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**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this Discourse Analysis study was to explain the nature and function of Kikamba language interjections in discourse. Kikamba is a Bantu language and the Kimasaku dialect of the language was the focus of this research study. This survey study used three theories in explaining the nature and function of interjections in Kimasaku dialect of Kikamba language discourses. The Functional Theory of Interjection (Ameka, 1992), the Speech Acts Theory (Austin 1962) and Brinton’s (1996) Taxonomy of Discourse Markers were the theories used. Data was collected and analysed using Qualitative research methods. The study used a combination of two research instruments namely; questionnaires and a content analysis guide. These two tools helped in the identification of interjections for analysis from a book-Kikamba Self/Instruction Manual and a questionnaire. Ten respondents sampled out throw social network participated in the filling of the questionnaires. There was also a key informant, purposively sampled to assist in the research. There were seven mini dialogues sampled from the book above, for analysis using the content analysis guide. One of the objectives was to describe the various structural forms of the interjections. Findings revealed that structurally, interjections are in the forms of sound, word, phrase, clausal and sentential structure levels. The second objective was to find out the role played by interjections in Kikamba language discourse and the contextual conditions defining their functions in the discourses. The findings revealed that interjections play important roles in discourse such as discourse marking and acting as speech acts. It was concluded that the role that an interjection played in discourse was determined by the context of the interjection use/ appearance. Finally, categories of discourse markers as well as the types of speech acts constituted by the interjections in Kikamba language discourses were compiled. Findings revealed a variety of discourse marker functions performed by the interjections such as; showing subjectivity by expressing a reaction to the preceding discourse/action and turn taking among others. Some interjections served as information carrying units and concluded to be speech acts. Assertive and directive SAs were some of the speech acts functions performed by the interjections. The results of this study demonstrated that interjections are key expressions that serve important functions in conversations by transmitting information and structuring discourse. Thus language users and speech writers ought to be enlightened on the importance of interjections in language use. Curriculum developers in the Language Subjects need to provide fleshy information concerning interjections just the same way other word classes have adequate details. This is because a lot of information details about the structural and functional aspects of this important word class across different languages.
# ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM/DMs</td>
<td>Discourse Marker/Discourse Markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>Functional Theory of Interjections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA/SAs</td>
<td>Speech Act/ Speech Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Speech Acts Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Communication Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSIM</td>
<td>Kikamba Self-Instruction Manual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Dialect** - A regionally or socially distinctive variety of a language usually associated with a distinctive pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. The Kĩmasaku dialect is one of the dialects of Kĩkamba language.

**Discourse** - Language used in different social contexts for the purpose of communication; for example a conversation between friends.

**Discourse Markers** - These are elements that structure or organize conversations and contribute to meaningful transfer of information. They include okay, yes among others.

**Interjections** – It is a word class, mainly used in expressing of emotions. They may also transfer meaningful information and organize discourse. For example, ugh, wow, phew among other

**Primary interjections** – these are words used to express emotions and can stand alone as an utterance. They include sh, pss, uh.

**Secondary interjections** – they are semantically independent words from other word classes, but are often exclamatory in nature. They may include swear words, exclamations or greeting formulae among others.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the following: the background to the study, the problem statement, research objectives, research questions, and research assumptions, significance of the study and the scope and limitations of the study.

1.1 Background to the Study

Kīkamba language is a Bantu language spoken mainly by the Akamba people found in mainly four counties in Kenya: Makueni, Kitui, Machakos and Kwale. There are also some Kamba groups in some parts of Tanzania (Kieti, 1988).

The Akamba are about 3,893,157 and form a 10.08% of the total Kenyan population according to Population and Housing census, which was in 2009. The Akamba are the fifth most populous tribe in Kenya after the Gikuyu (6,622,576), the Luhyia (5,388,666), the Kalenjin (4,967,328) and the Luo (4,044,440).

