. E: That game is not bad.
135. G: There is no game that has been played here ((Meaning they haven’t played well)).
136. H: They got lucky.
137. E: There is nothing like luck here, we played a classic game.
138. C: And what are the scores?
139. E: one is a draw, the other is draw. It is zero-zero.
140. A: Man U will beat them because there is a central defender here, if he was with Rooney, Rooney would have scored. There is someone in the centre who is leaving the striker unmarked. He is with the striker yet the striker gets the ball. And he stood behind this striker.
141. D: Or maybe he was setting an offside trap?
142. A: ((Demonstrating)) You see he stands like this, he is like this and the striker is there.  
[Now he got the ball and scored.]
143. B: When we substitute Neville and Berbatov... We will beat these guys.
144. A: ... Another defender should have been in front and him behind.
145. F: We are together. ((To E))
146. H: Don’t you see even Kibet is has kept quiet.
147. C: We are together.
CONVERSATION 2 (TRANSLATION)
PARTICIPANTS: BELOW 5
LENGTH: 6 MINUTES

5. A: Yes, Ulinzi are the ones in Red. They are playing against Zamalek. Be watching Kenyan football, don’t just be watching Arsenal.
6. B: Ah! Now Kenya football really? You will hear they are pelting one another with stones...
7. C: [This season is tough! [They have bought so many players.
8. A: [But they have put effort, they have started waking up.
9. D: It has gone back to what it used to be in the past, in the era of...
10. C: [The era of 96/97 FC Leopards and Gor ((Mahia)).
11. D: It is like Arsenal in the ninety’s. That is when the Kenya premier league had started.
12. C: [But in 2000 it got so bad...
13. B: [I do not see myself going back to Kenyan football [at all.
14. C: [Personally I am going back to it openly. Even now I have a team.
15. D: Sofapaka?
16. B: I don’t know what it is, when I hear they are in the field, I would rather watch ‘papa shirandula’ ((a TV comedy)).
17. C: ((Reading from the TV screen)) J. Odhiambo.
18. A: Kenya has even professional players, they buy players from Congo ... [Nigeria
19. C: [Uganda, Nigeria.
20. B: Oh! They are here?
21. A: Yes, they play for Kenyan teams.
22. C: At least one is at AFC leopards and others are at Sofapaka. There are two Congolese...
23. D: [There is also a Ugandan...
24. B: [Why then do they take a Jersey that is ...! ((Exclaiming))
25. C: I am telling you this season they have got wiser, they have bought many.
26. B: Aai! ((Disapproval))
27. C: All of them are offside! Ulinzi is a good team.
28. B: Is this round robin or...?
29. C: Yes it is Round robin.
(6 sec)
30. D: They have set a very good trap!
(6 sec)
31. A: This is home so we must win. If they don’t win...
32. B: [This is Nairobi?
33. A: Yes. The game is being played in Kenya with a return match in their home country.
34. C: You know Egypt is a theatre.
35. A: That has been returned to Cech. ((Alluding to the Chelsea goalkeeper))
36. B: aah! Aah! – ((Surprise))
37. A: It is not east to play against a Kenyan team.
38. B: Arab contractors.
(5 sec)
39. A: He has no one to support him.
40. C: Kick the ball out then.
41. A: That is their Scholes.
42. D: Apul.
43. C: Apul.
@  
44. B: He doesn’t see.
45. A: He was looking for someone on the wing.
46. C: Do they write players’ names on Jerseys?
47. A: When they go to play in Africa I think they write.
48. C: So they write even on Jerseys to be used outside the country.
49. D: hey!
((Silence))
50. B: Why are the defenders so confident?
(8 sec)
51. A: There is a player who plays for this team. Do you remember Kaka. The one who was in Maji mazuri?
52. B: Oh! Yes!
53. C: The one whose eyes used to look like those of a drug addict?
54. A: The one who used to play for Maji mazuri.
55. B: He is at Ulinzi?
56. A: Yes.
57. B: At least you are making it interesting!
58. A: Yes! The lad was in this team and played in the previous league, He was in this...
59. B: Ulinzi.
60. A: He plays, even now he is still at Ulinzi.
61. D: but he does not call himself Kaka.
62. A: He calls himself Kaka Brian, that is what he calls himself here.
63. D: This guy who was from here?
64. C: Right now age is catching up with him?
65. A: Right now he is so old that you can’t...eeh... (-). If you defend that way in the premier league, won’t that ball be taken away from you?
@  
66. A: That you get it and return it there.
67. D: aah! The defence is stable.
68. B: The defence is also comfortable.
69. C: Look at how he will pass through it.
70. B: Aren’t these people old?
71. C: When these ones go to play in the African Cup of Nations! They beat other teams!
72. A: Isn’t this nearly half of the Egypt national team?
73. D: nine, nine, nine.
74. C: Not half, all of them, aren’t they Ten?
75. D: It was said Nine.
76. C: They are nine nine?
77. D: Nine who...
78. C: [who play for Egypt.
79. D: You know many Egyptian players do not play abroad. They only play for their local clubs.
80. C: Where did Mido go to?
81. D: I think Mido is at... that other team from Egypt.
82. C: No. Hadn't he come to this team?
83. D: He went back.
84. C: And where was he before that? Was it Middlesbrough?
85. D: Yes he was at Middlesbrough.
86. B: And this...?
87. A: I don't know him.
88. C: Gor have even a Kalenjin player. A Kalenjin player. I think he is called Kiplagat.

