

**USE OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES BY TEACHERS IN
THE SCHOOL STAFFROOM IN KIRINYAGA COUNTY**

**WAMBUGU ROSE WAITHIRA
C50/CE/21232/2012**

Department of English and Linguistics

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO SCHOOL OF
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL
FULFILMENT FOR THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS OF
KENYATTA UNIVERSITY**

OCTOBER, 2018

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been submitted or presented for any other award in any other university, either in part or as a whole

Signature _____ Date _____

Wambugu Rose Waithira
C50/CE/21232/2012

SUPERVISORS

Signature _____ Date _____

Ms. Florence Owili
Department of English and Linguistics
Kenyatta University

Signature _____ Date _____

Dr. Purity Nthiga
Department of English and Linguistics
Kenyatta University

DEDICATION

To God for I could not have made it without Him. My father Mr. Joseph Wambugu and mother Bilha Wambugu to you I dedicate this work. You have been a source of encouragement and support. To my siblings Bernard, Beatrice, Lydia and Jeremy- thank you for always being there for me especially when I needed you most during the development of this work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to my supervisors: Dr. Purity Nthiga and Ms. Florence Owili for their support, intellectual guidance, and constructive criticism throughout the period of this study. I also thank all lecturers of the Department of English and Linguistics of Kenyatta University. My sincere gratitude too goes to all head teachers and the teachers of the sampled schools for the permission to record them during data collection.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
ABSTRACT	xv
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background to the Study	1
1.3 Statement of the Problem	6
1.4 Research Objectives	7
1.5 Research Questions.....	7
1.6 Research Assumptions.....	7
1.7 Justification of the Study	8
1.9 Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	9

CHAPTER TWO	10
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Linguistics Politeness	10
2.3 Theoretical Framework.....	15
CHAPTER THREE.....	17
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	17
3.0 Introduction	17
3.1 Research Design	17
3.2 Area of Study.....	18
3.3 Target Population	18
3.4 Sample Size	18
3.5 Research Instruments.....	20
3.6 Pilot Study	20
3.6.1 Validity of the Research Instruments	20
3.6.2 Reliability of the Research Instruments.....	21
3.7 Data Collection Procedures	22
3.7.1 Official Interactions	22
3.7.2 Non-formal Interactions	23
3.8 Data Analysis Procedure	23

3.8 Logistical and Ethical Considerations	24
CHAPTER FOUR	26
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION	26
4.1 Introduction	26
4.2 Use of Politeness Strategies by Teachers	27
4.2.1 Positive Politeness Strategies	27
4.2.1.1 Notice, Attend to Hearer	28
4.2.1.2 Optimism.....	29
4.2.1.3 Seek Agreement Strategy (Repetition).....	30
4.2.1.4 The Inclusive 'We'	36
4.2.1.5 In-group Identity Markers	38
4.2.1.6 Give or Ask Reasons	44
4.2.2 Negative Politeness Strategies	46
4.2.2.1 Minimize the Imposition (RX)	47
4.2.2.2 Apology	49
4.2.2.3 Impersonalizing S and H	50
4.2.3 Bald-On-Record Politeness Strategy	52
4.2.3.1 Bald-On- Record (With Minimization)	53
4.2.3.2 Bald-On-Record (Without Minimization)	55
4.2.4 Off-Record Politeness Strategy	58

4.2.4.1 Give Hints	59
4.2.4.2 Presuppose	61
4.2.4.3 Ambiguity	62
4.2.4.4 Metaphor	66
4.3 Sociological Determinants of Politeness Strategies	70
4.3.1 Relative Power of the Speaker or Hearer (P)	71
4.3.2 Social Distance (D).....	73
4.3.3 Rank.....	75
4.3.4 Gender	77
4.3.5 Age.....	80
4.4 Influence of Politeness Strategies on interactions	82
4.4.1 On Record Strategy Without Redressive Action.....	82
4.4.2 Off Record Strategy	84
4.4.3 Negative Politeness Strategies	85
4.4.4 Positive Politeness Strategies	86
4.5 Chapter Summary	88

CHAPTER FIVE	90
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
5.0 Introduction	90
5.1 Summary of Findings	90
5.1.1 Politeness Strategies	90
5.1.2 Sociological Factors Influencing the Choice of Politeness Strategies ...	91
5.1.2.1 Power, Social Distance, Ranking, Age and Gender (P, D, RA and G)	91
5.2 Conclusions from Findings.....	93
5.2.1 Use of Politeness Strategies.....	93
5.2.2 Sociological Determinants of Politeness Strategies.....	94
5.2.3 Influence of Politeness Strategies on Interactions	95
5.3 Recommendations	96
5.4 Suggestions for further Research.....	97
5.5 Chapter Summary	97
REFERENCES	98
APPENDICES.....	104
APPENDIX I: INTRODUCTION LETTER.....	104
APPENDIX II: CONSENT LETTER.....	105
APPENDIX III: CONVERSATION 2, SCHOOL A.....	106
APPENDIX IV: CONVERSATION 7, SCHOOL B.....	109
APPENDIX V: CONVERSATION 9, SCHOOL C.....	111

APPENDIX VI: CONVERSATION 17, SCHOOL A.....	114
APPENDIX VII: CONVERSATION 18, SCHOOL B	118
APPENDIX VIII: CONVERSATION 4, SCHOOL C.....	120
APPENDIX IX: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FROM GRADUATE SCHOOL KENYATTA UNIVERSITY	122
APPENDIX X: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FROM NACOSTI.....	123
APPENDIX XI: RESEARCH PERMIT	124

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BOR	-	Bald on Record
CA	-	Catholic Action
CAT	-	Continuous Assessment Test
CJ	-	Chief Justice
Conv.	-	Conversation
CS	-	Cabinet Secretary
CU	-	Christian Union
D.O.S	-	Director of Studies
DP	-	Deputy School Principal
EFL	-	English Foreign Language
FTA	-	Face Threatening Act
H	-	Hearer
H.O. D	-	Head of Department
JSC	-	Judiciary Service Commission
K.C.S. E	-	Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education
N. F	-	Negative Face
N.F.T. A	-	Negative Face Threatening Act
N.P. S	-	Negative Politeness Strategy
NACOSTI	-	National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation
P	-	Power
P. F	-	Positive Face
P.F.T. A	-	Positive Face Threatening Act

P.P. S	-	Positive Politeness Strategy
S	-	Speaker
SD	-	Social Distance
SWOT	-	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats
T.O. D	-	Teacher on Duty
T.V	-	Television
TSC	-	Teachers Service Commission
U. S	-	United States

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4. 1: Summary of positive politeness Strategies as used by teachers	45
Table 4. 2: Summary of Negative Politeness Strategies	52
Table 4. 3: Shows the summary of bald-on record usage among teachers in the staffroom.....	58
Table 4. 4: Off-record Politeness Strategies	69
Table 4. 5: Politeness Strategies used by Teachers	70

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Face:	public self-image that every adult tries to protect.
Positive face:	consistent self-image or personality claimed by participants.
Negative face:	want of every “competent adult member” that his actions be unimpeded by others. It is the freedom of action and freedom from imposition.
Face threatening acts:	acts that cause threat to the positive and the negative face of the hearer or speaker.
Politeness:	expression of the speaker’s intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts.
Politeness strategies:	techniques used by speakers in conversation to achieve mutual understanding
Power:	level of authority a participant has over others.
Peer teacher:	form four leavers with good performance and are hired to handle questions from students in various subjects.

ABSTRACT

The purpose for this study was to analyze the politeness strategies used by teachers in the school staffroom in Kirinyaga County. The objectives were; to determine the strategies of politeness employed by teachers in their interactions, to analyze how the sociological factors such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance influence politeness strategies used by teachers and to determine how the politeness strategies affect interactions among teachers in Kirinyaga County. Descriptive research approach was adopted for this study. Three secondary schools were randomly sampled. All teachers in the sampled schools were selected for the study. Research instruments were video recorder, observation and field notes to reinforce the data collected through video recording. Qualitative approach to data analysis was used in the study to present the utterance by teachers. However descriptive data from the frequencies of use of the politeness strategies by teachers was presented in tables. The positive politeness strategies used by teachers included notice, attending to hearer, optimism and seeking agreement. Negative politeness strategies used were minimization of imposition, apology and impersonalizing of speaker and hearer. Bald-on-record and off-record strategies were also used by the teachers. The Power of the principals was considered great because they were influential, eloquent and the fact that they acted as representatives of the teachers' employer. This was evident from the straight forward orders and requests they made to the teachers. The distance of the speaker and hearer was identified from the way teachers interacted amongst themselves and with the principals. The use of the word 'sir' to address the principal was social distance characteristic. The social distance helped teachers to freely interact with each other and keep it official with the principals. The social distance between the speaker and hearer was however varied among participants of the same gender, age and rank among different schools. Gender, age and the ranks of teachers played a crucial role in the manner in which the teachers interacted. Politeness strategies brought about respect and cohesiveness among the teachers and the principals. Teachers need to understand the politeness strategies that can be used among them and the administrations to avoid friction and misunderstanding. This study observes that politeness has an instrumental role in the social interaction among teachers and therefore, use of politeness strategies is highly encouraged to foster good working relations among teachers and principals. Politeness strategies would also enhance output among teachers since it helped create unity of purpose among teachers. The findings of this study correctly predict how politeness is used in face to face conversations. For instance, this study observed that small talk upholds social relationships among teachers agreeing with the theory on positive face. A study to establish politeness strategies used by teachers on learners at different school levels and subjects would help to highlight reasons for varied perceptions on different subjects, teachers and schools among learners.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the study background, the problem statement, the study objectives and the research questions. The chapter also presents research assumptions, justification for the study, scope and limitations.

1.2 Background to the Study

Politeness is considered an essential practice which ensures that interactions between people are orderly and that the desired goal is realized (Bremner, 2012). According to Pullin (2010), politeness is a universal phenomenon involved in the creation and maintenance of good interactional relations, although politeness norms may vary from one community or individual to another. Politeness stands out as a vital communicative activity that tends to harmonize social interactions (Kádár & Pan, 2011) and foster interpersonal relations between the members of a society (Najeeb, Maros & Nor, 2012). Brown and Levinson (1978) define politeness as a countenance of the intention of the speaker to assuage threats of the face carried out by face threatening acts (FTAs) towards another person in social interaction. 'Act' according to Darics (2010) refers to the intended act either verbally or through non-verbal communication. On the other hand, Rixer (2016) defines politeness as portrayal of good manners and respect for others.

According to Mills (2011) being polite is an attempt to save face for another. Lakoff (1989) looks at politeness as a means of minimizing the risk of confrontation in discourse while Eelen (2014) views politeness as formality, as difference, as etiquette, good manners or as tact. Politeness gets its strength over others by explaining it from a more fundamental notion of what is to be a human being, the basic notion of face; which is all about the self -image in public which everyone wishes to claim (Bloor & Bloor, 2013).

Politeness is such an important principle in human language use because speakers must consider the listeners' feelings (Eelen, 2014). Understanding among people promotes good interpersonal association and creates a favorable working environment. Brown and Levinson (1978) notes that politeness has the notion of 'face' which exists universally in human culture and social interaction. 'Face' which originated from Goffman (1967), is the self- image in the public that people want to claim for themselves. Face has two related aspects: positive and negative faces.

Positive face is the consistent self- image that is positive (Brown & Levinson, 1978) or personality desiring that a self-image is acknowledged and claimed by members in an interaction (Eelen, 2014) while negative face is the desire of every participant in a conversation to be unhindered in social interaction and described as an individual's basic claim to territories, personal preserves and self-determination (Harris, 2003). Kithure (2008) avers that the two aspects of face are the basic wants in any social interaction, so co-operation is needed amongst the participants to maintain each other's face.

Mills (2003) notes that politeness is the manifestation of the encoder's intentions to lessen threats of the face supported by face threatening acts towards others. The concept of face is vital to power since it defines the personalities established in different contexts by people for output in linguistic. Face affects linguistic strategies that are used by people with varying social distance. Nevertheless, not all circumstances cater for the face needs of members. Stephan, Liberman and Trope (2010) state that people require to show urgency or emphasis and may thus appear pushy, intimidating or impolite.

Scholarly studies have been done on communication strategies across the globe and they have revealed that communication strategies are part of the people's repertoire whether they are old or young (Mei & Nathalang, 2010). Marriott (1993) posits that in informative interviews where Australian businessmen discussed a range of attitudes towards code switching during business meetings, some take lenient views in contexts where code switching is seen as a corrective device to rectify inadequacies in English communication on the part of Japanese interactants. Eelen (2014) found out that the speakers ought to use politeness strategies to save their own faces and those of their interactants. She further argues that for effective communication to take place, members must draw from their assumptions and background knowledge when interpreting social meanings of other people in a conversation.

According to Locher (2010), what might be polite to the speaker may turn out to be impolite to the hearer who may belong to a different cultural background and what may be polite in one culture is not necessarily polite in the other. During such interfaces, speakers choose expressions that vary on politeness scale (Stephan et al., 2010) and can be more polite or less polite which is dependent on prevailing situations (Eelen, 2014). They also use terms definitive of power and indicating social associations (Locher, 2010). Polite terms like honorifics, excuse me, sorry, please, greetings, appreciation and turn taking show politeness. Politeness improves one's rapport, builds respect and relationship, boosts one's esteem, confidence and improves one's communication skills. At work like in a school, politeness can be useful in diffusing differing opinions. Disagreements are inevitable but divergences coupled with impoliteness can lead to fruitless arguments or personal attacks. Well-reasoned deliberations can help principals, deputy principals and teachers to resolve discrepancies fairly such that they avoid arguments that damage professional and individual relationships.

Koike (2014) states that in a work place one should greet people. According to Koike (2014), it is right to greet colleagues and other every day associations. Kádár and Haugh (2013) note that people engage in small talk and light conversations. Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, Sudhof, Jurafsky, Leskovec and Potts (2013) posit that a person should be approachable, use polite words and if someone gives anything, use terms like "yes please" or "no thank you."

According to politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), politeness serves to both reflect and regulate social distance. Politeness according to Trope & Liberman (2010) is related to abstract construal, temporal distance, and spatial distance. The general assumption of Brown and Levinson (1978) theory of politeness is that many speech acts like, requesting, criticizing, and disagreeing are intrinsically threatening to face. Speech acts are threatening because they do not consider the face wants of the interlocutors. By applying Brown & Levinson's (1987) theory to the speech act of disagreement, the speech act constitutes a threat to the hearer's positive face as a speaker is imposing her/his will on the hearer.

Different people depending on social factors apply varied politeness strategies. For instance, Guodong & Jing (2005) revealed that, when disagreeing with the superior, Chinese students employed more politeness strategies and address forms than American students. Both the American and Chinese students applied less politeness strategies with increased social distance among peers while Chinese female used more politeness strategies than their male counterparts.

Teachers need to apply the above strategies in their interactions in the school staffroom to promote good interpersonal relationships among them. This study thus investigated strategies of politeness used in the staffroom by teachers, analyzed how the social determinants such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance influence the choice of politeness and investigated how these politeness strategies influenced communication among teachers. This was to

determine the influence of various politeness strategies on the relationship among teachers. This study therefore examined the use of politeness strategies in the school staffroom by teachers in Kirinyaga County.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Lack of politeness among teachers as in any other profession is likely to cause conflict (Behnam & Niroomand, 2011). To communicate effectively, teachers use language in different ways. Different functions of speech may be used to express the same meaning among different teachers in the staffroom. Social factors such as gender, age, or power are regarded as factors influencing these differences. Studies have shown that language use is affected and constrained by socio-cultural factors and individual discourse styles and communicative strategies (Brown & Levinson's, 1987). To understand the use of politeness in interaction among members of any society, a thorough understanding of these social factors and how they affect the interaction must be done.

Studies done on politeness strategies have focused on other social sectors like banking (Walya, 1996; Wambui, 2014), and religion (Kithure, 2015). Studies on politeness strategies in the education system were done in colleges and universities (Odongo, 2008; Li, 2012). No study has however been done on the effect of social factors on politeness strategies among teachers in high schools. This study therefore examined strategies of politeness that were applied by teachers in the school staffroom, analyzed how social factors such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance influence the choice of politeness strategies.

1.4 Research Objectives

This study sought to achieve the following objectives;

- i. To determine the strategies of politeness that are employed by teachers in the school staffroom in their interactions.
- ii. To analyze how the sociological factors such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance influence politeness strategies by teachers in the school staffroom.
- iii. To determine how the politeness strategies affect interactions among teachers in the school staffroom.

1.5 Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions;

- i. Which politeness strategies do teachers apply in their interaction in the school staffroom?
- ii. How does age, gender, power, rank and social distance influence politeness strategies used by teachers in a school staffroom?
- iii. What is the influence of politeness strategies on interactions among teachers in the school staffroom?

1.6 Research Assumptions

This study made the following research assumptions:

- i. Different politeness strategies are used by teachers in the school staffroom in their interactions.

- ii. Sociological factors such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance influence the choice of politeness strategies by teachers in the school staffroom.
- iii. There is an influence of politeness strategies on interactions among teachers in the school staffroom.

1.7 Justification of the Study

Politeness is essential in determination of the success or failure of a relationship. In a school staffroom, several social factors are at play in determination of politeness strategies used by teachers. Considering these factors is important as it helps in understanding the influence of the politeness strategies on the addresser and addressee. These study findings are likely to be useful in the following ways:

In pragmatics, this study sought to fill a gap on the effect of politeness on relational association among teachers in the staffroom. A study on staffroom discourse can present teachers with important information and knowledge about the politeness strategies which they use or need to communicate successfully and relate well with each other and avoid face threats to each other.

Head-teachers and teachers may get information on ways of resolving discrepancies fairly and avoid arguments that may damage personal relationships. This study sought to provide data on the nature of verbal connections that take place among teachers which may help them to constantly

check on the kind language they use. The school managers may acquire knowledge concerning politeness to attain the anticipated results in the schools for the smooth running of schools.

The findings may be useful in organizations such as banks, churches, hotel industry and public service providers in which good staff relation is vital for the smooth running of the organizations and good personal relations and work relations. Writers of textbooks may use this valuable information on politeness. These textbooks would in turn be helpful to teachers of English in teaching decorum to students.