In Guthrie’s (1967) classification of languages, Kīkamba is in zone E55. It is part of Central Kenya group, which has two main groups: the Kamba -Kikuyu group and Meru-Tharaka. The Kamba - Gikuyu group includes Kamba, Embu, Gikuyu, and Chuka. There is no agreement on the number of dialects that exist in Kīkamba language. Mathooko (2004) gives six dialects of Kīkamba as Kimumoni, Kingulya, Kikilungu, North Kitui, South Kitui and Kīmasaku. Kaviti (2004) cites Mwove (1987) who identifies the two main Kīkamba dialects, which are further divided into sub-dialects. The first is the Kitui dialect (Ki-kitui) which consists of Kitui North sub-dialect and
Central/Eastern/ Southern Kitui sub-dialects. The second main dialect is the Machakos dialect (Kī-masaku) which has the Kilungu/Makueni and the standard Machakos variety sub-dialects. Mutiga (2002) states that the Kīmasaku dialect is treated as standard Kikamba and is normally the one taught in the lower primary schools in Ukambani and to non-native speakers learning the language. This dialect is spoken with variation in the whole of Machakos and Makueni Counties. She further states that it is also the variety used in Kikamba broadcasts and in print such as in literature, grammar books and the bible.

The interjection word class is considered a minor word class in English language. Ameka (1992) points out that interjection as a word class has eluded description. He also cites that Quirk et al (1985) discussed interjection as a word class located at the periphery of grammatical system and that it represents a phenomenon of minor importance within the word class system. He further notes that it is not clear whether the interjection is an open or closed word class. The researcher observed that this marginal aspect is also replicated in the Kenyan English curriculum in both primary and secondary levels of study, where scanty details about interjections are given.

Blakemore (2002) stated that languages have universals, and interjections are assumed common in most if not all languages and are language specific. For this reason, the researcher concludes that Kikamba language has interjections as one of its word classes and appears in both spoken and written discourses. The study focuses on two main aspects of the interjections; the structural
forms and the variety of functions, which an interjection can perform in discourse. The language under study is thus Kikamba, and the specific dialect chosen is the Kimasaku dialect. Therefore, the study focuses on the structure and function of interjections in Kikamba language discourses, specifically in Kimasaku dialect. Below is the introduction of the concept of interjections.

1.1.1 Interjections

The descriptive grammarians treated interjections as marginal elements and considered less important in communication contexts. Grammarians such as Huddleston and Pullum (2002) defined interjections as a category of words that do not enter into syntactic constructions with other words and have expressive rather than propositional meaning. McAuthur (1992) cited in Nina (2006) defined interjections as marginal items functioning alone and not as conventional elements of sentence structure.

However, Wharton (2003) and Nina (2006) sought to add meaningful significance to interjections other than the proposed expressive aspect mentioned above. In addition to the emotive aspect of the interjections, Wharton (2003) observes that interjections show the state of mind of a speaker and enhance the understanding of utterances that follow them. Nina (2006) found out that interjections could contribute to transfer of meaningful information in a conversation in English, Russian and Japanese language. She identified interjections as discourse markers and speech acts. Other linguistic studies involving interjections tend to study interjections as discourse markers (henceforth DM/s). Below is a brief discussion on discourse markers.
1.1.2 Discourse Markers

Discourse markers also called pragmatic markers, discourse particles among other terms by different scholars. According to Schifrin (1987), discourse markers (henceforth DMs) are sequentially dependent elements, which bracket units of talk. She focuses on the way DMs operate to create coherence in discourse. Ameka (1992) citing Fraser (1990) explains that the category of DMs is a functional category, and explains that the grouping of DMs is based on their indication of the way a speaker intends a subsequent discourse fragment to be related to the previous unit.