@  
89. D: Gor Mahia! ((surprised))
90. A: Just check yesterday's The Standard newspaper. There was a picture of Ulinzi team and Kaka was there.
91. B: Really!
92. C: what of today's newspaper?
93. A: I haven't seen today's newspaper.
94. C: Today it is at the back again, In red Jerseys.
95. A: ((Watching the game)) Aii!((disapproval))
96. C: Kenya should be very careful.
97. A: They will break the offside trap. [Wouldn't this player have broken the offside trap if he was behind? He is the one who is moving forward.
98. D: [They will break it.
99. C: Mmmh!
100. A: Or he should have gone back so that the other player goes for the ball.
101. C: Kenya will be beaten because of that.
102. A: This pitch is small.
103. B: ((laughs)) It is not small.
104. A: The keeper kicks the ball all the way and it goes out.
105. B: When the ball hits a flat surface it bounces. Sorry when it hits a... hard surface.
106. D: They guy misses the ball!
107. C: Ulinzi are very fast.

END.
CONVERSATION 3 (TRANSLATION)
PARTICIPANTS: BTN 5 AND 10.
DURATION: 11 MINS

((There is a blackout and conversations begin as viewers await power))
1. A: [Only Tottenham.
2. B: [and Liverpool.
3. C: An those two ...
4. D: [Man U. still have a difficult task.
5. E: And Man City.
7. D: And ... ( 
8. C: We comparing Tottenham and Man City for us. Man City played so well against us.
9. E: Man city defended themselves that we beat them because (we were at home)
10. B: (To a waiter) Sebi, you will lose customers, customers are leaving...
11. C: [I am telling you the game fear! The one I fear is against Tottenham. No other.
12. E: Man U. is a tough team.
13. C: I only fear Tottenham.
14. B: Are you going to play there?
15. C: We are meeting them next week.
16. A: That will be a tough game.
17. D: ((To waiter)) isn’t the generator there?
18. C: And the crafty ones will meet Man City next week, Saturday, won’t they? So if you won’t lose any game, you must lose next week.
19. B: And it will be bad.
20. C: Where will they be? Will they be at Old Trafford?
21. A: I don’t know where they will be.
22. B: No! They will be at Stamford ...
23. C: [The first game you...
24. B: [They haven’t played against Chelsea.
25. D: No, They haven’t played against Chelsea, they played against Man City.
26. C: In the first game they drew one, they went ...
   Several Speakers: [They were playing against Man City.
27. C: They can therefore force a win in that game, they are at home.
28. B: These days there is no [better place.
29. D: [Whether you are playing at home or away it is the same. Let’s see today’s game first.
30. C: We want to see.
31. D: We are analysing. We are trying to forecast. ((Inaudible interruptions)) you know even the manager knows there are still fifteen games. Then he decides how many points he wants in this game. So it is important to look ahead. It is called forward planning.
32. C: I want them to give Man City two goals then they follow them from behind. You know they are used to forcing goals.
33. D: Who?
34. C: Man U.
35. A: To give Man U [two goals?
36. C: [Let them give them two goals then we see if they will they equalize. Or the game will be over.
37. E: No! Even the way they gave the other day? Which team was that?
38. B: Blackpool, Blackpool, it was Blackpool.
((Inaudible talk))
39. E: If it is Arsenal they will make a comeback...
40. B: [No!
41. E: Because Arsenal continues to press for more goals.
42. C: Isn’t that what is required. If a team wants to score two, score three.
43. B: [That is to kill the game completely.
44. C: [The referee did something stupid. Someone is fouled in the box and he says play on. And if he had awarded a penalty, that would have been the end of Man U.
45. B: Imagine the player was pushed literally...
46. D: [Who?
47. C: And then the guys said refereeing rules say that if you award a penalty when one team is down it demoralizes [the team.
48. B: [there is nothing like that.
49. C: That guy! It gave advantage to Manchester.
50. F: Even if a team has conceded eight goals, if they commit a foul, a penalty is awarded. [a foul is a foul]
51. D: [Even if it means sending off a player, it is done.
52. C: you know it was a clear penalty?
53. G: Are you still talking about the Man U penalty?
54. F: It is a foul and it is given.
55. B: ((to H)) you know there is something that cannot even come out of my heart. ((Laughter and inaudible talking))
56. D: If you ask me who should win the league, i would rather Chelsea does instead of Man U.
57. C: and who is Arsenal’s referee? Because they are always beaten by other teams.[like the recent one]
58. B: [Ah! There isn’t! [And all the fouls are usually ours.
59. C: [Someone is sent off and he was on the flanks!
60. G: Let the teacher come and talk...