1.9 Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the politeness aspect as influenced by various sociological variables such as age, gender, power, rank, and social distance and the effect of politeness strategies on interactions. However, the study was limited by the ideal situation that was created due to the researcher's presence in the other two schools, B and C. From the study findings, School B and C used more positive strategies than negative, off-record and bald-on while school A used more negative strategies since the researcher was a teacher in the school. Nevertheless, the researcher carried out six conversations in each school for purposes of minimizing biasness.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, relevant literature on the study objectives is covered. The study conceptualizes negative & positive face and face threatening acts. The chapter also presents linguistic politeness and the theoretical framework.

2.2 Linguistics Politeness

Brown and Levinson (1987) state that a positive face is the want of everybody that his wants be desired to some other facilitators while negative face is the wish adult members that their actions do not cause an imposition upon others. They define a face intimidating action as an action that fundamentally threatens the face of the recipient or the presenter by opposing the requirements and needs of the other. Use of politeness in linguistics has widely been researched on.

Negative face threatening acts damage either the presenter's or listener's negative face, and make one of the discussers to succumb and hence the liberty for choices and exploits are considerably threatened. Positive face threatening acts occur whenever the speaker or the listener cares less about the discussers' emotional status, wants or does not want what the others want. These acts cause damage to both the orator and the listener. Politeness has been studied by various scholars in the study of pragmatics as discussed below.

Ting-Toomey (1994), notes that faces are images of personal or collective group that people see and appraise based on cultural norms and values. Conflicts occur when that group or individual has their face threatened. It is important to observe the degree of concern for self and others' faces because it delivers. This study therefore aims to explore the determinants of the strategy chosen for politeness by teachers in a staffroom to save the individual's face.

Canale, (2014) posits that communicative ability involves not only understanding language but also knowing to whom, and in which way to say it in different situations. One ought to know the practices of turn-taking in discussion, how to ask for and give information, how to request, give commands, and all other things language does, as stated by Canale (2014). This competence was expected among teachers in a staffroom.

Tannen (1991) revealed the difference between female and male use of language. He stressed the importance of small talk as being a critical component in women's communication to shape and conglomerate relationships. Furthermore, small talk generates a friendship, when the audience members answer back in the anticipated way. Tannen's affirmation that small talk is critical in upholding social relationships agrees with Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory on positive face.

Nguyen (2009) compared and contrasted Vietnamese and American undergraduate students' performance. The study found that both groups preferred using non- conflicting disagreement strategies than conflicting ones and they mostly expressed their disagreement in a non-threatening way for fear

of breaking the group. Male tended to be more direct than the female respondents. Americans were more indirect and less aggressive than their Vietnamese counterparts. The study further showed that Americans were more careful to save the face of their interlocutor and did their face threatening act off record. On the contrary, Guodong and Jing (2005) revealed that, when disagreeing with their superiors, Chinese students employed more politeness strategies and address forms than American students.

Bolkan and Holmgren (2012) examined the impact of polite student e-mails on instructors' motivation to work with students and both their perceptions of students' competence and potential for success. The study found out that the use of politeness strategies influenced levels of affect toward students. It was established that when instructors had higher positive affect toward students, they were more motivated to work with students and had higher perceptions of both students' competence and potential for success in their classrooms. While this study focused on the influence of politeness on teachers' motivation and perception, the current study examined the influence of social factors on use of politeness strategies among teachers in the school staffroom.

Li (2012) analyzed the wiki-mediated discourse of one collaborative writing group in a Chinese EFL context. The writing group comprised of three EFL college students at a Southwestern University in China. The study examined how this group actively engaged in social interaction by espousing politeness strategies during communication in a wiki "Discussion" module. Results from the study showed that the group used three politeness strategies; positive,

negative, and bald on record skillfully, to establish friendship, solidarity and respect while completing their collaborative writing tasks smoothly and efficiently. Similarly, there is use of positive politeness strategy in the findings of the current research.

In 2011, Gharaghani, Rasekh, Dabaghi and Tohidian, investigated politeness strategies that native Persian, English and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners employed for greetings in opposite gender contexts. The study found out that gender had a significant effect on the degree of formality in Persian greetings. The study showed that EFL learners used inappropriate politeness expressions in their English responses. While Gharaghani et al. (2011) was a cross cultural study, the current study was conducted among teachers from the same cultural background which affected the type of politeness strategies employed.

Miriti (2012) did an investigation on politeness and speech accommodation in intercultural business cooperation between Igembe and Somali miraa traders. He established that miraa dealers used many face threatening acts. The study found out that miraa traders employed varied communication strategies, reticence and volubility, directness and engage in unsafe talk topics among others. The study discovered that miraa traders accommodated one another through congregating and departing in their discourse which led to a conclusion that the traders used these communication strategies to enhance maintenance of better relations and accommodate one another to maximize

their gains. The current study also sought to establish how the choice of politeness strategies affected their interactions.

Karambu (2010) carried out a study on communication proficiency among students in Kaaga Girls' High School. The study revealed that the students used a range of politeness strategies. There were however instances where students failed to use politeness strategies acquired from class. The current study focused on the impact of politeness strategies used by teachers on their interaction class. Brown and Levinson theory of politeness was used in this study.

Ambuyo, Indede and Karanja (2011) when studying the use of politeness in politic speech found out that question time was a highly aggressive session full of FTAs but the parliamentarians were constrained to produce parliamentary language required by the standing orders of 2008, leaving politeness strategies as the only linguistic device to the realizations of fruitful political discussions. Similarly, Walya (1996) studied the Kenyan banking discourse and identified those strategies that different interactants employ in their conversation and looked at the effects these may have on the entire discourse. She explains that effective communication presupposes grammatical competence and knowledge of culture and whatever governs the way in which a speaker uses certain lexical, sociolinguistic, and other knowledge in producing and interpreting information in a certain context. It is evident from her study that the characteristics of the Kenyan banking communication and politeness strategies were determined by grammatical as well as communicative competence.

Communicative competence is used in linguistics to mean a language user's grammatical knowledge of syntax morphology phonology and the like as well as social knowledge about how and when to use utterances appropriately (Purpura, 2013). Communicative Competence should accomplish four main purposes including: expressing wants and needs, developing social closeness, exchanging information, and fulfilling social etiquette routines (Richards & Schmidt, 2013). Teachers were expected to display this competence in their interactions.

Odongo (2008) studied patterns and motivations of code switching in staffroom conversations in Nairobi Aviation College. The study found out that presenters switched codes in attempting to display their confidence level, when they wished to show social integration and approval. The study showed that gender, rank and age had an influence on code switching. The current study was conducted in school staffrooms and aimed at analyzing how the sociological variables such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance affected the choice of politeness strategies by teachers in the staffroom.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by politeness theory (Brown and Levinson 1978-1987). This theory equalizes the outrages to face, postured by face intimidating acts. According to the theory, people use language when in contact with one another and weigh their speech and the way they deliver it. In a case where a member projects an unfavorable face, he/she creates disagreements with their listeners. To avert the face threats, Brown and Levinson (1987) observe that participants

will employ various politeness strategies including off-record (indirect) and bald-on-record. The use of these strategies, the theory observed that social factors are at play. The factors include but not limited to the social distance (D), relative power of the speaker and the addressee (P), absolute ranking (R) of imposition.

Politeness theory was used to examine the strategies of politeness used by teachers in the school staffroom discourse and analyzed how various social factors such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance influenced their choices of politeness strategies and the effects of politeness strategies on interactions among teachers in school staffrooms in Kirinyaga County.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with research design, study locale, target population, the sampling procedures, and sample size, research instrument, data collection procedures, data analysis and ethical issues.

3.1 Research Design

Descriptive research approach was adopted for this study. This research design according to Handayani (2017) permits one to institute patterns, tendencies and relationships from the information collected. The researcher described the strategies of politeness applied by teachers in the staffroom, analyzed how the sociological factors e.g. age, gender, power; social distance and rank influenced the choice of politeness strategies and investigated how politeness affected interactions among participants in the school staffroom.

The research design was appropriate since it enabled the researcher to describe data and characteristics of what is being studied. According to Creswell & Clark (2010) descriptive research design is concerned with the exploration of an existing phenomenon and in this case, politeness existed in the school staffroom. It was also appropriate since it demonstrated associations or relationships between things for example the relationship between politeness strategies applied by participants and power, rank, age or social distance.

Bogdan and Biklen (2007) assert that in a descriptive study information is gathered without altering the environment (i.e. nothing is influenced). Data in this study was gathered in the school staffroom and the participants were not subjected to any manipulation.

3.2 Area of Study

The data for this study was collected in Kirinyaga County. The area was preferred since this was a project with a time frame and therefore the researcher could not go very far. Furthermore, deeper explanations emanating from politeness strategies used by teachers like code switching required a person with proper understanding of the local language and hence collecting data from other regions with different local language would have posed an inadequacy for this fact. Other than code switching, staffrooms elsewhere could not be far varied. Most importantly, to the best of this researcher's knowledge, no single study on politeness in the school staffroom has been conducted in Kirinyaga County.

3.3 Target Population

This study targeted all the teachers and principals in the sampled schools in Kirinyaga County. The county had a total of 10,034 teachers in 668 schools.

3.4 Sample Size

The sample size of this study was 88 respondents including subject teachers, heads of departments, deputy head teachers and head teachers of the three

sampled schools. This study used a small sample size because it is no longer necessary to work with large samples when carrying out a study in linguistic analysis (Marshall, Cardon, Poddar & Fontenot, 2013). Studies on linguistic exchange are apparently more homogeneous than many other types of descriptive studies. In addition, this study on discourse required very keen recording and careful transcription. Therefore, it is a practical incentive to use a small sample (Tucker et. al., 1981).

The study obtained 18 conversational exchanges from the three schools. These included three conversational exchanges during formal discussions i.e. briefings and three conversational exchanges during informal interactions from each of the three schools sampled. Informal and formal settings were vital in creating different environments in which teachers' interactions and politeness strategies would be dictated by authority and social standing hence creating a distinction between the strategies used during the varying environments. Three conversations were obtained from each school in each cadre (formal and informal) to ensure that any variations and similarities in the use of politeness strategies within the same school at different times were noted. Since each conversation took 30 minutes long, staff briefings that took less than thirty minutes were disregarded. The researcher recorded only the first 30 minutes of the meetings and the non-formal interaction periods (lunch hour) starting from when teachers came in from class preceding lunch break.

3.5 Research Instruments

Since the study focused on interaction analysis, the main research instrument was a video recorder which captured both the verbal and non-verbal aspects of communication. The researcher also did an open observation and taking note of the occurrences in the staffroom. The observation was meant to capture all non-verbal communications like facial expressions, shaking of hands, attentiveness of the hearer among others that were likely to escape the camera. Through observation the researcher highlighted strategies used and by who and the frequency of use of the strategy. Most importantly the observation schedule helped to reinforce data collected through video recording. Note taking was useful as it helped the researcher in tabulating the types and frequencies of politeness strategies used in conversations.

3.6 Pilot Study

Piloting was carried out in one school within the study area. The school selected for piloting was not included in the actual study sample. Only two conversations were done; one official and one non-official. Piloting helped to pre-test the research instruments to validate and ascertain their validity and reliability.

3.6.1 Validity of the Research Instruments

The validity of research instruments was measured against construct and content of the instruments. In this regard, the validity was measured through consultation with experts and professionals in the department especially the supervisors of this work. The video recorder was checked to ensure that it had

the capacity to hold power for a minimum of 30 minutes to ensure that the entire conversation is captured. The camera used was of high definition to ensure quality picture.

3.6.2 Reliability of the Research Instruments

To improve the reliability of the instruments, the researcher assessed the consistency of the responses on the piloted conversations to make a judgment on their reliability. The reliability was established using test re-test technique where the researcher recorded the conversations to the selected staffroom twice in a span of a week. The two sets of the results of the pilot study were analysed and correlation calculated using Cronbach Alpha to ascertain the internal consistency of the tools items. The frequency of the politeness strategies were used in calculations. According to Rosen et al. (2000), the acceptable values of the alpha (α), range from 0.70 to 0.90. The Cronbach's Alpha Formula is given as:

$$\alpha = \frac{N \cdot \bar{c}}{V + (N-1) \cdot C}$$

where N = Total number of items/elements –respondents

C= Average inter-item covariance

V = Average variance

From the results of the piloting, the correlation coefficient was 0.72 showing that the instrument used was reliable.

3.7 Data Collection Procedures

The methods of data collection used were; video recording, open observation and note taking.

3.7.1 Official Interactions

Official interactions were recorded during staff meetings and staff briefings that lasted for at least 30 minutes. Teachers through the principals were briefed on why the researcher was present during the meetings. The researcher was a participant observer during all the meetings. Consent was sought from individual teachers for video recording. The recording started on the onset of the meetings and lasted for 30 minutes. Data recording through video-recording was done to ensure that all conversations were efficiently recorded together with their mood, facial expressions and gestures. Open observation and note taking helped to reinforce the data collected through video recording. All the forms of data collection were done by the researcher.

The researcher video recorded all the conversations as participants engaged in interactions with every session taking 30 minutes. Thirty (30) minutes duration was considered long enough to be able to capture both spoken and non-verbal aspects of communication. Since most schools do not hold staff meetings daily, data was only collected on the days designated for staff meetings in every school with the guidance of the school principals. Since all teachers were involved in the staff meetings, the same teachers were involved in all the three conversations from each school.

3.7.2 Non-formal Interactions

Data on non-official interaction was done during lunch breaks when all teachers were gathered in the staffroom. The data collection started immediately teachers disembarked from class. The researcher collected 3 interaction exchanges during informal interactions in each school. All teachers were briefed by the principals and consent sought for video recording. Data was collected on three different days – which helped teachers to interact freely after familiarization with the researcher. All data was collected by the researcher. The study focused on interaction exchanges in the staffrooms and the non-verbal aspects such as mood, facial expressions and gestures. Most of the face intimidating acts are vocal; however, they can also be passed in the characteristics of dialogue such as tone and modulation or in non-spoken forms of communication. Hence, vocal and non- vocal acts were considered vital.

3.8 Data Analysis Procedure

Qualitative approach was used to analyze the data. First, data collected through video was transcribed, coded and cleaned to remove any unnecessary details. Actual names used by teachers during the conversations were replaced with dummy names for ethical considerations. Distinctive features in the conversations were noted while at the same time noting the type of politeness strategy, the number of times it had been used and the reaction of the politeness strategies to the listener. The data collected was analyzed within the politeness model by Brown and Levinson (1978-1987). The study established how these factors influenced politeness strategies used by teachers. Brown and

Levinson's politeness theory helped identify the social factors with the highest influence on the use of politeness strategies among teachers. It also helped to understand the influence of the politeness strategies on interactions among teachers and principals in the school.

The video-recorded conversational exchanges were transcribed and those not in English were translated. The researcher then did a content analysis of data collected where the transcribed utterances were studied to establish the polite forms applied in conversations and classify them into politeness strategies. The video recording helped identify the mood, facial expressions, gestures from participants and possible reasons for such acts. This also helped analyze the responses (facial and vocal) of the respondents upon who such strategies had been employed.

3.8 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

The researcher got clearance to collect data and a letter of introduction from the Graduate School at Kenyatta University (see appendix IX). Then she obtained a research permit from National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). (See appendix X).

The researcher obtained informed consent from all head teachers and from individual teachers to participate in the research study before commencement of the study.(Appendix II). Teachers were informed of video recording prior to data recording. Confidentiality of the information provided and anonymity of the respondents was assured since participants names were not used (dummy

names were assigned instead). In addition, the researcher ensured minimal interference with the school-programme during the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This study sought to assess the use of politeness strategies in the school staff room in Kirinyaga County. The study set to establish politeness strategies used by teachers and the factors influencing the choice of the strategies applied by teachers in the staffroom. Specifically, the study sought to achieve the following objectives; to determine the strategies of politeness employed by teachers in their interactions, to analyze how the sociological factors such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance influence politeness strategies used by teachers and to determine how the politeness strategies affect interactions among teachers in Kirinyaga County.

The presentation of data starts with strategies of politeness that are employed by teachers in the school staffroom as they interact then the sociological factors that influence politeness strategies by teachers in the school staffroom. Such factors are age, gender, power, rank and social distance. Lastly, the chapter presents the effect of the politeness strategies on interactions among teachers in the school staffroom. Politeness theory was used to elicit strategies of politeness and explain factors that influenced the choice of politeness strategies by teachers in the staffroom.

The names used herein are fictitious for ethical reasons. Extracts that contain the face threatening acts and the politeness strategies from the conversations were lifted from the discourse and italicized. In some cases, conversations have been repeated to illustrate different linguistic features.

4.2 Use of Politeness Strategies by Teachers

The first objective of this study was to determine the strategies of politeness that were employed by teachers in their interactions in the school staffroom. The strategies identified were: positive politeness strategies, negative politeness strategies, Bald-On-Record and Off-Record politeness strategies. The following are discussions of these strategies used by teachers in the staffroom.

4.2.1 Positive Politeness Strategies

Positive politeness is an expression focused to the addressee's positive face; his/her desire that his/her wants are desirable. The positive politeness strategy indicates that you acknowledge your hearers. It also confirms a friendly relationship and expresses group reciprocity. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) positive politeness is not just a redressive of a face want infringed by the FTA but a kind of social accelerator between speakers and listeners. In positive politeness, members use the language of intimates and show approval of each other's personality as somehow alike for purposes of interaction. This intimate language gives positive politeness its redressive force.

Brown and Levinson (1987) outline fifteen positive politeness strategies: notice, attend to hearer; exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer; Intensify interest to hearer and use of in-group identity markers. Other strategies according to Brown and Levinson are: seek agreement; avoid disagreement; presuppose, raise or assert common ground and joke. Lastly, other strategies include: offer, promise; optimism; assume or assert reciprocity and finally give gifts to the hearer. This section covers the strategies that were used by the teachers in the staffroom during both official and unofficial conversations.

4.2.1.1 Notice, Attend to Hearer

This stresses that a speaker should notice aspects of the hearer's condition and approve of it. Consider the conversation below.

Example 1, School C

A talk of teachers in the staffroom during lunch break and some are taking lunch while others were preparing for the next lesson.

Turn 1(Mr. John): *Habari zenu (How are you?)* (Shakes hands with two ladies who are in a deep conversation).

Turn 2 (Ladies): *Mzuri (fine)*

Turn 3(Mr. John): (to Grace). *I like the colour of your earrings.*

Turn 4 (Mrs. Grace): (smiles). *Thanks* (touches them and winks).