Brinton (1996) uses the term discourse particles and gives a description of some of the DM function that an interjection can perform. They include: to initiate discourse, to help the speaker acquire or relinquish the floor, act as a filler, to mark discourse boundary, to denote new or old information, to marks sequential dependence, to repair own or other’s discourse, show subjectivity in discourse, indicate interpersonal relations and lastly, to express deference or agreement on something. According to Nina (2006), when an interjection structures or organizes conversations, it is at that point a DM. The study pursued this proposal by Nina (2006); in its endeavour to bring out the functions Kikamba interjections play in discourse. Nina (2006) also observes that when an interjection serves the informative function of language, it is an information-transmitting unit, thus a speech act (henceforth SA/s). Below is a brief section on speech acts
1.1.3 Speech Acts

There are direct and indirect SAs according to Austin, J (1962). The direct SA refers to a communicative activity (locution), defined in terms of illocution (intentions of the speaker) and perlocution (effect the utterance had on the listener). An indirect SA is one in which the speaker performs one illocutionary act but intends the listener to infer by way of relying on their mutually shared background information which could be linguistic and non-linguistic. Ameka (1992) observed that interjections are forms of mental acts for they appear in situations of immediate responses. This notion of interjections used as SAs is presented in this study and below is a relevant example picked from the questionnaire:

(Speaker A and B are in the kitchen, speaker B stretches his hands forward to take a cooking pan which is on the fireplace, off the fire. Speaker A shouts at speaker B)

\[
\text{Eka! nūvya nī kīkaangi kū. Stop! You will burn by cooking pan that 'Stop! You will get burnt by that cooking pan'}
\]

The above Kikamba word ‘eka’ means ‘stop’ in English language. It is a secondary interjection and thus translated from Kikamba to English. In a situation where the speaker shouts this interjection (like in the above scenario), it indicates a discontinuation of an action, in addition to expressing strong negative feelings of warning. It is for this case, it can be said to be a direct SA for it is an utterance (locution), uttered by a speaker A with the intention of ‘stopping’ (illocution) speaker B from handling the hot cooking pan. Speaker B
will likely stretch back his hands and thus not handle the hot pan (perlocution), for he has to heed to the warning given out strongly by the interjection uttered by speaker A.

Ameka (1992) recommends for more empirical research on interjections in different languages. There is death of studies on interjection in African languages in general and Bantu languages in particular. A descriptive study on interjections in Kikamba language showing the various structural forms, functional classifications and discourse functions is lacking. For this reason, the study filled this gap by using data to demonstrate the various forms, classifications and functions of interjections that can be found in Kikamba discourses.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Discourses in Kikamba language contain instances of interjections, back channelling expressions and speech fillers. Interjections being one of the word classes yet largely unexplored in most African languages places this significant word class in a marginal position. The DMs have overtly been perceived and studied as speech fillers, non-words, and not a word class that has semantically loaded items that could contribute to significant meaning transfer such as nouns and verbs. This marginal treatment of interjections has resulted in few systemic analyses on interjections in different languages among them Kikamba language found in Kenya. Interjections in Kikamba language have not been studied to the best knowledge of the present researcher and literature reviewed.
The structural form and a description of the functions of interjections use in the Kímasaku dialect of Kikamba language remained unexplored.

1.3 Research Objectives

The objectives of the study were:

1. To describe the structural form of interjections used in Kikamba language discourses.

2. To analyse the contextual functions of interjections in Kikamba discourses

3. To analyse the categories of discourse markers as well as the types of speech acts constituted by the interjections in Kikamba

1.4 Research Questions

The research questions were:

1. What is the structural form of interjections in Kìkamba language discourses?

2. What functions do interjections perform in Kìkamba language discourses and what contextual conditions define their functions?