61. B: [Ah! The teacher supports...
62. C: [What is the teacher saying?
63. B: Those are called false prophets. False prophets!
64. F: There is no such an offside. I mean...
65. D: [Who does he want to come and talk? @
66. F: That rule is not there.
67. A: It is not.
68. C: We refused the law you brought the other day, unless he brings the rule book i read it.
69. H: Who sits here? (pointing to a chair)
70. F: There is no one. I am the one who was there then I moved here.
71. C: That the Man U. teacher said the Everton goal [was not an offside= 
72. A: [No! Even...
73. C: =That the team, your team passed the ball.
74. A: Yes.
75. C: Did they pass the ball or it was a deflection?
76. A: That’s like a back pass.
77. C: No that is...
78. A: [What if it was like the one Arshavin scored?
79. G: ok, ok, Macho, an Arsenal fan has said it.
80. B: Mato, let me tell you one thing.
81. G: Mato, Mato, You!
82. B: When checking for an offside, the moment the moment the ball is released, 
before the ball reaches you and you are in an offside position, the whistle is blown. 
It is not a must that the ball has to reach you for it to be an offside. The moment the 
ball is released to you...
83. G: [You Mato (Calling). It’s like that ball...
84. A: [what made the ball to get to Saha, was Koscielny. Koscielny was trying to clear 
but the ball went [to Saha].
85. B: [Yes, I am not refusing that.
86. C: it is ok, I accept. But initially, where did the ball come from initially? Where was he when the ball was released? Wasn’t he in an offside position?
87. A: [He was in an offside position.
88. G: [He was in an offside position. Before the ball moved he passed it ...
89. B: [When the ball was hit, he was in an offside position.
90. F: Ah! You see, you look at the last time the ball was touched, not when the ball was passed. Who touched the ball last? Waas he in an offside position when the ball was touched last? That is what you check.
91. A: Wasn’t he still in an offside position?
92. F: But did he touch the ball?
93. A: The Arsenal defender.
94. F: That is the problem that is why it is not an offside.
95. G: [Let me ask you; Is there a time when the ball has to reach the player for the whistle to be blown?]
96. F: [So there you look at the last time it was touched.
97. C: if there is such a rule then the offside rule is useless.
98. F: Ah! It is like that,
99. C: It is like that, it gets now much complicated.
100. F: an offside is like...
101. D: [All referees are human.
102. F: If it had been an Everton player he would have been judged to be in an offside position.
103. C: What if the free kick was not touched?
104. F: Free kick?
105. C: When the free kick is taken nobody touches the ball.
106. F: And the ball goes in? That is a goal.
107. C: No, the ball goes and Saha chases it.
108. F: That is an offside. But if the free kick goes straight in it is not an offside.
109. D: [No interference.
110. F: [Yes! There isn’t.
111. C: That rule has not sunk into my head. I see it as denying someone a goal.
112. D: Even Moyes accepted it was an offside.
113. C: Because he was trying to clear, wasn’t he trying to clear? Can the keeper catch the ball?
114. F: Yes.
115. C: so why do you count it as a back pass if keeper can catch the ball?
116. F: Now the issue there is: was it a back pass or not?
117. C: [It was not a back pass as he got the ball and it was deflected. Then the keeper caught the ball. Wasn’t it so?
118. (F nods in agreement))
119. C: It will not be. Now taken as a back pass. Why do you take it as a backpass whenever a player is interfering?
   ((Inaudible conversation as power comes back and TV is switched on))
120. F: but normally for others they make mistakes because in every rule, there is a loophole. So there are those who will use the loophole to favour a certain person.
121. C: Yes.
122. F: it is like the goal Stoke scored and the keeper was impeded but he did not jump for the ball. Another referee will say it is not a goal. One will say he impeded the keeper and another will say it is a goal.
123. D: You can see they are trying to show in slow motion up to where he had not reached.
124. F: so it is fifty-fifty and different referees will judge it differently.
125. D: This is where this player scored against us.
126. B: Yes.
127. C: He has a powerful kick! He is the one who has been sold at thirty five million pounds.
128. D: Imagine, but he has an injury. He is out for four weeks.
129. F: Now that injury will be detrimental. But if he was in good form they would beat Chelsea.
130. A: [Liverpool are ok.]
131. F: [Know that Chelsea’s problem is not forward, Chelsea’s problem is in the midfield.
CONVERSATION 4 (Translation)
PARTICIPANTS: BTN 5 AND 10
DURATION 12 MINS