Turn 5 (Mr. John): *Give me a pen, a blue one* (gets the pen and leaves, returns after a few minutes). *Thank you.*

In this conversation there is use of notice and attend strategies by teachers as they converse. Mr. John's notice of the colour of the earrings of Mrs. Grace is

taken as an appreciation. Mrs. Grace smiles, winks and touches the earrings as a way of appreciating the compliments from Mr. John.

4.2.1.2 Optimism

Optimism is a positive politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). A speaker expresses hope for a certain action carried out. E.g. If you work hard, you will surely do well in your exams. An instance of such optimistic utterances is presented below;

Example 2, School C

The conversation takes place during briefing in the staffroom immediately after assembly.

Turn 1(Principal): *...the other thing I wanted to mention about application for interviews of job group M. Sure you noted there was an extension of deadline, isn't it?*

Turn 2 (Teachers): *mmm (nod)*

Turn 3 (Principal): *I would encourage you... it is good to apply, every time we must aspire to grow, you must aspire to grow, we move forward unless you are dead, you cannot say you are not ambitious, everyone is ambitious, you are ambitious that one day you shall move on to the next level. You find you have a feeling you want to stagnate then, I am sorry you may be in the characteristics of the fellows as I had just mentioned in the assembly, the walking dead. Please let's grow let's look for forums to grow because that makes*

you a better teacher and a professional. Actually, I like telling myself that one day I will become the president of this republic that's my inspiration and I think my dream is valid! Sawa sawa (isn't it?).

So that is it and in case there will be other directions given will inform you. This morning we also have a friend and a visitor and we have allowed her to be with us in this sitting. We don't allow strangers where we are discussing our issues but will allow her with a reason and because she is a friend to Winfred, you can see she is seated next to her. Can Winfred stand and introduce the friend?

The head teacher starts by encouraging teachers to apply for interviews for job group M and tells them that they should aspire to grow and move forward. The principal shows through this statement the optimism that application may result to growth among the teachers. To assert the point, he likens those who may not apply or wish to grow to the living dead. It is evident from this conversation that the head teacher was hopeful about the future of the hearers and tended to expect that good things would happen to his hearers.

4.2.1.3 Seek Agreement Strategy (Repetition)

Agreeing with the speaker is a characteristic of claiming common ground with the hearer. Seeking agreement is also used when the speaker wishes to remove any threats of imposition on the hearer. This strategy is used by teachers in the following conversations.

Example 3, School A

Turn 1 (Principal): *Good morning?*

Turn 2 (Teachers): *Good morning.*

Turn 3 (Principal): *There are a few things I would like us to talk about, one is about the joint evaluation, and we already have one that is going on.....even as we continue evaluating the students in our class it is important that we remember we are dealing with that kind of a parent, who makes a small population of the nature of the parents in our school. It doesn't represent the entire parent nature in our school. So, when the likes of mama (mother to) Clifford come our way, one need to be a bit sober so that we deal with them, place them where they belong.*

Even if they use very soft language let them be able to make their bed of roses and do what? And have the courage to sleep on them. The other area we have, we want to mention this morning is the end of term for the form 1 & 2 you remember we had already prepared the exams and there is a time-table, we...Mr. Fred there is a time table, isn't it?

Turn 4 (Mr. Fred): (nods)

Turn 5 (Principal): *We had initially requested may be to push the exam up to may be on Thursday but I think we later agreed to let it remain as it is, the exams end on? The initial one was ending on?*

“.....let them be able to make their bed of roses and do what?” as spoken by the principal (Example 3, Turn 3) seeks agreement from the teachers who are expected to complete the statement in the affirmative. The principal uses this question to involve the teachers in the ongoing conversation about parents of mama Clifford’s kind. This makes the teachers feel part of the decision making by finishing what ought to be done to such parents. This strategy by the principal also helps reduce the social distance created by the rank of the principal. The principal is considered a figure of authority in the school. In the statement “...we had already prepared the exams and there is a time-table, we...Mr. Fred there is a time table, isn’t it?” (Example 3, Turn 3) he seeks for a clarification from Mr. Fred on the availability of the timetable. The question sounds like a confirmation of the availability of the timetable. However, on responding, Mr. Fred nods showing a relaxed mood between Mr. Fred and the principal. Hence, seeking agreement on the timetable reduces the FTA and hence saves the principal’s face. On rescheduling the examination, the principal asked teachers on the initial last day of the examination- “*The initial one was ending on?*” (Example 3, Turn 4).

Example 4, School C

- Turn 1 (Principal): *...I am sure Brian is not covered in our welfare issue but as a friend, as a member of this community we need to assist. (Several nods). I don't know how much money we will give Brian as a support, the fare is two thousand to and from, he may not necessarily have a big party but I believe as friends, we want to celebrate with him. So, I don't know how much money we will give, remember he is not on a regular pay like us, remember he was our student. If our student invites us to attend a graduation, so how will we attend, how will we attend Madam Kate?*
- Turn 2 (Kate): *We are not attending; we are sending the cash.*
- Turn 3 (Principal): *Because the way I looked at it, it's almost like the father wants a small party, they finish the business there and they go their separate way.*
- Turn 4 (Kate): *Okay.*
- Turn 5 (Principal): *That's the way he has chosen and we can't go against but what will we do?*
- Turn 6 (Kate): *We would give him some money.*
- Turn 7 (Principal): *We would give him some money! Isn't it? (Several teachers nod). Anahitaji pesa ya ku-hire the gown na because pia yeye ameajiliwa, hizo zingine ajipange, isn't it? (He needs money to hire the gown and because he is employed, he will organize the rest).*
- Turn 8 (Teachers): *mmmmh (yes)*

- Turn 9 (Principal): *That's the policy of the father and that's what he decided to do, and he is still under the care of the father, isn't he?*
- Turn 10 (Teachers): *Mmmh (yes)*
- Turn 11(Principal): *So here we are very ready to support him so that.....Eh..., I don't know how much money we can give in support, Madam Grace? (Reading from the welfare's constitution).*
- Turn 12 (Grace): *Yes.*
- Turn 13 (Principal): *So that we can agree on the amount of money and the deadline, it should be collected by Madam Grace. What do you suggest?*
- Turn 14 (Grace): *500*
- Turn 15 (Principal): *500? Is 500 okay with everyone?*
- Turn 16 (Sue): *It's okay (nods).*
- Turn 17 (Principal): *so, we continue with the 500, let us support him, he is still ours, deadline? The graduation will be on 11th. Can we agree now?*

This conversation occurs during an official meeting held in the staffroom. The matter of discussion is a graduation of a former student – Brian. The principal makes statements and asks a number of questions as depicted from the above excerpt;

- i) I don't know how much money we will give Brian as a support,*
(Example 4, Turn 1).

ii) *....., remember he is not on a regular pay like us, remember he was our student* (Example 4, Turn 1).

iii) *.....how will we attend Madam Kate?* (Example 4, Turn 1).

iv) *That's the way he has chosen and we can't go against but what will we do?* (Example 4, Turn 5).

v) *I don't know how much money we can give in support, Madam Grace?* (Example 4, Turn 11).

vi) *We would give him some money! Isn't it?* (Example 4, Turn 7).

vii) *So that we can agree on the amount of money and the deadline, it should be collected by Madam Grace. What do you suggest?* (Example 4, Turn 13).

viii) *500? Is 500 okay with everyone?* (Example 4, Turn 13).

ix) *...deadline? The graduation will be on 11th. Can we agree now?* (Example 4, Turn 17).

All the nine questions in the above conversation are intended to involve the teachers in the conversation by seeking their opinions and agreement on certain issues under discussion. In this conversation the principal seeks agreement on several issues as a method of avoiding FTAs. The statement "*I don't know how much money we will give Brian as a support*" (Example 4, Turn 1) seeks a contribution from members and therefore a politeness strategy to seek agreement. The principal further seeks consensus from the teachers when he

says “*So that we can agree on the amount of money and the deadline, it should be corrected by Madam Grace. What do you suggest?*” (Example 4, Turn 13) *Is 500 okay with everyone?*” (Example 4, Turn 13). Even though 500 shillings had been suggested by a teacher, the principal sought agreement from the rest of the staff to avoid imposing his opinion on them. This is confirmed when Madam Sue nods and replies; “*it’s ok*” (Example 4, Turn 16) as an agreement to the principal’s question.

4.2.1.4 The Inclusive 'We'

One of the most important strategies that the teachers used was that of the inclusive ‘we’. Brown and Levinson (1987) posit that when a speaker uses ‘We’ form, she/he really means ‘you’ or ‘me’ . The principal is talking about interviews and addressing the issue of Brian’s graduation, he keeps on using the word ‘we’ to avoid the imposition. For example, the principal says; “, *you must aspire to grow, we move forward unless you are dead, you cannot say you are not ambitious*” (Example 2, Turn 3). The principal is addressing the teachers but chooses to use the word ‘we’. It is expected that the principal is beyond job group M but he says “*we move forward.....*” to redress the FTAs of imposition to the hearer yet the statement is directed at the teachers. The use of the collective term ‘we’ is used by the principal to make the teachers understand that it is the inspiration of every teacher to grow regardless of the rank. After the principal says “*you must aspire to grow*” (Example 22, Turn 3) using the word “you” for second person, he continues with “we” so that he does not appear like he is telling the teachers that they do not want to grow

hence “we” serves as an indication of the need for growth of all members despite their job groups.

The principal also says, “*We don’t allow strangers when we are discussing our issues but will allow her with a reason.....*” (Example 2, Turn 3) when talking about the issue of the researcher sitting in their staff meeting. Only the principal has the express authority to invite and allow someone else into the staff meeting but he chooses to use the word, ‘we’ as an insinuation of a group or collective responsibility. The principal thus uses the word ‘we’ to include members in giving the researcher permission to be in their midst during the meeting. This way all teachers feel there is no intrusion.

Below are some of the statements made by the principal.

- i. *as a member of this community we need to assist.* (Example 4, Turn 1)
- ii. *I don’t know how much money we will give Brian as a support* (Example 4, Turn 1)
- iii.*and we can’t go against but what will we do?* (Example 4, Turn 5).
- iv. *So that we can agree on the amount of money and the deadline.* (Example 4, Turn 13)

Among many other statements made in the conversation from example 4, the principal uses the inclusive ‘we’ as a strategy to redress the FTAs. The principal is persuading the teachers to contribute towards the graduation of Brian but to avoid the imposition, he uses the word ‘we’ as an inclusive

strategy. This is sometimes used when the speaker does not have express power to make orders to the listeners and hence uses the strategy to create an impression of collective responsibility hence effectively redressing the FTAs. In this case the principal could not force the teachers to contribute or impose an amount on them thus seeking agreement and inclusion. Other examples of the use of the inclusive “we” appear in appendices (IV), (VI) and (VII). Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that when speakers use the inclusive ‘we’, they call upon the cooperative assumption by including both the speaker and hearer in activity thereby redressing the imposition.

4.2.1.5 In-group Identity Markers

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) these convey in-group membership by use of address forms of language, dialect or jargon. Leech (1983) calls the attempt to maximize praise for the other, approbation strategy which shows one’s loyalty to a social group. This agrees with Brown and Levinson’s (1987) view of in-group membership which stresses common ground as indicated above. This reveals solidarity or closeness.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the use of such terms e.g. mate, friend also reveals that the speaker considers the relative power and status difference between himself and the addressee to be small thus softening the commands in the imperative sentences by turning them into requests.

- a) **In-group generic names** (such as *friend*, *colleagues* are used to claim common ground with the hearers. Examples below show instances of the use of in-group generic names.

Example 5, School C

Principal:*It is effectively done and so far, the papers I have seen and please keep it up that is the way. So, for the Form 1 and form 2 that is starting next week, let's be very effective colleagues.*

When principals address teachers as colleagues they show that they do not want to threaten their own face as they belong to the same group. This brings the idea of oneness and togetherness with the teachers.

Example 6, School C

Principal: “.....*i am sure Brian is not covered in our welfare issue but as a friend, as a member of this community we need to assist. (Several nod). I don't know how much money we will give Brian as a support; the fare is two thousand to and from*” (Example 4, Turn 1).

The principal refers to Brian as ‘a friend of the staff’ instead of ‘former student’ and managing to avoid the FTA. The principal does not want to threaten his own face as he belongs to the same group. This reveals solidarity or closeness of the staff to Brian.

Example 7, School C

Principal: “..... *this morning we also have a friend and a visitor and we have allowed her to be with us in this sitting. We don't allow strangers where we are discussing our issues but will allow her with a reason and because she is a friend to Winfred, you can*

see she is seated next to her. Can Winfred stand and introduce the friend.

The principal calls the researcher as 'friend'. This helps him to claim common ground with the researcher. Referring to the researcher as 'friend' helps the teachers to feel comfortable with the researcher and feels that there is no intrusion in their meeting. They therefore are feeling to engage freely among themselves and with the principal.

b) Code switching

Code switching refers to the use of language, dialect or local terminology as in-group codes. Brown and Levinson (1987) assert that when a speaker uses in-group codes, they assume that the hearer understands and shares the associations of that code and this creates common ground between the participants. Teachers used English language as their medium of communication especially in official conversations with only few codes but they frequently switched to Swahili language and the local Gikuyu language as a way of creating rapport with their hearers. The following are some of the extracts depicting these in-group codes in teachers' conversations.

Example 8, School B

This conversation takes place among teachers in the staffroom during their free time. The teachers speak mostly in Swahili as they converse.

Turn 1 (Mr. John): *Peter*

Turn 2 (Mr. Peter): *yes*

- Turn 3 (Mr. John): *Kuja, uko na class saa hii?* (Come, do you have a class right now?)
- Turn 4 (Mr. Peter): (stretching) *Hapana, aki leo nimechoka.* (No, today I'm very tired)
- Turn 5 (Mr. John): *Siuende ile ulikuwa unaniomba* (why don't you attend the one you had requested me)
- Turn 6 (Mr. Peter): *Form?*
- Turn 9 (Mr. John): *I south*
- Turn 10 (Mr. Peter): *Form 1 south?*
- Turn 11 (Mr. John): *mmh?* (So?)
- Turn 12 (Mr. Peter): *Naomba kupumzika for 40 minutes* (I request to rest for forty minutes)
- Turn 13 (Mr. John): (laughs)
- Turn 14 (Mr. Peter): *Nimechoka na niko na hiyo class double jioni* (I am tired and I have a double in the same class in the evening)
- Turn 15 (Mr. John): *Weeh. Unafunza nini huko?* (What do you teach there?)
- Turn 16 (Mr. Peter): *Mathematics*
- Turn 17 (Mr. Peter): *Habari madam* (how are you madam?)
- Turn 18 (Researcher): *Mzuri* (I'm fine)
- Turn 19 (Mr. Peter): *Ata ndio nimeona kuko na mgeni karibu lunch.* (I have just noticed now that there is a guest, welcome for lunch)
- Turn 20 (Researcher): *Asante* (thank you).

Mr. John and Mr. Peter were discussing a lesson. Both teachers are in their late thirties and sit close to each other in the staffroom. Mr. John wishes that Mr. Peter goes to his (Mr. John) class but Mr. Peter declines. The use of Swahili language helps the teachers to create a common ground. This agrees with Brown and Levinson (1987) who posit that when a speaker uses in-group

codes, he/she assume that the hearer understands and shares the associations of that code and this creates common ground between them. They further state that code switching is a potential way of encoding positive politeness when redress is required by an FTA. Therefore, Mr. John uses Swahili phrase *Siuende ile ulikuwa unaniomba (why don't you attend the one you had requested me)* (example 8, Turn 5) to sound politer to Mr. Peter and avoid FTA.

Example 9, School A

Turn 1 (Principal): *Eh nilikua nataka.... nani ameona madam Jane? (I wanted...who has seen Madam Jane?). (To Mr. Nyamai): Githe ndukimenyaga ona muthuri niatumagwo nokurumwo atarumagwo? (You know even an old man can be sent but shouldn't be insulted.)*

Turn 2 (Mr. Wambua): *I think ako kwake (I think she is in her office) (Mr. Nyamai goes to call her and they both appear in the staffroom)*

Turn 3 (Principal): *okay, excuse me, good morning?*

Turn 4 (Teachers): *Good morning!*

Turn 5 (Principal): *There are few things I would like to point out. One, we have some new boys in form three and those who are teaching that class, eh...those boys, some of us were involved in interviewing them..... They will feel very uncomfortable and that kind of thing. Hiyo ingine (the other thing) there are two things that are coming up..... he says Mr. Micah is exposing him and making*

others know that he can't perform. Sasa anaona Mr. Micah mpaka anaogopa kuingia kwa darasa. Mr. wanjau? (Now he sees Mr. Micah and fears to get into class). (Mr. Wanjau nods). Mr. Micah sijui kama mnakosana na kijana kwa sababu ya E, lakini sasa. You will know how to handle it because anakuona anaogopa (Mr. Micah, I don't know if you are falling out with the boys because of grade E but now I know you will know how to handle him because you now know that when he sees you he gets afraid).

Here the principal switches codes from English to Swahili and Gikuyu languages “*Githe ndukimenyaga ona muthuri niatumagwo nokurumwo atarumagwo*” (You understand that even an elderly man can be sent but cannot be insulted) (Example 9, Turn 1). Which means you can send an elderly person but you shouldn't insult him/her. In switching codes to Gikuyu, the speaker tries to sound unofficial as he sends Mr. Nyamai who is older than he (principal). He manages to redress the imposition of sending an older person as an authority but is casual since Gikuyu is not an official language. It also creates a sense of belonging to the same ethnic group hence mitigating the FTAs and the imposition of authority. Other examples of using code switching are presented in Appendices IV, VI and VII, for instance,

Example 10, School B

Turn 1 (Mr. John): *Patrick*

(Eunice laughs)

Turn 2 (Mr. John): *Patrick ngune earphone* (Patrick, May I lend you earphones?)

Turn 3 (Patrick): (laughing) *iima* (yes, sure)

Turn 4 (Mboko): *ingira T.v ini* (get inside the TV)

Turn 5 (Mr. John): *utonga wake ndethire akurite tawe* (he didn't get wealthy at an advanced age like you) (laughter)

The tone of voice is light as marked by laughter and this lessens the face threat on participants like Patrick (appendix VII) who is being told that the person under discussion did not get wealthy at an advanced age like him (Patrick). The laughter also brings out the jovial mood among these participants and hence Patrick also laughs with his colleagues instead of getting offended by the remark.

It can therefore be concluded from the conversations highlighted above that code switching presupposes that the hearer understands and shares the associations of that code. This may be exploited as a positive politeness device. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that it is expected that a speaker will switch into a code associated with in-group and domestic values. They note that this is a potential way of encoding positive politeness.