3. What categories of discourse markers (DMs) and speech acts (SAs) do the interjections in Kìkamba discourses constitute?
1.5 Justification and Significance of the Study

Interjections are language specific (Aijmer, 2004) and this attribute means that analysis of interjections in different languages needs to be done. The study aimed at giving linguistically significant information about the nature of interjections in Kikamba language such as their structure and function at discourse level. Since interjections are common in all languages, a descriptive study on their form and function in Kikamba is likely to prompt related studies involving other African languages, as well as giving additional linguistic information on interjections as linguistic units. This linguistic information on interjections in this study could be of great use in various social contexts of language use such as in natural conversations and in the Kikamba media forums such as in radio programs. The study could also offer a fertile ground to demonstrate the importance of this word class, especially in our Kenyan English Subject curriculum at both primary and secondary schools levels. This word class has scanty details compared to other word classes such as nouns and verbs.

1.6 Scope and limitations of the Study

There are many dialects in Kikamba language. The study looks at interjection use among speakers of Kīmasaku dialect of Kikamba, thus the other dialects fall outside the scope of this study; and only mentioned to the extent that they further the understanding of Kīmasaku dialect. This is because the researcher is a native speaker of the dialect and therefore in a position to understand and
discuss the happenings within the dialect. Only the interjections presumed by
the researcher as belonging to the Kimasaku dialect were discussed.

There are numerous models and approaches in the study of interjections such
as the semanticists and descriptive grammarian approaches. These approaches
largely ignore the functional aspects of interjections discourse. This study gives
a detailed approach of this functional aspect of interjections as linguistic items
in Kikamba language. In order to achieve this, the following theories of
research were used: The Functional Theory of interjections, the Speech Acts
Theory and the Brinton’s taxonomy of discourse markers. There are many
expressions, which may be considered as interjections but this study focused
only on the interjections captured in the data collected. The study focused on
the synchronic state of the interjections as they were and their contexts of use.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0 Introduction
This section provides a critical review of literature based on the objectives of the study. Afterwards the theoretical framework central to this study is discussed.

2.1 Review of Literature
This section presents the review thematically as follows: definition of interjections together with the various approaches in studying interjections, definitions/classification of interjections adopted in the study, structural forms of interjections and previous discourse studies on interjections.

2.1.1 Definition of Interjections
Just like most word classes, interjections have proven difficult to define and classify and, thus, a disagreement about whether or not some words belong to this interjection word class. Wharton (2000) argues that there is no general agreement on the definition of interjections. He defines an interjection using two parameters. First, an interjection is an utterance capable of constituting itself in a unique, non-elliptical manner. Secondly, an interjection is an utterance that expresses a mental or emotional attitude or state.

Poggi (2009) defines an interjection as a codified signal that is perceivable and linked in a stable way in the minds of the speakers of a language, and has both propositional content and a performative aspect of a language. This
classification by Poggi (2009) recognizes interjections as meaningful elements of a language as well as constituting of speech acts. She however excludes onomatopoeias from the class of interjections. Poggi’s definition of interjections was useful in this study since the interjections analysed had a propositional content and others had the performative aspect of SAs. The study did not consider onomatopoeic words as belonging to the class of interjections just as Poggi suggested.

The heterogeneous nature of interjections as observed by Cuenca (2002) and Cruz (2009) make it complicated to generalize on interjections. Further, Cruz (2009) studied the theoretical approach in interjections and observed that interjections do not have a constant meaning, but are multifunctional in nature. This informed the study in that, the researcher sought to find the specific nature and discourse functions of interjections in Kikamba language. Aijmer (2004) also observes that the culture specificity attribute of interjections render interjections idiosyncratic in nature. This means that it is hard to find out the exact equivalents in other target languages when translating interjections. This study adopts Aijmer’s (2004) approach concerning the translation of Kikamba interjections to the target language (English) except on grounds where a secondary interjection is used. This is because secondary interjections have independent meaning attached to each one of them and therefore easily translated.
Another approach related to this study is the semanticists approach to interjections. Some linguists such as Tim Wharton (2002) also refer to this approach as the conceptualist viewpoint. Nina (2006) observes that this approach views interjections as a separate word class with features and functions of its own. However, among the semanticists, there is no agreed definition and classification of what interjections are. Introducing this viewpoint, Wierzbicka, (2003) describes an interjection as a linguistic sign having the some properties. These properties are; can be used on its own, can express a specific meaning, a linguistic sign which is not homophonous with another lexical item that would be perceived as semantically related to the interjection, and a sign which refers to the speakers current mental state or mental act, for instance; ‘I feel…..’, ‘I want…..’, ‘I know…..’.