((The participants are waiting for a game to begin and start a conversation.))

1. A: You don’t reproduce. In western province a man fathers children until they fill the place. You cannot ( ) ((whisper)) on the bed = ((laughter all over )) = by the way, it’s true.
2. B: I see!
3. A: Kalenjins! [they are too many, but they father nothing=
4. B: I see!
5. A: You don’t reproduce.
6. B: I see!
7. A: There in Nyahururu [listen!
8. C: [there is no one there.
9. A: Then which community lives in Subukia?
10. D: Let me hand over this newspaper? ((to A))
11. A: ((Ignoring D)) [But the man produces nothing.
12. D: (pleading) Let me give this newspaper to someone. It belongs to someone else and he wants to leave.
13. A: Oh! ( ) ((Gives the newspaper))
14. D: [That is the newspaper that belongs to this place.
15. A: [Two children each, as if you have been given family planning drugs.
16. D: Do we have two? ((Angrily))
17. A: in the first place someone like you cannot father three children.((Laughter)) two, two [three!
18. E: How many do you have? How many do you have?
19. A: It is because I don’t have land, if I had land I would have added till I have how many? ((Demonstrating with fingers)). Till I have how many? I would add up to how many? I would add up to how many?
20. E: Six.
21. A: but for now [let me stop where [I have seen...
22. E: [there is no land [because you are in Migingo. Migingo is only one [One acre.
23. A: [what will you plant thee yet maize does not grow there? (4sec) By the way, I was passing somewhere, then I asked myself, all this land cant these people ( ) But when you check there is nothing! Yet you are arguing with mukhwasi. Mukhwasi is far much ahead of you= @ Mukhwasi has beaten you and he is small. He is really spreading. ((The laughter has lessened considerably.)) Central is full till it is bursting=
24. E: And...
25. A: = [it just bursts pu! You find them in Molo, they say it is home [try to go there.
26. E: [Where is Akuku Danger from?
27. A: @ These are your people. Your fellow Nilotes. He is a Nilote. Mayengo! ((Greeting a new person)). Truly marriage breaks up. Someone sang “Marriage...” Raila have broken their marriage. [That is our joy.
28. B: [mmmh!
29. A: Truly if they had remained together we would never have seen power forever. =
30. E: You have amused me! That the whole of Rift Valley is ours and we are not there!
   ((calling))You Chebii!
31. A: =See the padlock ((Demonstrates)) [They had put on the state house door.
32. E: [Chebii don’t you see central?
33. A: Central what?
34. E: Central province.
35. A: what has it done?
36. E: It is small but they [have filled it.
37. A: [It has burst and is in..., it bursts and lands in Molo, it bursts and lands there
   [Nakuru they say is their home, and they are not leaving.
38. E: [You mean they are not where you come from?
39. A: Where?
40. E: Nyanza.
41. A: No! In our place in Kisii you may think it is their land. [all shops...
42. E: [No! No! Your home is Nyanza. Kisii is not in the [equation
43. A: [even in kisii we are the ones who bring that ( ) there.
44. E: We will go to the forest. We are taking ( )
45. A: No, you people have maize that you give them to eat with' ugali’. To eat with fish.
   They will come to take...
46. E:[what of you? Don’t you give them ‘matoke’?
47. A: last time when you said “Oh! If we are given...”
48. B: Timo why don’t you press that thing we see what is there?
   ((F takes the remote to search for the channel))
49. A: Which super sports channel?
   Several voices say :three.
50. A: wasn’t that where he was?
51. B: (To F) just press the Ok button.
52. F: OK?
53. A: Isn’t that where it was. (10 sec) A: Now you are the one who doesn’t want to confess that “these are our people by blood”. You cannot object. You have a common origin, common blood, common... These are your people. When you flogged us thoroughly saying you have kept [( ) weren’t you seeing?
54. E: Sincerely we never touched you, we never touched you..
55. A: Mzee tells you “these people have come up to my house to urinate on me, leave them alone.” You refused to. Now you say they are bad.
   [(Disapproval sounds and clicking)
56. C: [You!
57. A: Go away! You used the water to bathe, now bathe with it! Bathe even if the water is cold! ((B Laughs quietly)) A: Now, isn’t this pure joy? You know we sit aside and watch the war you are fighting. [bathe! = ((E & B: laugh quietly)).=If someone had
told you then that Raila was bad you would not have accepted. Then you said you know him very well. Tugul didn’t tell you. [To me, that old man is my friend. That old man, that one!
58. E: [Who? Who?
@ 
59. A: Chepkeres. [Came home and told you...
60. E:((hitting the table)) [I know the old man who is your friend is Raila [the late.
61. A: [ No problem. He’s yours! That old man is yours. You like it or not...
62. E: Ours is Chepkeres.
63. A: No, no way, No way! [You refused him and stoned him. Then you went and sat on the grass.
64. E: Ours is Chepkeres] Didn’t you see recently he said the constitution is bad and we supported him?
65. No! No! It is recently when you realized you had chased the wind and fell in, fell in the cold then … (laughs)
66. [Yes] We cannot accept this one. If we didn’t know how to swim...
67. A: For us, since long ago...
68. E:[ Who?
69. A: Us, since long ago...
70. E: [You as who?
71. A: Us! The ones you know!
72. E: I see!
73. A: We are independent.
74. E: I see! Ok.
75. A: With our hunger.
76. E: I see!
77. A: We have no need. We don’t come to Rift Valley to look for maize. You take your maize to Nyanza [or Ukambani. Do not bring me your stupidity.
78. E: (To waiter) [Manu! Bring me water to drink.]
79. A: Water is here, ask for a glass. (Handing him a jug of water) (5sec)[You usually take maize to Ukambani and Kisumu=
80. E:(holding the jug) [Chebii do you know I will put this into your eyes?]
81. A: = what are you telling us? ((Laughter all over)) A: Haven’t you been seeing…You Tum! (Calling)
82. G: Yes!
83. A: Is there any maize that comes from Rift Valley and goes to Kisii?
84. G: No.
85. A: it goes to Nyanza! Kisumu and ukambani. We are not threatened here!
86. G: [and Lodwar.
87. A: [We will till the road and produce bananas.
88. E: (calling) You, Timo!
89. F: Yes!
90. E: We have Raila! Spokesman. (Laughter) He is the one who sells Raila’s policies [in Koibatek district.