4.2.1.6 Give or Ask Reasons

The speaker giving reasons as to why she/he wants what they want, that is, 'S' wants thereby leading the hearer to see the sense of the speaker doing the FTA. This strategy has been used in the conversation presented in example 9, Turn 5. In this example, the principal cautions the teachers about the use of some teaching methods in classes and gives reasons why it should not be so. "*Let us*

not go to repeat the history in class where you might start opposing them too much. They will feel very uncomfortable and that kind of thing". The principal explains that the student who was poor academically was afraid of coming to school because when teachers remind him of his performance in class, other students could laugh at him and hence he opts to stay at home. In this utterance - *they will feel very uncomfortable and that kind of thing*, the principal gives a reason for not repeating the history in class as it may cause discomfort among the students. So, he cautions the teachers against such acts. Giving a reason for the caution makes the teachers understand why the principal is against the move. In this way, he mitigates the FTAs and avoids the imposition.

The findings presented above shows that teachers in the study area used different positive politeness strategies in the staffroom. Table 4.1 shows a summary of positive politeness strategies identified.

Table 4. 1: Summary of positive politeness Strategies as used by teachers

Strategies	Schools			Total	Percent
	A	B	C		
Notice, attend to listener	0	0	1	1	6.6
Optimism	0	0	1	1	6.6
Seek Agreement	1	0	1	2	13.4
Inclusive 'we'	1	0	2	3	20.0
In-group (Code switching)	1	2	0	3	20.0
In-group (Generic names)	0	0	3	3	20.0
Give or ask reason	1	1	0	2	13.4
Total	4	3	8	15	100

Results in Table 4.1 show that notice, attend to listener and optimism were used once (6.6%) by school C only. Seeking agreement was used once by school A and C. Inclusive 'we' and in-group identity markers were the most highly used at 20% each. The study further showed that school A, B and C used 4 (26.6%), 3 (20%) and 8 (53%) respectively. It therefore observed that school C used the highest percentage of the positive politeness strategies.

4.2.2 Negative Politeness Strategies

Negative politeness strategies focus on satisfying the hearers' negative face, that is, their primary want to retain claims of self-determination and territory (Brown & Levinson, 1987). It performs the action of minimizing the imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects. Negative politeness is the heart of respect behaviour just as positive politeness is the kernel for the familiar and joking behaviour. Negative politeness corresponds to rituals of avoidance; it performs the function of minimizing the imposition that the FTA unavoidably effects mainly through indirectness. Negative politeness is the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies for FTA redress: it is stuff that fills etiquette books such as use of words like, '*please*', '*excuse me*', '*may I*' and so on. There are ten negative politeness strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987): be conventionally indirect, question, hedge, be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, give deference, apologize, and impersonalize S and H, state FTA as a general rule, nominalize, and finally, going-on-record as to incur a debt.

Negative politeness can be called "*politeness as a strategy for self-protection*". There are many advantages of practicing this form of sustained negative

politeness – keeping a safe distance from others. Even when being critical. It is related to understanding that sustained courtesy provides an opportunity of keeping a safe distance from others while minimizing negative feeling about such detachment. Below is a discussion of the negative politeness strategies that were used by teachers in their conversations.

4.2.2.1 Minimize the Imposition (RX)

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

Example 11, School A

Turn 1 (Principal): *What I am trying to say is that we may do some damages, more damages than helping them. Okay, let me just give you an example; one boy I have been handling has just said that he has developed fear of the class teacher, you know that it is good that we talk about some of these things. Madam Ngoiri you know yule*

kijana (that boy) refused to come to school because you said he was going to present.

Turn 2 (Ms. Ngoiri): *Lakini..... (but...)*

Turn 3 (Principal): *Aa! Aa! Aa! I am just giving an example. I am only talking. You say the guy is going to present, the guy is low academically so he feels now wale wengine watamchekelea (the others are going to laugh at him).*

When the principal says, “*What I am trying to say is that we may do some damages*” (Example 11, Turn 1). The word ‘trying’ as used by the principal was aimed at minimizing the imposition on the hearers. The principal also says “*let me just give you....*” (Example 11, Turn 1) and “*Aa! Aa! Aa! (No no no). I am just giving an example. I am only talking.....*” (Example 11, Turn 3). All of which are strategies that minimize imposition to the teachers. If the head teacher couldn’t have used the words ‘trying’ and ‘just’ it would have caused an imposition of authority. On the contrary, the use of ‘trying’ and ‘just’ made the listeners take it upon themselves as a responsibility and not an order from the principal.

Example 12, School A

In the conversation below, the principal is suggesting to the teachers the idea of improving the lunch offered in school through contributing some money.

Turn 1 (Principal): *I think it was Kshs 100 per week so that we can have meat 3 times and 2 times we have some sweet potatoes.*

Turn 2 (Teachers): (Laughter, some teachers talk to each other in low tones and other teachers nod).

Turn 3 (Principal): *Ei! If it is fried well, some cabbages are added, that was just a suggestion. Mnaona namna gani? (What do you think?)*

Turn 4 (Teachers): (exchange glances some rolling their eyes)

The principal used the phrase “*that was just a suggestion*” (Turn 3) to minimize the imposition of authority to the teachers. Teachers laugh after the principal said *Kshs 100 per week so that we can have meat 3 times and 2 times we have some sweet potatoes* (Turn 1) as a way of accepting his views as other teachers nod in agreement of what the principal had said. This reduces the social distance and makes the principal to drop his authority/imposition and thus asks teachers for their take on the matter under discussion. However, the exchange of glances and rolling of eyes by some shows they are not comfortable with the idea, but they do not express it out rightly for fear of publicly opposing the principal who is their senior.

4.2.2.2 Apology

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) when speakers apologize, they show averseness to impose on the negative face of the hearer, thereby redressing the FTA. There are many ways of apologizing such as admitting the impingement, indicating reluctance, giving overwhelming reasons, begging for forgiveness, and so on. “*I am sorry you may be in the characteristics of the fellas I had just mentioned in the assembly, the walking dead*” (Example 2, Turn 3, School C) is an example of use of apology strategy. In fact, the principal does not feel

remorseful but only uses the word sorry to mitigate the FTAs of the statement living dead.

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

4.2.2.3 Impersonalizing S and H

This is a way of avoiding the use of pronouns 'I' and 'you' like the agent was other than the speaker alone and the addressee were other than the hearer or only inclusive of the hearer. Ways of avoiding the pronouns, 'I' or 'you', is in the use of imperatives, impersonal verbs as in the use of passives, and in pluralization of 'you' or 'I'. Example 11 below presents impersonalizing S and H among the teachers.

Example 13, School A

The principal was reminding teachers of their role to maintain discipline and order during mid-morning briefing. He emphasized on time management among the students.

Turn 1 (Principal): *There is a habit I want us to kill and when it comes to killing habits now it cannot be a one-man show. This idea of students moving out of class immediately their teacher leaves the lesson or leaves the class is becoming eh...too much. So a teacher comes in, leaves the lesson, wanatoka*

(they go out). Another teacher comes in you start...that is something we should just kill eeh...Like in the morning there was trouble before the assembly. Almost half of the school, they want to go out. Then they cause a lot of disturbance. So nilikuwa nataka tusaidiane (so I wanted us to assist one another). When you go to the first lesson because I know you are here. Nani ako na first lesson? (Who has the first lesson?)

Turn 2 (Teachers): *(A few teachers put up their hands)*

Turn 3 (Principal): *So, we are here, communicate to them as you leave, nobody leaves and if you leave punishment. Wangojee mpaka wakati wa short break. (They wait until it is time for short break) communicate it in your own way.*

Turn 4 (Wakaria): *That is to the latrines?*

Turn 5 (Principal): *Sindio (yes, it is) that is it.*

Turn 6 (Wakaria): *Because now we are going for swapping of lessons.*

Turn 7 (Principal): *No, it's not about swapping. It is going for short call. You know there is the break...*

Turn 8 (Justus): *And the teacher has something to do. That is why I always tell them kama unatoka nje, ukae nje (if you want to stay outside you stay outside).*

Turn 9 (Principal): *Yeah yeah because now....*

Turn 10 (Wanjau): *Na wakiwa nje (and when they are outside) somebody should be looking around.*

Mr. Wanjau uses the word 'somebody' and avoids using the word principal or deputy principal to impersonalize the hearer. This is because he believed that

as teachers are in class, the principal or/and the deputy principal should be going around and dealing with those who have been locked out of class for being outside during lesson time. He deliberately uses the word ‘somebody’ to redress the FTAs.

From all the eighteen conversations undertaken, the study established the frequency of each of the negative politeness strategies used in the study. The frequencies were determined per school and per type of politeness strategies used. The results were presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4. 2: Summary of Negative Politeness Strategies

Strategy	School			Total	Percent
	A	B	C		
Minimize the imposition	2	0	0	2	50.0
Apology	0	0	1	1	25.0
Impersonalizing S and H	1	0	0	1	25.0
Total	3	0	1	4	100.0

The results shown in Table 4.2 above indicate that minimizing the imposition was the most used negative politeness strategy by the teachers at 50% followed by impersonalizing S and H and apology at 25% each. The study further revealed that school A had three of the total four negative politeness strategies used among the three schools sampled.

4.2.3 Bald-On-Record Politeness Strategy

Bald-on-record strategy is speaking without spurious, i.e. speaking the truth or being sincere (Sari, 2016). According to Sari (2016), a speaker should not say

less or more than is necessary and should avoid ambiguity or obscurity and remain relevant. Going on-record provides pressure towards directness and forthrightness. Brown and Levinson (1987) further argue that the maxims define the basic set of assumptions underlying every talk exchange but this does not imply that utterances in general must meet these conditions because most natural conversations do not proceed in such brusque fashion at all. According to Brown and Levinson, the desire for not speaking maxim-wise is to give attention to face. Bald-on-record usage falls into two classes.

Direct imperatives stand out as clear examples of bald-on-record usage. It is used where interaction is task oriented in instances such as *'Give me a nail'* or when the speaker is more powerful than the hearer and does mind retaliation from the addressee. The other type of bald-on record usage is implication. An instance of non-minimization in English is an exclamation such as *'Help!'* which shows urgency while in *'Please help me if you would be so kind'* is minimized and the urgency reduced. Direct imperatives in English stand out as clear examples of bald- on record usage with minimization because the subject is deleted. Teachers frequently used bald-on-record strategies in their conversations.

4.2.3.1 Bald-On- Record (With Minimization)

Bald-on-record with minimization is where the speaker minimizes face threats by implication. Imperatives stand out as clear examples of such usage and the speakers further minimize threats by being indirect as to who the object of the FTA is. The excerpt below discusses the use of this strategy by the teachers.

Example 14, School C

This conversation takes place during morning briefing. The principal is addressing the teachers.

Turn 1(Principal): *So that is it and in case there will be other directions given will inform you. This morning we also have a friend and a visitor and we have allowed her to be with us in this sitting. We don't allow strangers where we are discussing our issues but will allow her with a reason and because she is a friend to Winfred, you can see she is seated next to Winfred, can Winfred stand and introduce the friend?*

Turn 2 (Winfred): *Okay here we have madam Rose, she is my friend, right now she is carrying a research on politeness, how teachers interact in the staffroom and that's why she is here. I would just request you to give her total cooperation and everything will be okay.*

The principal uses a question; ‘Can Winfred stand and introduce the friend?’ implying that she should introduce her friend to the teachers. He uses a request in form of a question instead of a statement which would have been a command and consequently appearing bossy. The use of the word ‘can’ in the statement by the principal minimizes the FTA and redresses the face of the hearer. The principal could have said “*Winfred stand up and introduce your*

friend” but instead chose to use “can” hence manages to minimize the threat.

4.2.3.2 Bald-On-Record (Without Minimization)

Brown and Levinson (1987) observe that bald-on-record without minimization of FTA is used where efficiency is vital and this is clear to the members in the discourse and no face redress is needed. Speakers also speak as if maximum efficiency were very important when they provide a metaphorical urgency for emphasis. This can be seen where the speaker is calling across a distance or where the focus of interaction is task oriented, face redress may be felt to be irrelevant.

One example of bald-on -record usage is found in greetings and farewells and in general rituals of beginning and/or terminating encounter. For example, '*sit down*', '*come again.*' Below are examples of bald-on-record (without minimization) found in the conversations among teachers in the staffrooms?

Example 15, School C

In the conversation below the principal is addressing teachers on what is expected of them as the school term is ending.

Principal: *The class teachers must have updated the records of the parents, so ...therefore marking should have ended when? Looks like today (laughs) but because we had not mentioned it by Monday, we must be done with marking, isn't it? We must be*

done with marking? So burn the midnight oils and candles so that by Monday 5 o'clock you have finished marking and recorded.

Bald – On – Record without minimization is seen when the principal says ‘the class teachers must have updated the records of the parents. *‘By Monday we must be done with marking, so burn the mid-night oils and candles so that by Monday 5 o'clock you have finished marking and recorded’*. The reason for using this strategy is because great efficiency is required. As school head, he uses his rank to use bald on record without minimization. This presents him as a symbol of power and no hearer can challenge this decision. The words “.....*by Monday we must be done with marking*” is a command directed to the listeners. The words are used without redressing the FTA since his position allows him to use the bald-on- record strategy. The FTA is thus not minimized. Another example of bald-on-record without minimization is seen in conversation 17. (Appendix VI).

Example 16, School A

Principal: *That is why we are trying to suggest something like that. Then let us be keen with the form 4s at this time because some of them at time...That office of Madam John, please be locking when you leave. Mr. Japheth, Mr. Muthoka, hiyo ofisi yenu (your office). Mr. Japheth nataka tuonane (I want to see you). Mr. Muthoka because on Sunday you are on duty, after the service students are supposed to go to class at around 11.00a.m. Let*

them go to class, take lunch at around 1.00pm then 2.00pm go to class again. Then when you are on duty it is mandatory to do registration on Sunday and Saturday because there are students who leave home and lie to the parents that they are going to school but they don't!

The principal uses phrases like Mr. Japheth '*nataka tuonane*' to mean I want to see you. Here the principal does not request but gives a directive. He also says; then when you are on duty *it is 'mandatory'* to do registration on Sunday and Saturday because there are students who leave home and lie to the parents that they are going to school but they don't! This shows that the principal is commanding the teachers on what ought to be done.

The conversation above shows that the principal does not minimize the FTAs (orders). As Brown and Levinson (1987) posit, efficiency is vital and this is clear to both the speaker and hearer. In such instances, face redress is not necessary. Another reason is that the principals are more powerful than the teachers. Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that a speaker or hearer is more powerful if one plays the role of manager, is a thug with a gun or one is a priest. It could therefore be argued that the principals did not minimize the threats in the examples above because they were more powerful than teachers.

Yin et al. (2012) studied communicative interaction behaviors of physicians, patients, and patients' parents in pediatrics in Taiwan. Results revealed that most of the communicative politeness strategies used in pediatrics were bald-

on-record, direct, and non-redressed just like the findings of this study where bald-on-record strategy has been identified.

Table 4. 3: Shows the summary of bald-on record usage among teachers in the staffroom.

Strategy	School			Total	Percent
	A	B	C		
With Minimization	0	0	1	1	33.3
Without Minimization	1	0	1	2	66.6
Total	1	0	2	3	100

The results show that only three bald-on- record politeness strategies were used by the teachers in the three sampled schools. Bald-on record without minimization was the most used bald-on record strategy at 66.6 (n = 3) with bald-on-record with minimization was used once only by school C (33.3%). These findings disagree with those of Bolkan and Holmgren (2012) who investigated the instructors' perceptions of students and their use of e-mail messages with varying politeness strategies of a Chinese EFL class. The study focused on teacher's linguistic politeness in classroom based on observation, recorded data and interview with both the teacher and the students. The study showed that bald-on-record was used most with the proportion of 57.2%.

4.2.4 Off-Record Politeness Strategy

Off-record indirect strategies are used for taking pressure off the speaker. This politeness strategy is clear where the speaker tries to avoid the direct FTA of asking something and hence uses an indirect FTA for instance the use of satire

or questions). According to Brown and Levinson (1987), an act is off-record when it is impossible to relate only one intention to the act. The speaker cannot be held responsible to have committed oneself to just one interpretation of the act.

Brown and Levinson (1987) came up with fifteen off-record politeness strategies: give hints, give association clues, presuppose, 'understate, overstate, use tautologies, use contradictions, be ironic, use metaphors, use rhetorical questions, be ambiguous which is further classified into; be vague, over-generalize, displacement of hearer, and finally be incomplete or use ellipsis. Discussed below are some of the off-record politeness strategies used by teachers in conversing in the school staffroom.

4.2.4.1 Give Hints

If a speaker does an FTA and chooses to do it indirectly, he must give the hearer some hints and hope that the addressee picks up on them and thereby interprets what the speaker really means (intends) to say. The basic way is to invite conversational implicatures (as explained in the section above). For example, if someone says *'It was a busy session'* it could mean, *'let's have a rest.'* Giving hints violates the relevance maxim which states that the speaker ought to be relevant.

Example 17, School A

This conversation takes place during lunch break as the teachers take lunch.

The conversation is about the shortage of utensils.

Turn 1 (Mrs Jackline): *umuthi kai guthire atia? Hakuna sahani, vijiko, chakula hakuna, maji, hakuna (what is going on today, no plates, spoons, food, water)*

Turn 2 (Mrs. Doris): *T.O.D is there rationing? (T.O.D rises to go and take care of the situation).*

When Mrs. Jackline mentions the shortage of utensils and food in the staffroom, Mrs. Doris ask the teacher on duty whether there is rationing. So, she hints to her (the T.O.D) that she should do something about it.

Example 18, School B

This occurs when teachers were conversing loudly in the staffroom during lunch break. There is a lot of laughter and one of the teachers, Mr. Patrick, moves closer to the TV probably to follow what is going on in the TV.

Turn 1 (Mr. John): *Patrick*
(Eunice laughs)

Turn 2 (Mr. John): *Patrick ngune earphone (Patrick, May I lend you earphones?)*

Turn 3 (Patrick): *(laughing) iima (yes, sure)*

Turn 4 (Mboko): *ingira T.v ini (get inside the TV)*

By moving closer to the T.V, Mr. Patrick, is hinting to the teachers that they should reduce the much noise they are making so that he can follow the

programme in the television. By moving closer to the television, he avoids directly asking the teachers to keep quiet but instead gives them a hint to do so. In fact, one Ms. Teresia asks the teachers to tone down the noise for the sake of Mr. Patrick.