Wierzbicka’s definition above, explicitly states that interjections have specific meaning (propositional meaning), contrary to the descriptive approach to interjections by linguists such as Huddleston and Pullum (2002), who state that interjections are vaguely expressive in nature and do not have a propositional meaning.

Wierzbicka further introduces three classes of interjections namely: emotion, volitive and cognitive interjections. Wierzbicka uses ‘emotive’ to refer to those interjections which have the component ‘I feel something’ in their meaning, for instance ‘oops’. Volitive interjections are those which have in their meaning the component ‘I want something’, and which lack the component ‘I feel something’, like the interjection, ‘hey’. Lastly, there are
the cognitive interjections which have in their meaning the component ‘I think/ know something and which have neither the emotive component ‘ I feel something’, nor the volitive ‘I want something’ such as ‘oh-oh’. Wierzbicka however, admits possibility of other classification.

Nina (2006) observes that Wierzbicka’s classification of interjections may bring some challenges if universally applied because an interjection may have two conflicting meanings and the criteria for distinguishing one category from another are not explicitly defined; an example is the divergent use of the interjection ‘oops’. Moreover, some interjections do not belong to any of the classifications he offered; such include ‘okay’ and ‘well’. These two interjections in their discourse marker functions may be used for summarizing the on-going situation may not be included in any of the classifications without posing some controversy. The semanticists approach by Wierzbicka (2003) enrich this study to a large extend since the classifications of interjections provided are closely related to Ameka (1992) functional classification of interjections (Expressive, Conative and Phatic) used in this study. Both studies focused on the English language and are based on the semanticists approach. They helped in guiding the researcher in classifying interjections in Kikamba language.

A number of scholars studying spoken interjections point out that interjection are context-dependent. These scholars argue that interjections ought to be interpreted within their context of use. Norrick (2009) observes that the participants in the “concrete context” of speech normally understand
interjections. Cuenca (2000) adopts a prototype approach to categories, in which interjections are considered a context-sensitive peripheral class that typically encode pragmatic meaning.

Aijmer (2004) also observed that interjections do not have a constant meaning but are multifunctional and their meaning depends on the context where they are produced. These studies on contextual analysis of interjections informed this study since the Kĩkamba interjections analysed based on the context of use. Having reviewed the various definitions and categories of interjections offered by different scholars, the following is the specific definition of interjection adopted in the study.

2.1.2 Definition and Classification of Interjection Adopted in the Study

Ameka (1992) provides a critique on the various definitions by different scholars on what really should be termed as an interjection and what is not. This study adopted the criteria used by Leech et al (1982). According to Leech interjections include what he calls true interjection (primary interjections which are used only as interjection), and formulae/formulaic expressions.

This definition by Leech (1982) cited in Ameka’s work puts into consideration various aspects related to what an interjection should be and thus applicable in this study. He defined primary interjections as words or non-words that have the following characteristics:

a) Can constitute an utterance by themselves,

b) Do not enter into syntactic construction with other word classes
c) Could be used as co-utterances with other units, and finally
d) Sometimes interjections are phonologically and morphologically anomalous. This means that there are instances when an interjection may consist of sounds that do not exist in that particular language system). An example of primary interjection in English language is ‘ouch’.