91. A: [I took the position of that white man. What was his name?
92. C: Who is that?
93. A: [Salim Leon. I took his position.
94. C: [Lone]
95. E: Leon, Leon was a national...
96. A: [ or call me Karoli Omondi.
97. E: [ the good thing is that yours is just here in Koibatek.] a spokesman in Koibatek.
98. A: do you know who is Raila’s bodyguard now?
99. E: No.
100. A: The guy who was a boxer. He sung some time...
101. E: [Conje?
102. A: No. There is a guy who was caught some time in Dandora singing that “Kibaki is unable to do his work” and was jailed.
103. E: (laughs) these days he is the bodyguard?
104. A: What is the guy’s name? (pauses) Somebody! He is always [behind Raila.
105. E: [Now, so that is why you are struggling to leave you job of selling milk (you could be a bodyguard?]
106. A: [Me! I am the opposite of you who follow these people...
107. E: [Mmmh!
108. A: You forced us, you flogged us and we said let us give vote half heartedly.
109. E: Yes.
110. A: [But ... it is you]
111. E: [Now you will vote with all your heart.]
112. A: (jokingly) kumpaf*! Kumanina* hiil ((Abusive Swahili words with no equivalent in English))
113. E: Kumanyoko*!
115. E: Yes!
116. A: You didn’t know.
117. E: Aahh! Now we have known. Now we have known. Kumanyoko*!
118. A: (laughs) This guy is the one... there is a Kisii saying ...
119. E: [See Newcastle are in the ninth position.
120. A: They haven’t played one game. They are like you.
121. E: Everton are in the tenth position. Which position are Wolves in?
122. A: Can’t you see?
123. E: Imagine Man have twenty three? (pause)
124. A: if you are not careful, haitabadilikait will not change. Wigan Athletic!
125. E: Wolves...
126. A: [McCarthy knew he needed one point to be...
127. E: [Matthew, please give me a glass Mathew.
128. A: Westham nearly won yesterday. Did they lose?
129. B: Yesterday?
130. E: They scored in the ninety second minute.
131. A: wolves?
132. E: Yes buddy!
133. A: No. I am talking about West Ham.
134. E: xxxxxxxxxx was really beaten, he saved himself in the ninetieth minute...
135. A: [I am talking about West Ham Westham.](12 sec) Someone starts refusing his wife and they have children together. (laughter) even if you refuse, the children are already born.
136. E: Where?
137. A: These people like Sambili are children, Kosgei are children=.
138. E: But the good thing is, we know...
139. = [Magerer Lang'at, [Those are fruits.@
140. E: [2012, come and ask us in 2012]
141. A: They are the fruits of ODM you can't change that.
142. E: Ok, I know you cannot change. I know you cannot change.
143. A: We have our party, Ford people... 
   ((B Laughs))
144. E: [I know you cannot change the course of...]
145. A: And we are the people who have a stand. Because until now we have decided
   [we have decided, we have decided we will maintain KANU. We have supported
   the old man. If it were not for us!]
146. E: [Now, Ok. Why don't you listen Chebii. Why don't you listen I tell you. Do you
   remember people like mwaliwumu mentioning here, people like Emmanuel
   mentioning De Jong, I don’t know who?
147. A: Yes!
148. E: Continue mentioning to us. But 2012 is not in our calculation. That one I...
149. A: [No! There is nothing! Even if it is there, even if it is not there. [now you just
   stay] You do not know where you are going.
150. E: [Yes]
151. A: Now you are playing algebra.
152. E: I have offered myself, if Chepkerees does not contest, I am going nowhere. I am
   with Chepkerees!
153. A: Chepkerees is brighter than you because he told you last [time but you followed
   children.
154. E: [Yes then yes]. And now I followed children...
155. A: We are better with Ongeri as we saw...
156. E: [Now who are you?] [Now who are you and yet you are not even there?
157. A: [We and Ongeri we said then] let us stand with KANU. You said you are not in
   Ford I don’t know ODM. Whenever anybody talked you told him...
158. E: [Now I am with Chepkerees. And anyone whose name starts with ‘O’ we will not
   give him the [seat.
159. A: [Even Ocampa?] even Ocampa?
160. E: Yes, even Ocampa. We are not giving him the seat. Ogeto, is there a difference
   between Ogeto and Oduor
161. A: Ogeto, ONGeri, Omogeni, Yes!
163. A: That one!
164. E: [Another one?
165. A: [You will make] Onyancha ( )
166. E: another one? Ongeri, [Obure
167. A: [Onyanchae. (5sec ) (( looking at the screen))These people have really spoiled this studio completely=
168. B: Yes!
169. A: = With their ugly faces!
170. E:Isn't it four thirty yet?
171. C: it is now three thirty.
172. A: These days ( ). This studio was moved from where it was. It was good.
173. E(( Calling))Manu!
174. H: Yes!
175. E: Does the game start at five?
176. B: At four thirty. At four thirty. [Four thirty.
177. E: [And what is the time now?
178. C: Three thirty.
179. A: There is one game that starts early.
180. B: Yours is at four thirty. Then another...[ five.
181. A: [Yes there is one that starts at five, another at four thirty, another at six...
182. B: The Chelsea game is at seven.
183. A: Yes, that one is at seven.
184. B: Yours is at four thirty isn't it? Then there is one that starts I am not sure if [it...at six it is the Man City game.
185. A: [ There is this one starting now There is another right now.
186. B:There is..., your game starts then the Man City one, then Chelsea.
187. A: No! There is one before ours.
188. B: Mmmh! ((Seeking confirmation))
189. A: There is one starting before ours.
(5sec)
190. B: but on Wednesday=
191. A: Mmmh!
192. B: = The Chelsea game will start fifteen minutes before the others. Then Man U and Arsenal games both will start at the same time..
193. A: I want to get a TV to show only Chelsea games.
194. B: Sincerely get us one. [ where will you put it?
195. A: [you pay one hundred shillings]
196. B: No problem [we will pay.
197. A: [you pay for five people because there are no customers. It is only this one and Limo.
198. E: (counting) This one, Limo, Timo, (Pause) Ah! and Kemboi?
199. A: Yeal! and [Kemboi.
200. E: [And the son of Fabisch.
201. B: Kemboi moved to support Chelsea?
202. A: What time will Kemboi come to watch football [and he has to go and supervise his work?
203. [And his brother, his brother. The Chelsea goalkeeper.
204. B: ((proudly)) We are there.
205. E: And also... You have forgotten one teacher from Poror who comes [many times these days.