4.2.4.2 Presuppose

It is the way to indicate that S and H are co-operative, and therefore put pressure on H to cooperate with S. S wants to emphasize and show knowledge of H, e. g.: “I understand you can do it yourself, but this time, do what I suggested you do. An utterance can be almost wholly relevant in context, and yet violate the relevance maxim just at the level of its presupposition. If it is relevant only on the assumption that the speaker and hearer are counting the times each does the task, then a criticism is implicated. In another example, (example 9, turn 5), during a briefing where the principal is cautioning the teachers against embarrassing some students in front of the others due to their poor grades.

The use of the phrase “*some of the things*” has been used by the principal to mean that there could be some level of insensitivity among teachers towards students in some areas. The principal in essence says teachers needed to be extra careful when handling the students to avoid FTAs upon the students and that is just one of the examples. Hence, the principal leaves the teachers searching for other areas in which they have been insensitive towards the students. In example 4, the principal was urging the teachers to contribute some money towards the graduation of one of them.

The principal uses the word ‘*more*’ in the statement, “*he requires more of our support at this time of the hour and need,*” (School C, example 4, turn 17) to underscore the need to help one of the members of staff who required their (teachers) help. The word is used to show that teachers were in the habit of helping their colleagues but that one they were required to help beyond the ordinary help they always offered.

4.2.4.3 Ambiguity

This is violating the Maxim of Manner (Brown and Levinson, 1987). A speaker may choose to go off-record by being ambiguous or vague in such a way that the communicated intent is ill-defined. Ambiguity makes language more efficient, by allowing for the reuse of short, efficient sounds that listeners can easily disambiguate with the help of context (Grice, 1975). It may be that the clues sum up to an utterance that is ambiguous in context but by using what is technically indirect the speaker will have given a bow to the addressee's face and therefore minimized the threat of the FTA. Purposeful ambiguity may be achieved through the following ways:

a) Being Vague.

A speaker may go off-record with an FTA by being vague about who the object of the

FTA is, or what the offence is such as a criticism. For instance, ‘*someone*’ may be blind and say ‘*I am going to catch a movie*’. In example 2, turn 1). The principal was addressing the teachers about applications for job group M. The principal displaced the hearer by using the word “*everyone*” in his statement,

“everyone must aspire to grow” (School C, example 2, turn 3) to craft FTA like a command. In this statement, it may be construed that the principal was addressing a different group of people not present at the venue when in real sense he was talking to the teachers. Therefore, the word ‘everyone’ is vague.

Example 19, School A

The principal was addressing teachers in the staffroom in a morning briefing about KCSE registration of students.

Turn 1(Principal): *Mr. Mutua I don’t know if there is any student in form 3 who has not brought their birth certificate.*

Turn 2 (Mr. Mutua): *I told the class teacher.*

Turn 3 (Principal): *Mr. Nyamai is here, please check, check, check so that I can send these fellows home.*

Mr. Mutua says; “*I told the class teacher*” (Example 19, Turn 2). Mr. Mutua avoids mentioning Mr. Nyamai but instead says ‘the class teacher.’ He therefore goes off-record, and pretends to redress the FTA to whom it would not threaten and hope that the real target will see that the FTA is aimed at him. Mr. Mutua avoids mentioning Mr. Nyamai and leaves the teachers guessing who could be the class teacher of the class under discussion.

b) Over-generalize

A speaker may state something as a general rule that leaves the object of the FTA vaguely off-record. For instance, ‘*Form four students are supposed to be role models*’ (School A). The addressee then has the choice of deciding

whether the general rule applies to him/her, in this case. The same case applies to the use of proverbs though their use may be conventionalized. For example, *'Pastors should be prayerful'*. Such advice in context may serve as criticism. Another instance where the over-generalization is used is in Appendix (VII) in which the principal was reminding the teachers of their role upon the students during a morning briefing. He was a bit discontented with the way teachers were carrying out their responsibilities in school.

Principal: *We know the role we play as teachers* (School B) (Appendix IV).

The principal is talking about the role of teachers in ensuring discipline among the students. He goes ahead and lists them as; *"One, guiding them, 2, correcting them, 3, mentoring them, 4, reminding them"* (School B) (Appendix IV). The principal makes the remarks to the teachers as though he is reminding them of their duties as teachers. In this case the teachers may think that the principal is criticizing them for failing to perform certain duties. However, the principal does not explicitly tell them that they have failed to perform the duties of maintaining discipline in school.

c) *Incomplete statements, use ellipsis*

This is a violation of both the Quantity Maxim as well as the Manner maxim. Elliptical utterances are legitimized by various conversational contexts- in answers to questions. By leaving an FTA half undone, the speaker can leave the implicate 'hanging in the air,' just as with rhetorical questions. For instance, *'If any teacher fails to attend to his/her lessons ...'* (School B). This is one of the most favoured strategies for making requests especially to superiors. According

to Brown and Levinson (1987) in off-record usage, the mutual knowledge of the speaker and the hearer in context is crucial; the intentional, prosodic and kinesics clues of the speaker's attitude provide viable interpretations in context. Below are examples of conversation during which the teachers used incomplete statements and ellipsis.

Example 20, School B

The principal was telling the teachers of the impending celebration in which a bull could be slaughtered.

Principal: *...we have a bull eating for both students and support staff on 20th of this month next week being a mashujaa day, so you are welcome. We have taken care of everybody so we shall eat as a school and celebrate. So, on 20th we had put it towards closing but we realized we may get other challenges because when the students are free and the rest.....(opens his palms in the air)so we would like to eat our bull on mashujaa day and then when we close we go home. So, you are all invited, don't miss your soda and the other things you are supposed to do.*

The principal leaves the statement hanging in such a way that he was expecting teachers to contribute to what could be done in a situation where students would be free while other members of staff are busy with closure preparations. He thus explains why the bull eating was postponed to a later date, which sounds apologetic, and at the same time indirectly informing teachers that they

should also be there so that students are not left alone since they may engage in indiscipline. He thus manages to avoid imposition.

4.2.4.4 Metaphor

A metaphor is a figure of speech in which a word or phrase that is applied to something to which it is not literally applicable (Oxford dictionary, 2010). The principal in school A used metaphors in his exchanges. Brown and Levinson argue that metaphors are literally false. For instance, a crumbling building can be used as a metaphor for the society of the time. When a speaker uses metaphors, it is not clear exactly which of the connotations of the metaphor is intended to be invoked. For instance, in English someone may say, '*It was a 'stormy' relationship.*' This means the relationship involved a lot of '*anger or arguments* ', The speaker may say this to be technically indirect and will give a bow to the hearer's face thereby minimizing the threat of the FTA.

In the example below, the principal was addressing teachers in the staffroom during briefing about their tendency of embarrassing some students about their poor grades in front of the others.

Example 21, School A

Principal: *when someone is getting an E in class, what are we supposed to do in that class? To continue hammering the fact that he is getting an E, discussing it in front of the others? Or what are we supposed to do Mr. Wanjau?*

The principal says that; “...to continue hammering the fact that he is getting an E..”, The use of the word ‘hammering’ is used metaphorically to stand for ‘insisting or repeating something unpleasant to the students’. The word helps the principal to drive his point home and make teachers understand the intensity of the act.

Similarly, the principal uses metaphors in the following example.

Example 22, School C

Principal: *Even if they use very soft language let them be able to make their bed of roses and do what? And have the courage to sleep on them. The other area we have, we want to mention this morning is the end of term for the form 1 & 2. You remember we had already prepared the exams and there is a time-table, we...Mr. Fred there is a time table, isn't it?*

The principal was discussing the behaviour of parents and in particular Mama Clifford who was usually abusive and hence advises the teachers to remain sober when she comes to school – “one need to be a bit sober so that we deal with them, place them where they belong”. ‘Bed of roses’ is used by the principal to mean create trouble while ‘sleep on them’ stands for solving the issues created, take responsibility or accept the outcome of the situation created. The metaphor is therefore used by the principal to mean that a parent who creates issues or problems in school should be willing to take responsibility and solve the issues he/she has created.

The study established that teachers used different politeness strategies in the staffrooms including giving hints, presuppose and ambiguity. The strategies have been outlined and discussed above. In a study done by Kithure (2015), politeness strategies used by the Kenyan televangelists, she found out that they used negative FTAs (orders, requests, advice, promises and reminders); positive FTAs (accusations, challenges and criticism). Positive politeness strategies used were notice, attend to H, exaggerate interests, approval, sympathize with H, intensify interest to H, use of in-group identity markers, seek agreement among many others. Negative politeness strategies used by the televangelists were; being conventionally indirect, hedging, apologies and impersonalizing S and H. She observed that the Kenyan televangelists threatened their addressees' faces but they were also careful to redress them by using four politeness strategies as put down by Brown and Levinson (1987). This study's findings therefore corroborate her assertions.

From all the eighteen conversations obtained from the three schools, all the off-record politeness strategies used were populated and presented in Table 4.4 shown below.

Table 4. 4: Off-record Politeness Strategies

School/Strategies	A	B	C	Total	Percent
Give hints	1	1	0	2	16.6
Presuppose	0	0	1	1	8.3
Ambiguity	1	0	1	2	16.6
Metaphor	1	0	1	2	16.6
Overgeneralize	1	2	0	3	25.0
Incomplete statements	0	2	0	2	16.6
Total	4	5	3	12	100.0

The results show that 12 off-record strategies were used by teachers in the sampled schools with school A, B and C using 4, 5 and 3 off-record politeness strategies respectively. Of the six strategies used, overgeneralization was the most used strategy with 3 (25%) followed by give hints, ambiguity and incomplete statements at 16.6% each.

The study also computed the cumulative frequencies of all the politeness strategies used by the teachers in the staffroom. The strategies were categorized as positive, negative, bald-on and off-record politeness strategies. The results were presented in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4. 5: Politeness Strategies used by Teachers

Strategies	Schools			Total	Percent
	A	B	C		
Positive	4	3	8	15	44.1
Negative	3	0	1	4	11.8
Bald-on	1	0	2	3	8.8
Off-record	4	5	3	12	35.3
Total	12	8	14	34	100.0

Results in Table 4.5 show that politeness strategies were used 34 times. School A, B and C used 12, 8 and 14 politeness strategies respectively. Of the 34 uses of politeness strategies, positive politeness strategies were used 15 times (44.1%), off-record politeness strategies were used 12 times (35.3%) while bald-on was used only three times. Negative politeness strategies were used 4 times presented by 11.8%. Therefore, even though the study showed that all the teachers in the sampled schools used most of the politeness strategies observed, it was revealed that there were variabilities in the use of different types of politeness strategies among schools.

4.3 Sociological Determinants of Politeness Strategies

The second objective of the study was to analyze how the sociological factors such as age, gender, power, rank and social distance influence politeness strategies by teachers in the school staffroom. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1983 and 1987) argue that the seriousness of a FTA involves three factors: Social distance (D) of the speaker and addressee; the relative power (P) of the

speaker or the addressee, age (A), gender (G) and the absolute ranking of imposition (R). The following sub-sections discuss the influence of the above-mentioned social factors on the choice and use of politeness strategies in the school staffroom.

4.3.1 Relative Power of the Speaker or Hearer (P)

Power is the degree to which the hearer can impose his own self plans and his own self- evaluation at the expense of the hearers' plans and self-evaluation (Brown and Levinson 1987). Power may be assessed as being great because the hearer is eloquent and influential, or is a prince, a witch, a thug with a gun or a priest. Power differential is characterized by deference (Kithure, 2008). There are two sides in the realization of deference; one in which the speaker humbles and debases himself and the other where the speaker raises the hearer and pays him positive face (which satisfies the hearer's want to be treated as superior). This enables them to reduce the power differential and can attain their communicative goals in the most effective and efficient way (Kizelbach, 2017). Relative power of the speaker can also be depicted from example 9 when the principal is reminding the teachers about what he had talked about earlier; teachers embarrassing some students about their poor grades in front of other students.

The principal uses his authority to tell teachers '*I want us to be careful when we are handling them in class.*' The use of the words "I want" is a command from a person with a higher relative power and expects the hearer to do what is commanded.

Example 23, School B

Principal: *These are few things I would like us to discuss now that schools are almost closing. You know that every time we close the school, we have holiday assignments for our students. This term we are closing for two months so from 26th October to sometime around may be 4th January, so give enough work. And please don't tell the students to read this and that topic and make notes some of them are too wide, so specify!*

The principal gives direction on how teachers are supposed to give holiday work to the students. Even though he uses politeness by avoiding sounding like pushing the idea by using the term “*please,*” he uses his power and authority as a principal when he says ‘*.....don't tell the students to read this and that topic.... Specify!*’

Example 24, School C

Turn 1 (Principal): *So you've heard, she is doing a project and one of her areas is politeness and I don't know how polite we are, so...madam*

Turn 2 (Researcher): *yes sir*

Turn 3 (Principal): *I hope whatever you write, shall not be put in the national T.V.*

Turn 4 (Researcher): *No it will not. I promise.*

The use of the term '*sir*' by the researcher (Turn 2) is a sign of respect of those in authority. The researcher uses the term to show reverence of the position the principal holds and hence a way to respect power of the hearer.

4.3.2 Social Distance (D)

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

It is evident from the findings that there was social closeness between the teachers. There was also reciprocal giving and receiving in the many offers and promises made. Generally, this is illustrated by the extensive use of positive politeness strategies which acted as social accelerators and were not necessarily redressive but reduced the social distance between the teachers. In example 8, two young male teachers are having a conversation in the staffroom. They are free as others are in classes which are ongoing. Mr. John wants Mr. Peter to take his next lesson in a certain class.

They choose to converse in Kiswahili. From the conversation, the two are close. This can be seen from the fact they swap classes and ask some lessons from each other; “*Siuende ile ulikuwa unaniomba (why don’t you attend the one you had requested me)*”. We also see the people involved are of the same social age and hence Mr. John drops the formal title ‘Mr’ when, calling, Mr. Peter he simply says “Peter.” He also tells him to ‘come’ without using any redressing action. This is due to their proximity in age which reduces the social distance between them and hence allows them to use negative politeness strategy and bald- on- record.

This conversation is a non-formal one taking place in the school staffroom during tea break. Mr. John and Mrs. Grace are close to each other and therefore Mr. John tells Mrs. Grace, a female teacher, ‘*I like the colour of your earrings*’ (Example 1, Turn 3). Mrs. Grace smiles and winks in appreciation. This shows that the two teachers have a closer social knit. Mr. John also does not use any redress when asking for a pen from a colleague but just say, ‘*Give me a pen, a blue one*’ (Example 1, Turn 5). This shows that the two teachers enjoy the same social standing. This is shown by;

- i. Mr. John’s compliment of Mrs. Grace’s earring
- ii. Mr. John asking and taking the pen from Mrs. Grace
- iii. Conversation they have over the dismantled phone
- iv. Request by Mrs. Grace to Mr. John to help her reconnect the phone back.

These examples show a reduced social distance between the two teachers.

4.3.3 Rank

According to Brown and Yule (1983), ranking of imposition has to do with specific rights or obligations of the actors to perform an act or have specific reasons for not performing them and whether actors are known to enjoy being imposed on. Ranking therefore is defined by the degree to which acts are considered to interfere with the agent's wants of self-determination or of approval (that is, positive and negative face wants). The ranking of imposition identifiable with negative FTAs is in proportion to the expenditure of services (including provision of time) and goods (including non-material goods like information as well as the expression of regard and other face payments) (Coulthard and Sinclair, 1965). The lessening of certain impositions on a given actor is determined by the obligation (legally, religious, morally, by employment and so on) to do the act A. Results show that the principals in numerous times give orders to teachers which the teachers are supposed to follow accordingly. Discussions below depict some of the examples.

In example (12) Turn (3), the principal was calling upon teachers in a briefing in the staffroom to help him kill the habit of students wasting time outside between lessons. The teachers put up their hands when making suggestions during this briefing. Teachers put up their hands when they want to make contributions. This is a sign of respect for authority and hence power and context determine how people relate in the school staffroom because during informal interactions they don't put up their hands to make contributions. There is also proper turn taking and individual members respond when they are

called upon by the chair of the meeting to make their contributions. The principal switches off his phone when it rings because the situation (formal) demands that. The focus was on the one speaking unlike during informal interactions where there are small groups at times or some people don't take part.

Another example of rank appears in appendix (VII) in which the principal was making remarks about the duties of the teacher on duty. *"It is your responsibility to ensure there is order in school, full stop! That one does not need a lot of explanations, the class teachers who are here know your roles professionally"*. This is a statement made by the principal in exercise of his rank as the head of the institution. When he says: "That does not need a lot of explanations" he ascertains that no question is welcome on the issue and therefore in simple terms, the work assigned to every teacher must be done.

Example 25, School C

The conversation is between a teacher of physics and H.O.D sciences. It is after tea break and some teachers have left for class.

Turn 1 (Mrs. Jane): *Naweza patia Felias, peer teacher wafanye hii paper? (May I give Felias, the peer teacher they (students) do this paper in the afternoon?)*

Turn 2 (Mr. Fred): *Theory ama practical? (Theory or practical?)*

Turn 3 (Mrs. Jane): *Theory.*

Turn 4 (Mr. Fred): *Sawa, ongea naye (Okay talk to him)*

Mr. Fred is a director of studies and therefore Mrs. Jane asks for permission to seek the services of a peer teacher in administering the examination. This shows she respects the position Mr. Fred holds which means that rank influences the choice of politeness strategies used by teachers in school, she uses negative politeness strategy. i.e. Requesting for permission.

Example 26, School A

(The school secretary comes and whispers something to Mr. Maranga)

Mr Maranga: *Excuse me, walimu? (Teachers). (Teachers stop what they are doing and pay attention). The secretary is asking for form one exam; she hasn't received any (Some teachers nod).*

Mr. Maranga is the director of studies in the school and therefore the secretary whispers something to him which most probably is what he announces to the teachers. The rank is observed here in that the secretary does not face the teachers directly to address her concern and instead whispers, so that there is no direct communication to the teachers. She recognizes that Mr. Maranga is the person charged with the responsibility of such duties. The teachers respond appropriately by nodding showing respect for his authority.

4.3.4 Gender

Tannen (1991) argues that females are politer than males and that females engage in small talk to create warm relationship with each other. Men do not engage for the same reason. In this study, gender was assessed as a determinant of the choice of politeness strategies among teachers.