About formulae/formulaic expressions, also called routines, Wilkins (1992) also cited in Ameka (1992) defines a formulae as a social deictic element showing the social relationship between a speaker and an addressee. Routines include expressions of greetings, farewell or even apologies. They include; hi, hello for greetings, goodbye for farewell, and sorry for an apology among others. Ameka (1992) thus states that interjections are a type of routines since they are tied to specific situations and pragmatically, they are usually a reaction to an element in the linguistic context of speech. He also adds that routines are usually acts (SA) and this makes it appropriate to include routines into the working definition adopted in this study since interjections were analysed as SAs at one point.

In addition to the definition by Leech, the researcher included what Ameka called interjectional phrases (secondary interjections) and exclamatory expressions to the working definition used adopted. Ameka (1992) defines secondary interjections as words or expressions having an independent semantic value attached to them but conventionally can express a mental state/attitude and thus a mental act. He gave various forms such as
alarm/attention getters as fire! Watch out! , swear/taboo words such as damn! Hell! Heavens! Christ! and other emotively used words such as shame! and bother! .About the exclamatory expressions, Ameka argued that those utterances and expressions that have the characteristics of an interjections and are in the form of a clause/sentence be analysed as interjections. This is because all interjections are exclamations but not all exclamations are interjections. Concerning punctuation of interjections, they are usually followed by a pause such as a comma, exclamation mark or a question depending on the intensity of emotions being portrayed. This applies in both written and spoken discourse.

2.1.3 Forms of Interjections

Interjections have a structure or form just like the other word classes. Some linguists have structurally classified interjections as simple and composite. Simple interjections being those having the structure of a separate word, while the composite being those formed by combining several words. The structural classification of interjections proposed by Ameka (1992) together with the components of the working definition employed in the study, were used in analysing and classifying interjections in this study.

The classification by Ameka (1992) is a common one and has been embraced by a number of scholars among them Poggi (2009) for it is elaborate and well defined. This classification structurally identifies the primary and secondary types of interjections. As previously noted in the working definition of this
study, the interjections analysed in the study consisted of the following; primary interjections (true interjections), secondary interjections (interjectional phrases), formulaic expressions and some exclamatory expressions as identified by Ameka (1992). From these categories by Ameka (1992) and Leech et al (1982), the researcher reached at the following conclusion; that structurally, interjections exist at:

a) Sound level (the true primary interjections in form of non-word by Leech),

b) Word level interjections mainly in single-word form (they include; single-word true primary interjections, single-word secondary interjections and single-word formulaic expressions)

c) Phrase level interjections such as Ameka’s interjectional phrases (secondary interjections and formulaic expressions consisting of a group of words with a headword)

d) Clause level interjections (some exclamatory expressions and some formulaic expressions with the structure of a ‘subject + a verb’)

e) Sentence level interjections (some exclamatory expressions and some formulaic expressions with the structure of ‘subject +verb +object’)

Some of the primary and secondary interjections in English language, at these various levels include; at the sound level there are interjections such as pss..., shh..., brr, phew; word level interjections like what!, alas, Jesus! Stop!; phrase level such as oh my, oh no!, my God!; Clausal interjections such as you stop! Lastly interjections in form of sentences such as, why in God's name! among
others. This therefore means that each of the interjections analysed in this study was of great importance in making the meaning of a discourse effective, regardless of their structure level.

2.1.4 Studies on Interjections: A Discourse Analysis Perspective

Linguistic studies carried out on other languages have attributed considerable importance to interjections. However, detailed analyses of these forms have remained rather peripheral especially among African languages. Studies on interjections use in discourse are limited and are mainly on English as the focus language, with a few in other western languages mainly Russian, Japanese, Turkish and Chinese. This study on Kikamba, which is an African language, has given an analysis of common interjections and their use in Kikamba discourses.

Other African language studies focusing on interjections include Mugure (2016) who studied the role of procedural meaning in the understanding of utterances in Gikuyu language, based on the interjections and idiophones in Gikuyu language. The study explains how Gikuyu interjections and idiophones contribute to linguistic communication due to their procedural nature. The above study enriched this study since both studies are for the idea that interjections are expressions that enhance communication.