206. A: [But he usually doesn't come]

207. E: There is one guy from Poror who comes when the game is between Man U and Chelsea.

208. C: Oh! The tall guy?

209. E: Yes! Yes! (On phone) Where are you?

   END.
CONVERSATION 5 (Translation)

DURATION: 5 MINS

67. A: They should not get rewarded @
68. B: We are talking, teacher. Arsenal fans have a right to talk.
69. C: That is why I am saying...
70. B: [They are always position 3 in ( ]
71. C: [That is why I am saying as you listen] when an Arsenal fan talks let him talk. [it is normal.]
72. B: [stop telling us “let him talk”! Even last season you were lucky to win, [Let us see if you will take the cup this year.
73. C:[ @]
74. D: [You struggle for this...=]
75. A: stop!
76. E: No, no!
77. B: position three!
78. A: Did you pray for them?
79. D: = Let us fall, you struggle for this.
80. B: We are in position three and we are not moving from there. Don’t brag that Cech does not concede goals.
81. A: Were you to bring Almunia to be the Chelsea keeper?
82. B: Does he concede or ...?
83. D: Almunia!
84. E: This whole problem has come just because we have conceded a goal, [Is conceding your problem? Fool!
85. B: ( to E) [You are talking badly! Don’t vent on us. (( Calling)) Koech!
86. F: I hear you want an alliance. The house is burnt so you are looking for an alliance. @
87. B: Amos!
88. F: I hear you are looking for an alliance. Sit with Amos.
89. A: Amos sit down here. So that we make an Alliance.
90. F: We have decided to go ( ) you look for an alliance.
91. B: Ten people!
92. F: Even if we are ten [let us go.
93. B: why don’t you let me look for a party with many people then I join them.
94. F: We know that is you habit. @
95. B: where there are many people, you join them...
96. F: [We know you have no stand.
97. B: Really! What will your stand do for you in Kenya? Do you need food or an alliance with a stand?
98. G: Can I sit here?
99. F: Someone has already paid for the seat.
100. B: No, you want to annoy me man! [{ ]
101. H: [Ah! Take this!}
102. B: The person who was selling albinos should have sold Amos [( )]
103. D:[They should form a party.
104. B: Who?
105. D: You should form a party.
106. B: What for? [Even where i come from no one] says he wants to split the votes. I will go there and vie for a political seat and see whom I will contest with.
   Several speakers interrupt: [Ah! So many people!
107. D:[Another party...
108. I: so that people can support you ( )
109. B: Even for you Moi was the last. You will be supporting others [forever.]
110. D:[we are here for football], who started politics here.
111. B: Ah! I am talking with the teacher. The teacher said... 
   @
112. D:[ Koech what have you discussed there?
113. B: especially Koech!
   Several voices: Koech.
114. C: Koech, this centre that has many votes in Poror?
115. E: [where? They have no votes.
116. F: [They have no votes, it is like that of ( )]
117. B: They do not have votes, these ones. it's just like ( )
   @
118. D: Koech what is this alliance for?
119. F: I don’t know, ask Cherutich.
120. B: He has refused to face the ball. That would have been a goal. (-)if somebody wants to move to Chelsea( )
121. C: You mean recently he joined Chelsea from Man U. (-) People have woken up!
122. D: Why don’t you sell us Gallas.
123. B: Gallas is at Tottenham. And the beat a team today.
124. D: No! I want you to sell him to us. Now you want to remove him from there and return him where he was. Didn’t you sell him and he said he would score against you?Sasa
125. J: We have wasted two clear goals.
126. B: You have come here expecting Wigan to beat Chelsea.
127. J: Who? It can even end in a one all draw.
128. B: it is Amos who says so and I am angry.
129. D: form an alliance. Just that, Yes [just that].
130. B: an alliance to support Chelsea.
131. F: Chebon’s work is just to look for alliances. I wonder why he is looking for an alliance with Amos when there is a friend of his next to him yet he is not looking for an alliance with him. What do you want, Chebon?
   @
132. B: This friend of ours, his game ended, they beat someone six nil.
   END.
CONVERSATION 6 (Translation)
DURATION 8 MINS
PARTICIPANTS : 9