In Example 1, Turn 5, we see that gender determines politeness strategy applied by participants with the male being less polite than the female because Mr. John demands for a pen instead of requesting. He says; ‘give me a pen’ this threatens the negative face of the hearer. He also does not say thank you immediately after receiving the pen but later. The absolute ranking of the face threatening act is however less, which is another factor that determines the politeness strategy applied by participants.

Mrs. Mary however corrects herself when she realizes she is about to demand other than request appendix (VIII). She says (hebu ii..., can you...) the study opines she wanted to say “can you connect it?” but immediately uses an off-record politeness strategy when she says she was unable to connect the phone. This is a polite way of requesting the other teacher to connect it for her. Hence, she is tactful. This shows gender determines the politeness strategy applied by participants with the female coming out as more polite than male.

Example 27, School A

It is in the staffroom during informal chats. One teacher Ms. Iriya is narrating to others how her house help left with no intentions of coming back.

Turn 1 (Iriya):*Wacha nisijifanye desperate saaana alikuwa anadhani maisha yangu yatakosa kuendelea (let me not act so desperate, she thought my life will come to a standstill.*

Turn 2 (Ms. Doris): *Mmm hawa wasichana nakwambia (laughter) sometime umejiprepere kuja kazini anakwambia, na nilikuwa nataka kwenda leo. (These house helps I am telling you,*

sometimes you prepare yourself for work then she tells you “I wanted to leave today”).

Turn 3 (Mrs Muena): *Girls are funny.*

Turn 4 (Ms Doris): *Usijali, mtoto amekua for that one year. Harudi nyuma (don't worry, the baby has grown for that one year, he is not retrogressing).*

Turn 5 (Iriya): *Eeh harudi nyuma (yes, he is not retrogressing)*

The above conversation asserts Tannen's observation that women engage in small talk to build relations. For example, Iriya says “*Wacha nisijifanye desperate saaana alikuwa anadhani maisha yangu yatakosa kuendelea (let me not act so desperate, she thought my life will come to a standstill)*”. She starts this conversation even though not affecting any of them at the time for purposes of developing a closer relationship with colleagues. The others immediately empathize because their colleague does not have a house girl then. They understand how difficult it is to work without one and this develops into a discussion. Empathy is a form of positive politeness. In comparison with Mr. Peter and Mr. John in the staffroom, (Example 8) we see a discussion about lesson and how one of them should stand in for the other while female teachers are discussing social affairs. These findings agree with Tannen (1991) who stressed the importance of small talk as being a critical component in women's communication to shape and conglomerate relationships. On the other hand, Tannen posits that the male gender does not engross for the same resolution.

4.3.5 Age

One of the factors influencing the choice of politeness strategies among work mates is the age differences. Conversations between people of different ages frequently show different level of politeness. Mizutani and Mizutani (1987) state that differences in age will influence the formality of speakers and hence the degree of politeness.

Example 28, School C

The conversation takes place in the staffroom during free time among three ladies in their late twenties. They are close friends.

Turn 1 (Winfred): *Biro yaakwa ina madam, wacha nikuchukulie (my biro is with madam let me pick it for you)*

Turn 2 (Judith): *Hiyo ni ya red. (That one is red). (calling); ding- ding, ding- ding*

Turn 3 (Matiba): *Mmh (yes)*

Turn 4 (Judith): *Ball pen ya blue*

Turn 5 (Matiba): *Kuja utafute. (Come look for it)*

Turn 6 (Judith): *winfred toa hapo kwa pouch yangu (Winfred get it from my pouch) (Ms. Judith hands over the pen to Winfred).*

Teacher Judith refers to the other Ms. Matiba by her nickname (ding- ding). This shows that the two teachers enjoyed a close relationship. They are also less formal with each other; Judith doesn't take care of imposing on Ms. Matiba when she asks for a biro from her and also from Ms. Winfred. They are young female teachers in their late twenties and young in the profession. They

are also the youngest among TSC teachers. The word ‘ding-ding’ is a nickname that could only be used by people of the same age group.

In example (14) Turn (1), the principal comes into the staffroom for a briefing and finds that some teachers are not there. He sends a teacher who is older than he is to go and call them. Even though he is a principal, he uses a proverb; “*even an old man can be sent but cannot be insulted*” when sending Mr. Nyamai to redress the FTA. Mr. Nyamai was in an advanced age. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) the factors mentioned above are not the only relevant factors in the choice of politeness strategies. However, they were key in this study.

Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al. (2013) did a study of the relationship between politeness and social power. The results showed that polite Wikipedia editors were more likely to achieve high status through elections, but, once elevated, they became less polite. There was a similar negative correlation between politeness and power on Stack Exchange, where users at the top of the reputation scale were less polite than those at the bottom. The study found a politeness variation by gender and community. These findings agree with Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al. (2013) since only head teachers used bald-on politeness strategies without redress as a sign of social power. It is also observed that gender and age played an important role in the selection of politeness strategies for example Ms. Matiba tells Judith “*Kuja utafute*” (come and look for it) and Judith also tells Winfred “*Winfred toa hapo kwa pouch yangu* (Winfred get it from my pouch). This is possible because all the ladies

are almost of the same age group. Relative power and ranking of imposition between principals and the teachers were more or less equal and imposition was not great. It can therefore be concluded that relative power, social distance, ranking, gender and age of imposition just as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) were the major factors that greatly influenced the choice of politeness strategies by teachers in the selected schools in Kirinyaga County.

4.4 Influence of Politeness Strategies on interactions

Brown and Levinson (1987) posits that any rational agent will seek to avoid face threatening acts or employ certain politeness strategies to minimize face threats in social interaction. A speaker takes into consideration the relative weightings of at least three wants: the want to communicate the content of the FTA, the want to be efficient or urgent and the want to maintain the hearer's face at any degree unless the want to be efficient is greater than the want to maintain the hearer's face and the speaker will want to minimize the threat of the FTA. This section discusses how politeness strategies influence interactions between teachers in a school staffroom. Politeness is believed to facilitate communication in human interaction, as it can minimize the potential for conflict and confrontation.

4.4.1 On Record Strategy Without Redressive Action

The most direct and threatening strategy is to act baldly on record. Direct speech acts are used and they tend to contain the imperative without any mitigating devices (Cutting, 2008). Brown and Levinson (1987) noted that

these acts follow Grice's Maxims of Cooperation. They are relevant, brief and avoid ambiguity and do not communicate more than is required and thus no concern for face wants is expressed. Bald-on-record acts are performed when the speaker has significantly more power than the hearer or when the threat involved is very small. For instance, when the principal says; "*It is your responsibility to ensure there is order in school. Full stop. That one does not need a lot of explanations, the class teachers who are here know your roles professionally*", he uses on record strategy to assert his authority upon his listeners and this creates a social distance between the teachers and the principal. It also helps the teachers to understand that there is a centre of authority and hence become more careful when handling their duties. When urgency or efficiency is necessary, a face threatening act can also be done without redress. Orders such as "Call the ambulance!" are not considered impolite and it is mutually understood that there is no time for mitigating strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Among the teachers, principals use the on-record strategy without redressive action e.g. "don't just ask them to read any topic. Guide them". The statement is meant to give orders to the teachers on how they are supposed to carry out their duties which most probably are unsatisfactory. This strategy used by the principal ensures that rank and power are maintained. The teachers are obliged to obey. When a principal goes 'on record' when uttering an FTA, the intention is unambiguously expressed and therefore clear to all participants. If one goes on record, one can express the FTA baldly, i.e. in most concise way possible to

utter something. Another example is when a principal tells the teachers “if a form four student refuses to eat, just leave him/her alone”.

4.4.2 Off Record Strategy

A speaker may decide to go off-record. In this way “it is not possible to attribute only one clear communicative intention to the act” (Brown & Levinson, 1987). This ambiguity is achieved by violation of Gricean maxims and it is left up to the hearer to infer the implicated meaning. The hearer’s face is protected by having the option to retreat behind the literal meaning of the words (Cutting, 2008) and the speaker can save his face by denying having performed the face threatening act. Therefore, this strategy minimizes the threat most successfully. Teachers use off record strategy in their conversations as depicted in the above discussions. The strategy helped to close the social distance between the teachers. Off-record strategy is also found in example (1) when two teachers John and Peter are conversing in the staffroom. Peter says “*I am very tired yet I have the next class* (Example 8, Turn 14) while John is asking him “*Do you have a class?*” (Example 8, Turn 3). While John is asking Peter to attend a lesson on his behalf, he does not directly ask so rather he asks Peter if he has a class. On the same note, John says that he is tired yet he has the next lesson. From the two statements, the addressee may not understand the speaker. However, the use of the strategies among the teachers were used to ensure that the hearer put him/herself in the situation of the speaker and hence become willing to oblige. Conversely, this strategy helped the teachers understand each one better and the needs of the speaker.

Off-record strategy is also used when Mr. Mutua says; “*I told the class teacher*” (Example 19, Turn 2) referring to Mr. Nyamai. He may as well deny that he did not refer to Mr. Nyamai since no names were mentioned. This strategy is used to avoid confrontation between the speakers and his listeners and creates respect among teachers.

4.4.3 Negative Politeness Strategies

Negative Politeness Strategies are oriented towards hearer’s negative face and they tend to “emphasize one’s deference to the addressee” (Huang, 2007). Negative politeness represents what is usually understood under respectful behaviour. It is always specific and focused, as it is directed at minimizing the imposition of a specific FTA and is not used freely in the conversation the way positive politeness is (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

While discussing the help that could be accorded to Mr. Brian, example (4), who had been a student in the same school for purposes of graduation, teachers were giving views on the amount of money that they could contribute towards graduation. The principals use negative politeness strategies in many ways. For example, the principal says “*I hope 500 shillings is okay with everyone*” Example (4, Turn 13). This helps the principal to avoid imposition and hence redress the FTAs. Through this, the principal manages to ask the teachers to contribute money willingly and hence redresses the influence of power and rank on the teachers. It is a strategy that helps the teachers to feel recognized by the principal and hence reduces the social distance between the principal and the teachers.

4.4.4 Positive Politeness Strategies

By using positive politeness strategies, the speaker conveys that they are co-operative with the addressee and that they have a common ground. The scope of strategies is wider than with negative politeness. While negative politeness strategies are used to redress a particular threat posed by the utterance, positive politeness involves such strategies as compliments or jokes and can be used more freely in the conversation without having to mitigate a specific face threat. When the speaker's positive face is attended to throughout the whole conversation, the social distance between the speaker and the addressee is reduced and a potential FTA is thus weaker. In the conversation between Mr. John and Mrs. Grace, example (1) Mr John compliments Mrs. Grace about the colour of her earrings and hence reducing the distance between them. This makes it possible for John to obtain a pen from madam Grace. In turn the pen madam Grace gives makes it possible for her to ask for a favour from Mr. John: to fix her dismantled phone.

Jansen and Janssen (2010) studied the effects of adding and combining positive politeness strategies to letters denying claims to policy holders. The results of two experiments showed that 'Give Reasons' had a positive effect on the evaluation of the letter.

The politeness strategies used by teachers brought about unity among the teachers. With all other factors at play, teachers and head teachers were able to have an understanding among them. These results corroborate with Jiang (2010) who studied a Chinese EFL teacher's linguistic politeness in classroom

based on observation, recorded data and interview with both the teacher and the students. The study findings indicated that politeness was used in the EFL class and that politeness promoted the mutual understanding and harmonious relationship between teacher and students. The study also observed that politeness enhanced teaching and benefited the students. Lastly, politeness contributed to the effective interaction and friendly, lively atmosphere in EFL classroom.

Wambui (2014) carried out a study on Linguistic Politeness Strategies in Kenya Commercial Bank Advertisements. The study found out that the bank tended to use more linguistic positive politeness strategies such as: notice and attend to H interest, wants and needs, give offers/guarantee, show solidarity by making use of in-group talk, exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H), seek agreement, be optimistic, assert common ground and give gifts to H. She observed that these linguistic politeness strategies acted as persuasive devices in bank advertising. In this way bank advertisements employ linguistic politeness strategies that persuade their target customers by taking care of their face needs and wants. Even though teachers were not using politeness strategies for persuasion, they applied most of the strategies highlighted by Wambui (2014).

Brown and Levinson (1987) list fifteen positive politeness strategies. With the first eight of the strategies, the speaker claims common ground, “indicating that speaker and hearer belong to the same set of persons who share specific wants, including goals and values”. In the current study, principals and teachers

belong to the same set of persons and therefore the use of the politeness strategies was to create common ground for peaceful co-existence. Brown and Levinson (1987) note that the latter strategies are used to convey that the speaker and the hearer are co-operative and have the same goals. In this case, the findings of this study agree with Brown and Levinson (1987). Consequently, if speaker requires something from the hearer, he can use the strategies to hint that by attending to the speaker, the hearer is acting in his own interest as well. Therefore, positive politeness played an important role when forming good interpersonal relationships between the teachers.

4.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the study findings. The study revealed that teachers in the selected schools used positive politeness strategies, negative strategies, bald-on record and finally off-record strategies in their interactions. The study further showed that positive politeness strategies were most used by the teachers followed by negative, off-record and lastly bald-on record strategies. From the study findings, social distance (D), power (P) and Rank (R) had were most at play in official conversations. This was because, in all the official communications, the school principals were present and were heading the conversations. However, in unofficial conversations, social distance (D), age (A) and gender (G) were the most predominant factors since teachers' interaction were varied based on the three social factors.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) agree with this view when they argue that when speakers use positive politeness strategies they create a cordial relationship

with their interactants for purposes of effective communication. As seen in the foregoing examples and discussions, positive politeness strategies were used to make the hearer feel good about themselves, their interests or possessions. They are mostly used in situations where the interactants know each other well.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

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

5.1 Summary of Findings

The study focused on Politeness. Using Politeness theory, the study identified the politeness strategies and established the sociological factors that influenced the choice of politeness strategies from the data. The study also sought to establish the influence of the politeness strategies to teachers' interactions in the staffrooms. The study found out that teachers in all the school sampled used positive, negative, bald-on and off-record politeness strategies. However, there were notable variations in the frequency of use of the strategies across the school. The following is a summary of the findings discussed objectively.

5.1.1 Politeness Strategies

Some of the politeness strategies that were used (positive and negative) are outlined. The positive politeness strategies included notice, attending to hearer, optimism, seeking agreement, the inclusive 'we', in-group identity makers and giving and asking reasons. Examples (1 – 9). The negative politeness strategies used were minimization of imposition, apology, impersonalizing of the speaker

and the hearer and state FTA as a general rule (example 10 & 11). Bald-on-record strategies were also used by the teachers. Off-record strategies used by the teachers included giving hints, presuppose and ambiguity. Examples (14 – 16). Results showed that positive politeness strategies were most used by teachers in all the sampled schools followed by negative strategies. Bald-on record strategy was the least used strategy in the schools sampled. The study also showed that negative, positive, bald-on and off-record strategies were used in all schools.

5.1.2 Sociological Factors Influencing the Choice of Politeness Strategies

As earlier noted, any model speaker will choose the same politeness strategy as any other given the same circumstances. The factors that influenced teachers' choice of politeness strategies were relative power of S or H, Ranking of imposition and gender.

5.1.2.1 Power, Social Distance, Ranking, Age and Gender (P, D, RA and G)

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

The social distance between the speaker and hearer was considered differently among different schools depending on how the teachers and the principals

interacted. On average, the social distance among the teachers was relatively shorter than between teachers and principals. This was identified when the principals gave orders to teachers and sometimes authoritatively spoke out on their roles and responsibilities. The fact that in all the schools the principals shared the same languages -English, Swahili and the local dialect- Gikuyu was an indication of reduced social distance for instance when one of the principals said; “*Githe ndukimenyaga ona muthuri niatumagwo nokurumwo atarumagwo*” meaning an elderly person can be sent but should not be insulted example (14). The teachers occasionally switched codes from English to Swahili to communicate some information example (12). The discourse was also characterized by the reciprocal giving and receiving of positive face when the principals made requests and questions to the hearers. Teachers occasionally nodded whenever some questions were generally asked. In some instances, where questions were directed to individual teachers, the teachers responded directly to principals. It can be noted that requests threaten the faces of both the speaker and hearer.

Ranking of imposition has to do with whether the actors enjoy being imposed. When the principals made several commands on a range of issues the teachers kept silent and some nodded. This was an indication of small ranking of imposition from the principals. It can therefore be concluded that the relative power of the principals and the teachers were highly varied though the principals tried to minimize the threats and hence ranking of imposition was not as great as it could have been without them. The age plays a role in the

choice of politeness strategy in the teachers' conversations. For example, the principal uses a proverb before sending an elderly teacher. He uses the proverb to minimize the imposition on the teacher.

5.2 Conclusions from Findings

The following conclusions are drawn from the findings.

5.2.1 Use of Politeness Strategies

Teachers used many strategies with positive politeness strategies being the most recurrent. Bald-on strategies were also used especially by the principals. This shows that the principals threatened the face of the teachers to some level. However, principals employed a lot of positive politeness strategies such as use of in-group identity markers, the inclusive 'we', code-switching and others which created a 'cordial environment' for smooth interaction. These demonstrated a high level of closeness where the principals interacted with the hearers without restraint though the setting was formal. The environment created by the politeness strategies helped to reduce the social distance between the interlocutors making communication effective. Interactions among teachers used numerous positive politeness strategies.

Furthermore, teachers used negative politeness strategies. Through the use of negative politeness strategies, principals assured the hearers that they respect their negative face and will minimally interfere with their freedom of action. The principals impersonalized the hearer by use of '*everyone*' to avoid direct reference to the hearer as a sign of respect.

The use of bald-on-record with minimization was recurrent in the principals' discourse and they were able to reduce imposition by implication especially in the use of imperative sentences. For instance, the principal said; "*It is your responsibility to ensure there is order in school, full stop!*" (Appendix VII). This implies that principals were powerful and they carried the authority of the employer and hence not afraid of any reprisals from the hearers. The principals used bald-on record strategies in a way that it was not possible to attribute only one communicative intention to the act. By so doing, the principals avoided responsibility for doing it and left it to the hearer to interpret it. This means that teachers and principals were professionals who understood the use of these strategies.