Dagdeviren (2003) examines natural data in Turkish language to find out the different pragmatic functions the same interjection fulfils in different
contexts. Aijmer (2004) studied interjections in English language, and their cross-linguistic peculiarities, and brings out the variety of pragmatic functions performed by interjections. This means that interjection have a possible pragmatic aspect, which is worth studying in different languages. Nina (2006) contrasts the discourse functions of phatic interjections in English, Russian and Japanese languages. This study by Nina was very crucial in this study for it inspired the researcher to unravel the various discourse functions of Kikamba interjections.

2.2 Theoretical Framework
This section reviews the theories and approaches to interjections that the study pursued. The three theories are: The Functional Theory of Interjections (FTI), the Speech Acts Theory (SAT) and the Brinton’s taxonomy of discourse markers.

2.2.1 The Functional Theory of Interjections
Ameka (1992) put the functional approach to interjections forward. According to Ameka (1992) also cited by Nina (2006), the functional approach to interjections is an integrated approach which borrows across a number of fields such as the descriptive grammar, semantics and sociolinguistics. This approach focuses on the semantic and structural features of interjections, and the specific functions performed by interjections in discourse. The approach also focuses on the conditions, which make it possible for an interjection to perform a specific function in discourse. Ameka (1992) concurs with most scholars that interjections do not take derivations or inflections and that their phonological
shape is often anomalous. Ameka distinguishes between primary and secondary interjections (structural aspect).

He describes primary interjections as words or non-words, which can stand alone as an utterance and do not enter into construction with other word classes. They could be used as co-utterances with other units and at this capacity, they relate to connectors, which occur with other utterances, thus the discourse marking function of interjections. However, connectors do not stand alone as utterances unless they are elliptically used but interjections can stand in isolation. The example below generated by the researcher best illustrates this;

\[
\text{Ooo, Nina ilinda yingi}
\]
\[
\text{Ooo, I have dress another}
\]
\[
\text{‘Ooo, I have another dress’}
\]

The Kĩkamba interjection ‘Ooo’, which is said usually prolonged and said with a fall-rise intonation can stand in isolation without the utterance sounding incomplete; unlike in a situation where the interjection is replaced by a connector ‘and’ as in the case below.

\[
\text{Na nĩna ilinda yingi}
\]
\[
\text{And I have dress another}
\]
\[
\text{‘And I have another dress’}
\]

In the above example, the connector ‘na’ (and) cannot stand in isolation for it appears to be asking for more information to complete its meaning. Primary interjections are sometimes anomalous both phonologically and morphologically. They consist of sounds and sound sequences that may not be
found in other parts of language. For example, in Kikamba language, *xixixi*.... is a form of interjection used by humans when calling for attention from animals such as goats. The Kikamba language does not contain the voiceless dorso-velar fricative ‘x’. Some of the examples of primary interjections in English language include hey, oh, oops, wow, ah, ugh, yuck, whew among others.

Ameka (1992) cited by Nina (2006) defined secondary interjections as a category of interjections belonging to other word classes in terms of their semantics and are only interjections because they can occur by themselves non-elliptically as one-word utterances. They are words having an independent semantic value but which a speaker, who wishes to express a mental state or attitude, can use as an utterance. For example *ĩka*! /eka/ to mean ‘stop!’ Words such as *damn, Christ, shit, dear, hell* among others, become secondary interjections when used as non-elliptical utterances with heavy emotional charge.

According to Nina (2006), Ameka correlates the functions of interjections with the functions of language. His classification of interjections considers both communicative and semantic features of interjections. He distinguishes interjections from other items such as particles, discourse markers and reserves the term ‘interjections’ for descriptive use within the word level category. He based his categorization of interjections on the specific communicative functions that interjections fulfil and on the types of meaning, they predicate.
The functional categories of interjections were derived from the broad structural classification of primary and secondary interjections. Ameka (1992) categorized them into expressive, conative and phatic interjections. The expressive interjections focus on the speaker’s mental state. They are further subdivided into emotive and cognitive interjections. The emotive interjections express the speaker’s mental state relating to emotions and sensations they have at the time of utterance, while the cognitive ones pertain to the knowledge state and thought at the time of utterance. The conative interjections are aimed at either getting other’s attention or demanding an action or response from the addressee.