((Silent watching))
90. A: That is why I am telling you he removes his tie and goes. He will put on the tie when receiving the cup.
((B laughs))
91. C: Ah! ( ) he kept quiet.
92. D: it is not even that, even in front, all of them would have won that ball already.
93. E: This one would be two nil now.
((Pause))
94. C: you see this player is just going round [there.]
95. E: [Berbatov is the one there.
96. A: I don’t like this player [completely.
97. B:[But you can’t blame him, you see the game he has played is too hard for him.
98. E: [he is not getting it today.]
99. [C: Yes, Yes!]
100. B: Balotelli can’t manage the pattern Ferguson is playing today, I mean Berbatov
101. C: [Berbatov. This is a hard game! He likes soft games. This is a hard game and too fast.
102. B: Even Ferguson’s pattern today...
103. C: [Ah! Do you see this [Football!]
104. E: [hasn’t he just given the ball away? It is [Carrick.]
105. A: [Carrick! Ah! Carrick just gave that away. And the defense got confused.
Several voices: Mmmh. ((affirmation))
106. F: Leo Van der Saar has been outwitted today. If the ball was from the flanks he would have cleared it.
107. A: pardon?
108. F: If he was on the Flanks, he would have cleared it.
((Pause))
Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
110. F: [he can’t see]
111. C: [he can’t see]
112. D: [Even this one should be substituted. Scholes is doing nothing.
113. G: Does he think that one has gone in really? That one.
114. C: The midfield is subdued. He should bring on Giggs and Nani.
115. D: Let him bring on Giggs.
116. C: is park in the field?
117. D: Park is in the field. ((Pause)) See!
118. G: Hey!
((Surprise all over))
119. D: This guy is useless. Berbatov is a liability.
120. H: He is playing the way Anelka played the champions league the other day. He played a childish game ( )
121. C: make a substitution!
122. D: That is..., the old England guy. Look at that old man. That is why you hear football ( ) everyone.
123. C: he should substitute ...
124. D: [ No! no!
125. C: Not Carrick.
126. G: Where is Anderson?
127. D: Let him bring on Anderson instead of Nani. (-) to change this game. He should substitute.
128. B: when you watch such a game you will realize Rooney [really works hard].
129. D: [Ah! Rooney plays! Rooney [plays!]
130. B: [Rooney plays the whole midfield.
131. D: Ah, Rooney! [Leave him alone].
132. B: [he is the one who falls back into the midfield then goes forward.
133. D: Ah, Rooney really plays. He is an engine. You will see him in defense then he is forward.
134. B: especially in the midfield he is the one who goes to get the ball, [passes it, and moves to receive the ball.]
135. D: [ And, and, eh!
((pause))
136. B: The ball is not going out. These boys know how to pass the ball. ((pause))
137. D: No, that is not bad!
((pause))
138. A: Ah! You!
139. C: These people should be substituted.
140. A: is it Barcelona?
141. D: Ferguson should make change. Otherwise these guys [will be knocked out.]
142. B: [he needs a strong midfield.
143. D: Yes.
144. B: when he knew Rooney is not playing he should have fielded a strong midfield. ((pause))
145. B: look at one like that one now.
146. C: if they get one!
147. D: The body, the body man!
148. B: if it were not for his discipline, Baloteli can be a [very good player.
149. C: [Yes, correct.
150. D: ((angry))Now what is this?
151. A: lie down, lie down!
152. G: stretch the field! stretch!
153. C: pass the ball backwards.
154. F: Vidic today! ((disapproval))
155. D: Ah! Forwards are very ineffective today, the midfield is weak that is why the
defence is burdened.  
Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
156. G: let him take the corner kick.  
157. A: There he is, there he is!  
Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
158. D: it was going in! It was going in! Van der saar has tried.  
159. B: That player is dangerous [that Silva!]  
160. D: [Yes, isn’t he the guy who scored using his hand – And that guy would have
gone to score.  
161. G: Had the ball passed, that player would have scored.  
162. F: That is another one!  
  @  
163. D: Ferdinand saved that. That is why the coach plays him, you know he has
experience.  
164. B: Mmh. ((agreement)) =
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
165. B: = Ah! This one is not yet.  
166. A: Pastor, your team has been beaten; they have been beaten by the other team.
((I remains silent))  
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
167. A: and that was a goal. This player was just standing, there is a guy who was just
standing. There is a guy, Oh Carrick! [Berbatov.]  
168. C: [Berbatov.  
169. D: Berbatov is the one who was lost. Oshea, even this Oshea is doing nothing.  
170. B: Eh! If that had been seen!  
171. D: yours alone, there it is!  
172. G: he is moving like Chelsea.  
173. C: play faster! Pass the ball in the middle! ((Pause)) Ah!  
174. D: Yellow card!  
175. B: now he has spoilt it.  
176. D: he has spoilt it.  
177. C: He knows if he is booked it is risky.  
178. D: He made a sliding tackle on him!  
END
CONVERSATION 7 (Translation)
DURATION 10 MINS
PARTICIPANTS: 10

((A few minutes before the game begins))
1. A: Must this beast be put here?
2. B: Rosisky cannot [( ) he wants to be put ( )] =
3. C: [How does this pitch look?]
4. B: =Age is getting the better of Rosisky [he can’t manage.]
5. D: [don’t be shocked about this pitch ( ) it was this way during the Blackburn game.]
7. F: Don’t joke; the guy can score a goal today.
8. G: why don’t you like this play yet he is [good?]
11. E: He doesn’t have the intelligence to score! [He doesn’t have the intelligence to score.]
12. H: Who?
15. E: How many times does he remain with the goal keeper?
16. H: Who?
17. E: Arshavin.
18. H: I don’t know what happened to the intelligence he had [( )]
19. F: What good do you seen in Arshavin?
20. G: I like the goals he scores. [When he scores they are very good.]
21. B: [( ) He was so good, he wants to go at an angle.
22. E: Yes!
23. F: The guy is left with the keeper yet he can’t [score.
24. H: [He scores wonder goals=
25. G: Yes!
26. F: He places the ball in the roof, [when the ball is moving in a line he places it in the roof.]
27. B: [Even when he fails to score he says it was not his fault. And he is so confident about it.
((Attention switches to the tv))
28. H: Nolan, Best. ((Calling names))
29. E: Best,Is Nolan playing?
30. H: This boy called Best has scored ... ( ) has not been tried in a big team.
((amidst murmurs)
31. E: This midfield will stifle them.
32. F: This midfield! [Wilshire must work hard today.
33. E: [Ah! The midfield is not strong!
34. B: [Wilshire is the one to do a lot of work.]
35. H: Diaby is a liability.
36. B: But if Diaby is substituted [who will take his place?
37. [Rosisky.
38. E: [Rosisky] will replace Diaby.
39. F: It is better for Diaby [to start.
40. E: [ and where did Carlos Vela go?
41. B: Carlos Vela left. The other one has an injury=
42. H: Who?
43. B: This Brazilian. [Denilson.
44. H: [Denilson has an injury.
45. A: Denilson has an injury.
46. B: We have lost three midfielders.
    ((murmurs))
47. C: ( )
48. Here I lack someone called Bentdner Nick!
49. E: [Yes here.
50. G: Will this defender play tomorrow?
51. I: Yes! ((pause)) But just to try him. ((
52. G: [Maybe he comes on as a substitute.
53. I: Ok.
54. G: But I think Torres will start.
55. B: Ok!
56. G: Torrres will start.
57. I: Torres will start.
58. E: Will he start?
59. F: he will finish!
60. B: No, he can't start.
    ((Inaudible murmurs))
61. E: I thought it was Diego Forlan, or who is he?
63. E: Not Diego?
64. H: This one is Kevin Nolan.
65. E: Where is Diego Forlan?
66. H: Diego Forlan is at - Atletico Madrid.
67. G: Which team wanted him, Tottenham?
68. H: Yes, Tottenham.
69. E: Whom do they want?
70. G: Forlan!
71. C: Look at that shoe!
    (6sec)
72. B: Diaby! (6sec) the boy must play properly today!
    ((Murmurs)) (15sec)
73. B: This guy never loses the ball.
    (12sec)
74. G: mistake!
Shouts all over: Goal! Xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