5.2.2 Sociological Determinants of Politeness Strategies

The principals used the inclusive 'we' strategy as they gave orders to the teachers, for example; "*I want us to be careful when we are handling them in class*". These strategies were used to help the principals asserts themselves as per the powers they had and therefore sought to make things straight. The principal gives direction on how teachers are supposed to give holiday work to the students. Even though he uses politeness by avoiding imposition, by using the term "*please*" he uses his power and authority as a principal when he says '*.....don't tell the students to read this and that topic.... Specify*'. (Appendix VII).

Both principals and teachers made effort to reduce the social distance in a number of ways for example code switching, nicknames and compliments are

used to redress the FTAs and help reduce the social distance between the speaker and the listeners. Teachers put up their hands when they want to make contributions. This is a sign of respect for authority and hence power and context determines how people relate in the school staffroom because during informal interactions they do not put up their hands to make contributions and hence rank as a determinant of politeness strategy was observed. Gender as determiner of politeness strategy is seen when the female teachers engage in small talk about a house maid (example 21). One of the teachers also compliments the earrings of a female teacher in the staffroom. This indicates that there are topics that could take place among people of the same gender and those of cross gender. Age as a sociological determinant is seen when teachers of the same age group freely interact and even use nicknames to refer to each other (example 22 and example 12). When the principal wishes to send an elderly teacher, he is forced to use a proverb to redress the FTAs (example 26).

5.2.3 Influence of Politeness Strategies on Interactions

The use of in-group identity markers, the inclusive 'we', code-switching and others which created a 'cordial environment' for smooth interaction reduced the social distance between the interlocutors making communication effective and helped the teachers to interact without restrictions and drastically reduced the social distance. They also reduced friction among teachers making them more productive. The principals used negative politeness strategies which helped to assure the hearers that they respect their negative face and will minimally interfere with their freedom of action.

Use of compliments also lessened the distance among teachers making them obtain the favours they needed from each other. Use of hints avoided direct confrontation among teachers hence enabling them to self correction without hurting each other's feelings. This always helped to maintain a good relationship among them.

The use of off-record politeness strategies gave a bow to the hearer's face and minimized the threats of the FTAs. Politeness strategies brought about respect and cohesiveness among the teachers and the principals. Other strategies also helped define the relative power and social distance between the teachers and the principals. However, the efforts made by both teachers and the principals helped to reduce and defuse the social distance among the teachers.

Bald-On-Record politeness strategies were mostly used by the principals. This enabled them as agents of TSC (teachers' employer) to give direction to teachers on what is expected of them without fear of retaliation. This strategy, being used by someone who is a symbol of authority ensures effectiveness in delivery of services in places of work.

5.3 Recommendations

The study showed that there was about 10% use of bald-on record strategies among the principals. This is likely to cause discomfort among teachers especially when such strategies are used in the absence of the need for efficiency or in cases of emergencies. The use of bald-on- record should only be used when necessary. The principals should take keen interest in the use of positive politeness strategies which is hoped to help them manage the schools

better since there would a good working environment is likely to be created by reduced social distance.

5.4 Suggestions for further Research

The current study focused on the politeness strategies by the teachers in the school staffroom and the influence of politeness strategies on interaction among teachers. Further, this study focused on only three schools in Kirinyaga County due to limited time and financial resources. Therefore;

- a. A study on politeness strategies employed by teachers of different subjects on their students in schools should be done. This could help in establishing factors responsible for students' perception of teachers and the respective subjects for purposes of enhancing learner achievement.
- b. Further studies on other institutions of learning need to be done to establish if there exist any difference in the use of politeness strategies among the institutions like primary schools and tertiary colleges.

5.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the summary of the study, conclusion and recommendations. The chapter looked at the politeness strategies that were employed by teachers in their interactions, the sociological factors that influenced the choice of politeness strategies used by teachers in their interactions and lastly, the chapter presented the influence of the politeness strategies on interactions among the teachers. The chapter sums up with recommendations and suggestion for further studies.

REFERENCES

- Ali, H.M. (2000). *Communication in intercultural discourse*. MA thesis. Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Ambuyo, B. A., Indede, F. N. & Karanja, P. N. (2011). Face threatening acts and standing orders: 'politeness' or 'politics' in the question time discussions of the Kenyan parliament.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine Books
- Behnam, B., & Niroomand, M. (2011). An Investigation of Iranian EFL Learners' Use of Politeness Strategies and Power Relations in Disagreement across Different Proficiency Levels. *English language teaching*, 4(4), 204-220.
- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2013). *The practice of critical discourse analysis: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and practice*.
- Bolkan, S., & Holmgren, J. L. (2012). "You are such a great teacher and I hate to bother you but...": Instructors' perceptions of students and their use of email messages with varying politeness strategies. *Communication Education*, 61(3), 253-270.
- Bolkan, S., & Holmgren, J. L. (2012). "You are such a great teacher and I hate to bother you but...": Instructors' perceptions of students and their use of email messages with varying politeness strategies. *Communication Education*, 61(3), 253-270.
- Bremner, S. (2012). Politeness and face research. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S., (1978). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Brown, P. & Yule, B. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: University Press. London.
- Brubæk, S. (2012). Pragmatic competence in English at the VG1 level: To what extent are Norwegian EFL students able to adapt to contextual demands when making requests in English?. *Acta Didactica Norge*, 6(1), Art-20.

- Canale, M. (2014). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In *Language and communication* (pp. 14-40). Routledge.
- Coulthard, R. M. & Sinclair, J. (1965). *Towards an analysis of discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford: Oxford Press.
- Creswell, J. W., Ebersohn, L., Eloff, I., Ferreira, R., Ivankova, N. V., Jansen, J. D., ... & Van der Westhuizen, C. (2010). *First steps in research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Second edition, Cambridge; Cambridge. University Press.
- Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, C., Sudhof, M., Jurafsky, D., Leskovec, J., & Potts, C. (2013). A computational approach to politeness with application to social factors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.6078*.
- Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, C., Sudhof, M., Jurafsky, D., Leskovec, J., & Potts, C. (2013). A computational approach to politeness with application to social factors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.6078*.
- Darics, E. (2010). Politeness in computer-mediated discourse of a virtual team.
- Edmonson, W. (1981). *Spoken Discourse: A Model of Analysis*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Eelen, G. (2014). *A Critique of Politeness Theory: Volume 1*. Routledge.
- Gharaghani, Z., Rasekh, A. E., Dabaghi, A., & Tohidian, I. (2011). Effect of Gender on Politeness Strategies in Greetings of Native Speakers of Persian&59; English and EFL learners. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(3), 93-117.
- Gharaghani, Z., Rasekh, A. E., Dabaghi, A., & Tohidian, I. (2011). Effect of Gender on Politeness Strategies in Greetings of Native Speakers of Persian&59; English and EFL learners. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(3), 93-117.
- Given, M. (2008). *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Los Angeles, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Goffman, E. (1967). On Face Work: *An analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction*. In, *Interaction Ritual* (pp. 5-45). New York: Panteon Books.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In, Cole and Morgan (eds.) pp 41-58.

- Griffin E.M, (1991). *Communication: A First Look at Communicative Theory*, New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies: Studies in Intercultural Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guodong, L., & Jing, H. (2005). A contrastive study on disagreement strategies for politeness between American English & Mandarin Chinese. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7, 10(1)
- Handayani, A. R. T. (2017). *Vocabulary level of the English e-textbook for grade XII Senior High School students* (Doctoral dissertation, Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya).
- Holmes, J. & Meredith, M., (2004). Relational Practice in the Work Place: Women's talk or gendered discourse? *Language in society*. Cambridge University Press. *Language in society*/vol 33/issue 03/July 2004, pp. 377-398
- [Http://www.skillsyouneed.com/ips/barriers-communication.html](http://www.skillsyouneed.com/ips/barriers-communication.html)
- International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(9), 209-218. Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Williams James Lectures 1955. Oxford.
- Jansen, F., & Janssen, D. (2010). Effects of positive politeness strategies in business letters. *Journal of pragmatics*, 42(9), 2531-2548.
- Jiang, X. (2010). A Case Study of Teacher's Politeness in EFL Class. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 1(5).
- Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kádár, D. Z., & Pan, Y. (2011). Politeness in China. *Politeness in East Asia*, 125-146.
- Karambu, P.M. (2010). *Communicative competence among students in high school*. MA dissertation Kenyatta University, Kenya. Unpublished dissertation
- Kizelbach, U. (2017). 14.(Im) politeness in fiction. *Pragmatics of Fiction*, 12, 425.
- Koike, D. A. (2014). *Language and social relationship in Brazilian Portuguese: The pragmatics of politeness*. University of Texas Press.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1989). The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua* 8 (2-3): 101-129.

- Li, M. (2012). Politeness strategies in wiki-mediated communication of EFL collaborative writing tasks.
- Locher, M. A. (2010). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication* (Vol. 12). Walter de Gruyter.
- Locher, M.A. & Watts, R.J., (2005). *Politeness Theory and Relational work*. Strategies retrieved on September 25, 2008, from <http://www.ling.wisc.edu/thesis/abstracts/wkiee.html>.
- Marriott, H. (1993). Politeness phenomena in Japanese intercultural business communication. *Intercultural communication studies*, 3(1), 15-37.
- Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research? A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 54(1), 11-22.
- Mead, M. (1977). "End Linkage: A Tool for Cross-Cultural Analysis" In Brockman J. (ed), New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Mei, A., & Nathalang, S. S. (2010). Use of Communication Strategies by Chinese EFL Learners. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Foreign Language Teaching & Research Press)*, 33(3).
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mills, S. (2011). Discursive approaches to politeness and impoliteness. *Discursive approaches to politeness*, 8, 19.
- Miriti, G., (2012). Politeness and speech accommodation in intercultural business negotiation. Unpublished MA thesis Kenyatta University, Kenya. Miriti, G., (2012). Politeness and speech accommodation in intercultural business negotiation. MA thesis Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Mizutani, O., & Mizutani, N. (1987). *How to be polite in Japanese*. Tokyo, Japan: The Japan Times, Ltd.
- Mugenda, O.,M., & Mugenda, A.G. (1999). *Research Methods Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Nairobi. Acts press-Kenya.
- Najeeb, Z. M., Maros, M., & Nor, N. F. M. (2012). Politeness in e-mails of Arab students in Malaysia. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1).
- Odongo, E. K. (2008). Patterns and motivations of code switching in staffroom conversation. MA project Kenyatta University. Unpublished dissertation

- Pullin, P. (2010). Small talk, rapport, and international communicative competence: Lessons to learn from BELF. *The Journal of Business Communication (1973)*, 47(4), 455-476.
- Purpura, J. E. (2013). Assessing grammar. *The companion to language assessment*, 1, 100-124.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge.
- Rixer, J. (2016). Kissing and other strategies for successful communication: A case study on communication between Nordic and Chinese business people using English as a lingua franca.
- Rosen, C. Brown, J. Heiman, S. Leiblum, C. Meston, R. Shabsigh, D. Ferguson, R. D'Agostino, R. (2000). The Female Sexual Function Index (FSFI): a multidimensional self-report instrument for the assessment of female sexual function. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 26(2), 191-208.
- Sari, Y. K. (2016). *An Analysis of politeness strategy in barack obama's victory speech* (Bachelor's thesis, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta: Fakultas Adab dan Humaniora, 2016).
- Sekaran, U. (2007). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach* (4thed.). New Delhi, India: Wiley Publishers.
- Stephan, E., Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (2010). Politeness and psychological distance: A construal level perspective. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 98(2), 268.
- Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand: *Women and men conversations*. New York: William Morrow. The Free Encyclopedia.Html.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (2003). *Intercultural conflicts: A face negotiation theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological review*, 117(2), 440.
- Tucker, B., Weaver II, B., & BerrYman-fink, C., (1981. *Research In Speech Communication*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Walya, E. (1996). *Kenyan Banking Discourse: structure, strategies and their effects on banking interaction*. Unpublished Masters' thesis, Kenyatta University.

- Wambui, N. S. (2014). *Linguistic Politeness Strategies in Bank Advertisements: A Case Study of Kenya Commercial Bank* (Published Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Watts, R.J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Yin, C. P., Hsu, C. W., Kuo, F. Y., & Huang, Y. T. (2012). A study of politeness strategies adopted in pediatric clinics in Taiwan. *Health communication*, 27(6), 533-545.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: INTRODUCTION LETTER

**KENYATTA UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LINGUISTICS
P.O BOX 43844,
NAIROBI.**

Dear Respondent,

I am a post-graduate student in Kenyatta University pursuing a Master of Arts degree in English and Linguistics. I am carrying out a research on discourse analysis of the school staffroom discourse for my final year project which is a requirement for the degree program.

The study is expected to be of use to school managers and teachers in the way they relate with each other during their interactions.

I kindly request you to participate in this study. The information you will give will be entirely confidential and will only be used for the purpose of this study.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

Wambua Rose Waithira

REG: C50/CE/21232/2012

APPENDIX II: CONSENT LETTER

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LINGUSTICS,
P.O BOX 43844,
NAIROBI.

Dear Respondent,

I am a post-graduate student in Kenyatta University pursuing a Master of Arts degree in English and Linguistics. I am carrying out a research on discourse analysis of the school staffroom discourse for my final year project which is a requirement for the degree program. Kindly allow me to video record you for the sake of this research only. Thank you

This is to confirm that I have agreed to be video recorded for the purpose of this research.

Sign_____

Name_____

Date_____

APPENDIX III: CONVERSATION 2, SCHOOL A

Principal: Eh nilikua nataka...nani ameona madam Jane? (I wanted...who has seen Madam Jane?)

Principal (to Mr. Nyamu): githe ndukimenyaga ona muthuri niatumagwo nokurumwo atarumagwo? (You know even an old man can be sent but cannot be insulted.)

Mr. Wambugu: I think ako kwake.

(I think she is in her office.)

(Mr. Nyamu goes to call her and they both appear in the staffroom)

Principal: okey, excuse me, good morning?

Chorus: Good morning!

Principal: There are few things I would like to point out. One, we have some new boys in form three and those who are teaching that class, eh...those boys, some of us were involved in interviewing them. You know that they are not very good nor bad. I want us to be careful when we are handling them in class. Let us not got to repeat the history in class where you might start opposing them too much. They will feel very uncomfortable and that kind of thing.

Hiyo ingine (the other thing) there are two things that are coming up. You know students may go to the parents and say many things and so on and so forth example for the non-performers. For example, kijana ya Mwau (Mwau's son) when I add all that what they are saying, I thought that it was important that we share. When someone is getting an E in class, what are we supposed to do in that class? To continue hammering the fact that he is getting an E, discussing it in front of the others? Or what are we supposed to do Mr. Wanjau?

Mr. Wanjohi: Some things we can't say there is some definite formulae but I think they are still our sons with the mentality of helping them

Principal: What I am trying to say is that we may do some damages, more damages than helping them. Okay, let me just give you an example; one boy I have been handling has just said that he has developed fear of the class teacher, you know that it

is good that we talk about some of these things. The fear for the class teacher who is Mr. Micah.

Mr Micah: (looks at the principal but says nothing).

Principal: he says Mr. Micah is exposing him and making others know that he can't perform.

Sasa anaona Mr. Micah mpaka anaogopa kuingia kwa darasa. Mr. wanjohi?

(Now he sees Mr. Micah and fears to get into class).

Mr. Wanjohi (nods)

Principal: Mr. Micah sijui kama mnakosana na kijana kwa sababu ya E, lakini sasa

You will know how to handle it because anakuona anaogoa (Mr. Micah, I don't know if you are falling out with the boy because of E but how I know you will know how to handle him because you now know that when he sees you he gets afraid).

Mr. Micah: (nods)

Principal: Madama Ngari you know Yule kijana (that boy) refused to come to school because you said he was going to present.

Ms Ngari: Lakini.....(but...)

Principal: Ah! Ah! Ah! I am just giving an example. I am only talking. You say the guy is going to present, the guy is low academically so he feels now wale wengine watamchekelea (the others are going to laugh at him).

So now he avoids coming to school. These are some of the things I am saying that we try to be a bit more sensitive. There are girls making fun of this boy and now he becomes very uncomfortable.

Three, in form 3 there is a girl called Winrose. Winrose had not opened school I don't want to talk about her but there are some of you that have an idea but I would want to suggest that, when you go to class please for the time being because her case is complicated, please just leave her alone, because she is trying to look for the slightest excuse to be at home. Please let us not give her that opportunity.

Hiyo inginge ni form 4s (The other things is Form 4s).

As for the form 4s I am also suggesting here let us not concentrate on them at all. I thought that these guys are seeking attention. Madam Iriya knows, Mr. Mutua knows...Wachana na wao. (Leave them alone) take them through revision anything else wachana na wao. (leave them alone)

Mr. Mutua: Especially the boys.

Principal: Especially the boys' class! Those who were in the assembly heard me talk about Ezra. He is not out to any good. So don't give them all that attention. If they don't eat you don't ask whether they have eaten or not because, why should you concentrate ...just leave them it will come out why they are not eating but don't go soothing them to eat. Si they said they are fasting? (Didn't they say they are fasting?)
Chorus: mmh.(yes)

Principle: Wachana na wao! (Leave them).

That is all about the students; eh let us keep our records updated. Let us keep our records updated and I am sure everything is going to move on well.

And...I don't know, madam Maina talked about the exam cats. If the time table would be ready this week it will be very good.

Ms Maina:(nods)

Principal: so we will move on until there is any other communication about visitors and so on. The inspectors could be here anytime. Last week they were in Embu, they would be in Kirinyaga this week.

So we talked about those boys in Form 3 one of the reasons that I was considering before admission is that those boys can perform, and that is one of the reasons why I gave them a chance. But if there is a case of indiscipline, among them, let us not wait, we report quite early so that eh...they can be dealt with.

Mr. Micah twende. (Mr.Micah let us go)

(Mr. Micah follows the principal).

APPENDIX IV: CONVERSATION 7, SCHOOL B

Continuation from when the researcher left)

Principal: we know the role we play as teachers. One, guiding them, 2, correcting them, 3, mentoring them, 4, reminding them, so we are still in charge and that's why I am telling Mr. Wambai here (points to the direction of the teacher).

Mr. Wambai: (nods)

Principal: We may talk so many things about discipline here, but we people know as per the TSC act we are not excess.

Mbutu (nods)

Principal: Like the T.O.D this week (One teacher leaves towards the door because there is someone standing there) and the other weeks to come. It is your responsibility to ensure there is order in school. Full stop. That one does not need a lot of explanations, the class teachers who are here know your roles professionally. The H.O. Ds who are here. So we are saying this, they said just like we normally say this Bwana (Mr.) Wahome. Social class

Wahome: yes

Principal: They do campaigns for the student council, isn't it?

Wahome: Yes...

Principal: we conduct elections democratically bwana John.

John: (nods)

Principal: But we vet! And we reserve the right (the teacher who had gone out comes back and whispers something to the principal) sasa mimi sitatoka tena (I will not go out again) (the teacher goes out to pass the message and comes back). So I was saying this, that eh all those things when they are coming up and down, we are the people who have the final say so that's why we vet them and that's why we even had to change people like kina muragusi and saraitani where they were placed last time and the students' body now cannot come and ask us why we put kina muragisi here. Just

like you saw JSC did its part. They have recommended the names; one for CJ the other one for deputy CJ. (Leans towards the teachers).

Our president has forwarded the names for the nominee for the position for? CJ should the parliament reject that name bwana wambai.

(Wambai nods) then the JSC will go back to the drawing board, isn't it? So what am I saying in this bwana mbocho? (Mr Mbocho?) In many words, the teachers, you and I, still have the control of the school. Me I will not listen to stories like ati ukuje uniambie (you come and tell me), my class secretary alikuwa anasema supposing yeye ndiye ndiye mkora mwenyewe (my class secretary was saying...supposing he is the crook himself?) you have seen me reprimanding some here! (Points outside) so we are not changing anything (points at a list that the deputy principal is holding). We are only trying to share what was aired and it's good because when I was talking about systems audit, madam Gachoki you are able to see how our school is, isn't it?

Madam Gachoki: (nods)

Principal: its better we are on the know than if we would have stayed on one side without knowing what was happening, okay! But we are saying this supervise your duties, supervise what you are supposed to, the other day I was making noise about the teachers giving notes to the students to copy. That's why you see me always going round, ata wale waliniangalia leo nilizunguka hivi na ata darasa yako niliingia ya form 4 (points at a teacher) nikaambiwa ulikuwa umepatiana kazi.

(Even you saw me today I went round like this and I even entered your class and was told you had left some work) but you were supervising an exam these (points towards the direction of the classrooms) so I can tell you the class that did not have a teacher was your class and I know where you were. So you can see every class I was aware. So we are saying this, we are not abdicating our responsibilities as teachers. Yeah that's all unless anyone has a question.

(Silence)

APPENDIX V: CONVERSATION 9, SCHOOL C

Principal: Good morning?

Teachers: Good morning

Principal: Good morning?

Teachers: Good morning.

Principal: There are a few things I would like us to talk about, one is about the joint evaluation, and we already have one that is going on. You remember the story of our CS, therefore because of joint evaluations, there is that issue (A teacher quickly gets in and sits) yesterday we were caught in a lengthy meeting so that we could look at the way forward, like Mr. Elias is asking, what happened, I want to give direction, one there is that issue that has come up, one of the policy of the ministry is that he eh.....we don't do... we do the end of year exam but they should be locally set and organized, so we will see what we can do, I think we will sit down as an academic committee and see the way forward.

Number 2, you've heard me mention about some of the challenges we are getting when parents refuse to accept the indiscipline and behaviour of their children. Yesterday, we had a very nasty case of a parent crying and shouting and screaming in the office because of the child! That's why today this morning, I chose to speak about the issue of these students and taking care of their parents and minding their parents as they must bear the consequences, you know there are those we send home because of the cases of theft, there are those that have cases of sneaking, we have those that have case of eh...fighting and therefore, remember we have often time have discussions with their parents on discipline issues and...

She started harassing madam Doris, Mr. Edward (points towards these teachers and they nod) actually she was saying Mrs. Doris is the one who suggested that the child should be sent away and this is a case of indiscipline, he was even asking Mrs. Doris why couldn't you keep quiet about it. You can see the kind of parents we are talking about we have a challenge with the nature of parents. That's why she feels that Mwalimu (the teacher) should have hidden the what? The issue, so that the boy doesn't face the wrath or the consequences. Even as we continue evaluating the

students in our class it is important that we remember we are dealing with that kind of a parent, who makes a small population of the nature of the parents in our school. It doesn't represent the entire parent nature in our school. So when the likes of mama Clifford come our way, one need to be a bit sober so that we deal with them, place them where they belong.

Even if they use very soft language let them be able to make their bed of roses and do what? And have the courage to sleep on them. The other area we have, we want to mention this morning is the end of term for the form 1 & 2 you remember we had already prepared the exams and there is a time-table, we...Mr. Fred there is a time table, isn't it?

Mr. Fred: (nods)

Principal: We had initially requested may be to push the exam up to may be on Thursday but I think we later agreed to let it remain as it is, the exams end on? The initial one was ending on?

Mr. Fred: on Wednesday 26th.

Principal: on Wednesday? Then let it remain as it is, that was the consensus point and make sure that we encourage our students to prepare for these exams, so that we are able to manage them up to the end of the term. We also talked about parties, end-of-year parties and I want to make this one very clear that this term there are no parties, no parties this term again in line with the ministry's requirements so those are the things I would like us to look at and if we do that we shall have saved ourselves a lot of trouble and...the other thing I wanted to mention about application for interviews of job group am sure you noted there was an extension of deadline, isn't it?

Some teachers: mmm (nod)

Principal: I'd encourage you it is good to apply, every time we must aspire to grow, you must aspire to grow, we move forward unless you are dead you cannot say you are not ambitious, everyone is ambitious, you are ambitious that one day you shall move on to the next level. You find you have a feeling you want to stagnate then. I am sorry you may be in the characteristics of the fellas I had just mentioned in the assembly, the walking dead. Please let's grow let's look for forums to grow because that makes you a better teacher and a professional. Actually I like telling myself that

one day I will become the president of this republic that's my inspiration and I think my dream is valid! Sawa sawa (isn't it?). So that is it and in case there will be other directions given will inform you. This morning we also have a friend and a visitor and we have allowed her to be with us in this sitting. We don't allow strangers where we are discussing our issues but will allow her with a reason and because she is a friend to Winfred, you can see she is sited next to Winfred, can Winfred stand and introduce the friend.

Ms. Winfred: Good morning?

Teachers: Good morning

Ms Winfred: Okey here we have madam Rose, she is my friend, right now she is carrying a research on politeness, how teacher interact in the staffroom and that's why she is here. I'd just request you to give her total cooperation and everything will be okey.

Principal: Thank you.

Nana: Okey, thank you

Principal: So you've heard, she is doing a project and one of her areas is politeness and I don't know how polite we are, so...madam

Rose: yes, sir

Principal: I hope whatever you write, shall not be put in the national T.V.

Rose: No it will not. I promise.

Principal: It is for the purpose of?

Rose: research

Principal: Research, give her the cooperation. If you are not polite, don't tell her you are tell her you are not polite

Teachers (laughter)

Principals: she will take you through that process. Otherwise Karibu (Welcome) and, we hope it will be of help, Thank you karibu! (Welcome)

APPENDIX VI: CONVERSATION 17, SCHOOL A

Principal: Good afternoon? Mmemaliza? (Teachers had been taking tea)

All: mmh

Principal: we are on the 3rd week and I understand that there is a block time-table for the form 4. Isn't it? We have about 1 ½ months.

Mr. Onyango...where is Mr. Onyango? They are starting when? We agreed that a time table just for what they are doing so that we can give them just a copy to put in class.

Mr. Wambugu. They have.

Principal: oh they have? Ok. We had selected some people just to give us an idea; I don't know what they came up with. They should tell us. Ah...we have some new students. They should be about 3 in form 3 and we can't say that they are well behaved.

It's those people. Ni watu wale... (Shakes his head) just in case we see that they are not reforming, we have agreed we can release them and there is nowhere the parent can go because they know.

(Some teachers nod)

Principal: we were in Nakuru and one of the things that were so much emphasized is to have a good idea about the new code of regulations. There are so many things that have been changed and I think we have copies, even here we have copies. Hallo...

Ms Maina: No!

Principal: sikupatiana? Meaning I didn't give them out?

Ms Maina: I only have one that I borrowed from your office.

Principal: There are so many things we need to know including discipline, filling of appraisals, whatever, those kinds of things. It's good that we go through it and have an idea about the whole thing. There are some few things about discipline and so on. Mr.

Macharia: What about retirement? (Laughter) colleagues

Principal: I have not read the whole of it what does it say?

Mr. Macharia: how much you qualify.

Principal: just like leaves. There are so many kinds of leaves and so on and so forth. I have three copies and when you get it please don't go home with it. Read it here because when it goes, it may be difficult to find it again. We also need to know about adolescents, what they think about authority.

Each one of us is supposed to be a counselor. We are supposed to understand them, assist them instead of condemning them.

Thank you for keeping the school going while I was away. It is quite good. We have a very short term so Madam Maina and those others who are in charge of that direction let us keep reminding everybody about those C.A.Ts we talked about. There was supposed to be election of prefects, I mean secretaries. We were reminded to completely stop calling them presidents at all at all in school and there was a long explanation. Madam Iriya?

Madam Iriya: yes...

Principal: Nobody should get into form 4 class; your boys except the one we talked about: Brian na huyo mwingine? (Brian and the other one) I saw Brian he is in here. (Phone rings and the owner disconnects)

We are supposed to contact Alex. It was your responsibility and I don't know who is supposed to take the responsibility to contact Ann. (silence).

Those are the few people who are supposed to be there today. Some were pleading with me next week nikawaambia ah ah. (I told them no).(Another phone rings and it's disconnected)

Then we were talking with Mr. Wambugu about improving this lunch. We saw we can have some sweet potatoes...Irish potatoes and meat 3 to 4 pieces and we were doing a small budget tukaona... (We found out...)What was it coming to? Per day?

Mr. Wambugu: About 20 shs.

Principal: I think it was 100kshs per week so that we can have meat 3 times and 2 times we have some sweet potatoes.(Laughter)

Ei! If it is fried well, some cabbages are added, that was just a suggestion. Mnaona namna gani? (What do you think?)

Ms Maina (puts up a hand): I thought, this githeri if it is fried well, even without any additions, it is okay.

Principal: What about others? Simuonjee, tuongee (let's talk) actually I went somewhere and saw githeri which had some sweet potatoes. (Laughter)

Principal: on my!

Mr. Mutua: You know, you can also use sweet potatoes to fry githeri. By the way they are used for mashing.

Principal: Well...we leave that one to be discussed. Actually the most important meal of the day is breakfast and lunch. For supper if you take ugali then go to bed you are doing a lot of damage to your body from a nutrition point of view and those of us who are 40 to 45, Mr. Nyamu you there?

Nyamu: yeah I am there. I only take water for supper. (Laughter)

Principal: That is why we were trying to suggest something like that. Then let us be keen with the form 4s at this time because some of them at time...That office of Madam John, please be locking when you leave. Mr. Onyango, Mr. Mutua, hiyo ofisi yenu (your office). Mr. Onyango nataka tuonane (I would like to see you). Mr. Mutua because on Sunday you are on duty, after the service students are supposed to go to class at around 11.00am. Let them go to class, take lunch at around 1.00pm then 2.00pm go to class again.

Then when you are on duty it is mandatory to do registration on Sunday and Saturday because there are students who leave home and lie to the parents that they are going to school but they don't!

Mr. Mutua I don't know if there is any student in form 3 who has not brought their birth certificate.

Mr. Mutua: I told the class teachers.

Principal: Mr. Nyamu is here, please check, check, check so that I can send these fellows home.

Madam John okay?

Madam John: (nods)

Mr. Wambugu: They have.

Principal: oh they have?

APPENDIX VII: CONVERSATION 18, SCHOOL B

Mnahome: *Ni ui gaathire US maguno gaka?(do you know he went on foot to US?)*

Mboko: *gaathire maguru maheni (he went on foot?that's a lie) (Laughter)*

Patrick: *Gaathire maguru Ati gatingiahotire kurihandege. Gaathire magurukinya Egypt.(he trekked he could afford an air ticket)*
(Listening to the speech on TV). (Lady comes in)

Jennifer: *haija food bado haijakuja?(oh, food hasn't been brought?)*

Maranga: *food ndiyo hiyo hapo.(food is right there)*

Mr. John: *guku nogathungu turathomithia Wambua.(we are just teaching English here wambua)*

Wambua: *ooh*

Mr. John: *kai ari ngunja gutu.(is it nguja gutu?)*
(Laughter)

Patrick: *(Moves closer to the T.v)Gathiire maguru through Nilegathiaga kuoya meli.(we trekked through Nile ,he was going to get into a ship)*

Mr. John: *Egypt ni mathira?(Is Egypt mathira county?)(Laughter)*

Patrick: *it is known*

Mr. Mbusho: *athiaga US guthoma? (Was he going to the US to study?)*

Patrick: *Athiaga na scholarship. (He was going on scholarship)*

Mr. John: *Scholarship sitionago uuguo(it wasn't easy to obtain a scholarship)*

(Teachers speaking at once.)

Maranga: *tatigai tuigwe (let us listen)*

Mboko: *gatiarie uhoro wa mburu(he should speak about Mburu)*

Mr. John: *gatige kwigatha(and stop praising himself)*

(Patrick moves closer to the T.v).

Eunice : *Tigai kunegenna uria*(stop making noise for the sake of whoever)

Mboko: *uuu?* (who?)

Mr. John: *Patrick*

(Eunice laughs)

Mr. John: *Patrick ngune earphone* (Patrick, May I lend you earphones?)

Patrick: (laughing) *iima*(yes, sure)

Mboko: *ingira T.v inni*(get inside the TV)

Mr. John: *utonga wake ndethiro akurite tawe*(he didn't get wealthy at an advanced age like you)

(laughter)

Mboko: *Badilisheni channel tuone news, weka citizen. Iyo niinoro.* (change channel, let us watch news,is that inooro station?)

Lady: *apana wacha tu tusikie hii.* (no,let us just follow this one)

APPENDIX VIII: CONVERSATION 4, SCHOOL C

Mr. John: Habari zenu (How are you?) (Shakes hands with two ladies who are in a deep conversation).

Ladies: Mzuri (fine)

Mr. John (to one lady) I like the colour of your earrings.

Mrs. Grace: (touches them) Thanks.

Mr. John: Give me a pen, a blue one (gets the pen and leaves, returns after few and says thank you).

Mr. John: Mrs. Mary?

Mrs. Mary: yes.

Mr. John: Why have you dismantled the phone? Kuna line kando, kifuniko kando, battery (The sim card, lid and battery are separate).

Mrs. Mary: Ni ya Alice, ebu iii...ni vile tumeshindwa kui-connect, (it belongs to Alice. Can you...it's just that we have been unable to connect it).

Mr. John: Kui connect? (to connect?)

Madam Gakii: Kui connect ama kuirudisha; assembling (to connect or assemble the parts).

Mrs. Mary: Kuna kitu haingii.

(There is a part that is not fitting)

Mr. John: Kitu haingii? (Something not fitting?)

Mrs. Mary: Ni ya Alice, alemwa ni kugonnect (its Alice she was unable to connect).

Mr. John (mimicking her accent):

Name waremwa, mwakinyio hau nikuremwa (and you were also unable).

(laughter).

Mr. John: assists in assembling the parts).

Mrs. Mary: hey! Thank you.

**APPENDIX IX: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FROM GRADUATE
SCHOOL KENYATTA UNIVERSITY**



**KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL**

E-mail: dean-graduate@ku.ac.ke

Website: www.ku.ac.ke

P.O. Box 43844, 00100
NAIROBI, KENYA
Tel. 8710901 Ext. 57530

Our Ref: C50/CE/21232/2012

DATE: 9th May, 2017

Director General,
National Commission for Science, Technology
and Innovation
P.O. Box 30623-00100
NAIROBI

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FOR WAMBUGU ROSE WAITHIRA – REG. NO
C50/CE/21232/2012

I write to introduce Ms. Rose Waithira Wambugu who is a Postgraduate Student of this University. She is registered for MA degree programme in the Department of English and Linguistics.

Ms. Rose intends to conduct research for MA Project Proposal entitled, "The use of politeness strategies in school staffrooms: The Case of Kirinyaga County".

Any assistance given will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Lucy N. MBAABU'.

MRS. LUCY N. MBAABU
FOR: DEAN, GRADUATE SCHOOL

APPENDIX X: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION FROM NACOSTI



NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Telephone: +254-20-2213471,
2241349, 3310571, 2219420
Fax: +254-20-318245, 318249
Email: dg@nacosti.go.ke
Website: www.nacosti.go.ke
When replying please quote

9th Floor, Utalii House
Uhuru Highway
P.O. Box 30623-00100
NAIROBI-KENYA

Ref. No. **NACOSTI/P/17/31605/17582**

Date: **19th June, 2017**

Rose Waithira Wambugu
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on "*The use of politeness strategies in school staffrooms the case of Kirinyaga County,*" I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in **Kirinyaga County** for the period ending **19th June, 2018.**

You are advised to report to **the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Kirinyaga County** before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit **two hard copies and one soft copy in pdf** of the research report/thesis to our office.

**GODFREY P. KALERWA MSc., MBA, MKIM
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO**

Copy to:

The County Commissioners
Kirinyaga County.

The County Directors of Education
Kirinyaga County.

APPENDIX XI: RESEARCH PERMIT

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT:
MISS. ROSE WAITHIRA WAMBUGU
of KENYATTA UNIVERSITY, 193-10230
SAGANA, has been permitted to conduct
research in Kirinyaga County

Permit No : NACOSTI/P/17/31605/17582
Date Of Issue : 19th June,2017
Fee Received :Ksh 1000

on the topic: THE USE OF POLITENESS
STRATEGIES IN SCHOOL STAFFROOMS
THE CASE OF KIRINYAGA COUNTY

for the period ending:
19th June,2018


.....
Applicant's
Signature


.....
Director General
National Commission for Science,
Technology & Innovation

CONDITIONS

- 1. You must report to the County Commissioner and the County Education Officer of the area before embarking on your research. Failure to do that may lead to the cancellation of your permit.**
- 2. Government Officer will not be interviewed without prior appointment.**
- 3. No questionnaire will be used unless it has been approved.**
- 4. Excavation, filming and collection of biological specimens are subject to further permission from the relevant Government Ministries.**
- 5. You are required to submit at least two(2) hard copies and one (1) soft copy of your final report.**
- 6. The Government of Kenya reserves the right to modify the conditions of this permit including its cancellation without notice.**



REPUBLIC OF KENYA



**National Commission for Science,
Technology and Innovation**

**RESEARCH CLEARANCE
PERMIT**

Serial No.A 14464

CONDITIONS: see back page