75. F: motorbike! Forty five seconds!
   ((Murmurs and noise all over))

76. B: You know he feared to touch him. [He feared to touch him. He feared to concede a penalty.

77. G: [Yes!

78. D: He shielded the ball!

79. B: Yes! He would have touched him but he feared conceding a penalty.

80. G: It is not a penalty. That is a send off.

81. H: you are sent off for that.

82. D: [That is a red card.
   ((Murmurs and TV noise))

83. E: (Walcott) is so fast.

84. B: This guy should be made a central striker and remain [there.

85. D: Central is better, he does it [so well.

86. B: When that guy plays in central defense he is usually... (3sec)

87. F: Pig!

88. H: This guy here is not the pig, [he is not the pig.

89. A: [He has touched the ball with his hand.

90. B: The guy's game has started improving.

91. F: Yes it has started.

92. B: Whose game? Isn't that Arshavin?

93. E: Fabregas.

94. J: ((Entering)) who scored?

95. C: Walcott.

96. F: Motorbike.

97. J: You people are watching this but you can't watch the Man U game? ((to F)) I can't sit with you.
   ((Murmurs))

   Everyone: GOAL! Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

98. B: Sit down man, many things will bypass you.

99. J: You go! ((at an opponent))

   @ ((murmurs))

100. C: Djorou!

101. J: You (   ) this is the third minute and they have two goals!

102. C: Djorou himself!

103. G: This one am not even paying, I am leaving!

104. J: Pardon!

105. G: I am going! I am not paying.

106. J: It is better you leave.


108. F: These ones can recover.

109. H: Nolan usually targets there.

110. F: That is bad.

   ((inaudible murmurs))
111. H: That is another one. 
   ((murmurs))
112. F: Let them just go with the ball!
113. J: Yes, let me greet you happy New Year.
114. H: (to G) But weren't you leaving?
115. G: I am just here! We were beaten so I decided to rest. (10sec)
   XXXXXXXXXXXXX ((exclamation and shock))
116. Look!
117. C: Oh No! he was ...
118. E: [He bumped into him!
119. H: [He would have been hurt in the middle!
120. B: Look man, doesn't this guy have a foul?
121. J: He saved himself, he saved himself...
122. H: [It is this referee? This one will award a penalty!
123. B: Yes this one will award a penalty.
124. C: We should be careful.
125. B: He will ...
126. H: [We should just be careful in our penalty area.
   ((1 min inaudible murmurs))
127. F: Hey!
128. B: Had he got that!
129. C: Good, Diaby today you have tried!
130. F: Friend!
131. C: Lift the ball!
132. J: So Henry is still on this pitch? (4sec)
133. C: No! Sh!
134. H: He didn't see. ((Murmurs)) If he got a player who places it just there!
135. F: But where does a goal come from? Isn't it just a good pass?. Killer pass!
137. C: [(
138. B: Ah, No way ... He will score.
   ((inaudible conversations))
A.3 TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

1. 1, 2, 3 turn number at the beginning of every turn
2. A, B, C Speaker identity
3. : Turn start
4. [ ] encloses speech overlap
5. | point at which interruption begins
6. ... hesitation because of interruption
7. @ Laughter
8. ( ) encloses researcher’s comments or observation notes
9. ( ) single parenthesis enclose items in doubt
10. ( ) empty parenthesis, hearing could not be achieved
11. <X X> encloses uncertain hearing
12. X indecipherable syllable
13. <L2 L2 > encloses code switching
14. = contiguous utterances (i.e. continuous flow of speech carried to another line to accommodate intervening interruption.
15. (6sec) pause interval within utterances
16. - short untimed pause
17. :::: extension of a syllable/ sound
18. ! animated tone, not necessarily an exclamation
19. **underline** emphasis
20. CAPS utterance or part thereof that is spoken much louder than surrounding talk.
21. Xxxxxxxxxxxxxx applause
22. X-x-x-x spasmodic or hesitant clapping
23. [P1], [P2], [P3], [P4], [P5] Numbers/codes in square brackets indicate the politeness strategy used.

(Adapted from: Jefferson 1979), Tannen 1989, 2007(2nd Ed) and Dubois 1991)
A.4 OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

1. What is the venue and time of the recording?
2. What is the number of men present?
3. How many men participate in the conversation?
4. Are there women present? What are they doing?
5. What is the order of sitting?
6. What are the foods and/or drinks taken?
7. Are the speakers sober?
8. What are the facial expressions of speakers?
9. How audible are the speakers?
10. What is the social status of each speaker?
11. What are the actions of speakers?
12. What are the men who do not speak doing?
13. Check for:
   a) Marked shift in pitch
   b) Marked shift if amplitude
   c) Fast rate speech