The phatic interjections are for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a communicative contact. They express a speaker’s mental attitude towards the on-going discourse, including back channelling and feedback. This functional approach to interjections seemingly borrows from sociolinguistics, where Ameka discusses the socio-communicative role the interjections play rather than any linguistic content they may have. Ameka’s functional approach to interjections thus appears feasible for this research, for it focuses on the broad discourse perspective. Figure 2.1 Below is a summary of Ameka’s proposition.
Figure 2.1: A summary on the functional approach to interjections by Ameka (1992).

2.2.2: The Speech Act Theory

The Speech Act Theory (SAT) was put forward by a group of British philosophers in the 1960s. According to Austin (1962), an utterance is an act performed by a speaker in context, in respect to an addressee. Going by the working definition of an interjection adopted in the study, there are mental acts and speech acts. Performing a speech act involves performing any of these three acts:

A locutionary act, an illocutionary and a perlocutionary act. A locutionary act is the process of producing a recognizable grammatical utterance in a language. An illocutionary act attempts to accomplish some communicative purpose and a perlocutionary act is the intended effect of an utterance on the hearer.

In Austin’s theory, the notion of the perlocutionary act is recognition that a speech act has an interactional component. In this regard, a conversation has a series of locutions between speakers aiming at achieving communication
between and among them (illocutionary force). There are direct and indirect SAs. The direct SA is used to refer to communicative activity (locution), defined in terms of illocution (intentions of the speaker) and perlocution (effect the utterance had on the listener). Indirect SA is one in which the speaker performs one illocutionary act but intends the listener to infer by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non-linguistic.

When a speaker makes an utterance in a conversation there is an intended effect on the hearer. Interjections being part of an exchange or an utterance were treated as locutions, which have intended illocutionary effect in the outcome of an exchange or the conversation. The illocutionary force of an interjection was established in terms of the function that the interjection can serve in the conversation depending on the context of use. Edmondson, (1981) points out that an exchange in a conversation is defined in such a way that it must elicit an outcome. The nature of the outcome is largely determined by the illocutionary act (as well as other acts), which realize the element composition of an exchange. Interjections used as discourse markers form part of the exchange and can be treated as locutions, which have intended illocutionary effect in the outcome of the exchange and the conversation (Nina, 2006). Interjections serving as SAs could be assertive, commissives, directives, declaratives or expressive.
Assertive SAs serve to get the audience to attend to the belief that the speaker is committed to a certain belief and include the different ways of suggesting, putting forward or concluding something. Commissives commit to a speaker a future action and is usually triggered by a directive and include the different forms of promising, planning, vowing or betting, while a directive gets the audience to do things, and are classified into two; request for ‘information acts’ (also called yes/no questions) and request for ‘action acts’. They include the different ways of ordering, advising or inviting.

A declarative act changes the state of world in an immediate way; for example, “you are fired”. Expressive conveys how the speaker feels about the situation, and includes the different kinds of welcoming, apologizing or even thanking.

The study revealed various types of speech acts, which were constituted by the interjections, and this was guided by these categories of SA proposed in the SAT. Next is the Brinton’s taxonomy used in the analysis of interjections that have the discourse marker function from the analysed data.

2.2.3: Brinton’s Taxonomy of DM Functions

According to Brinton (1996), interjections can serve as discourse markers (DMs) in a conversation. She uses the term ‘pragmatic marker’ to refer to Discourse Markers. According to her, DMs serve the following roles:

a) Initiate discourse
b) Claim attention of the hearer and close discourse, h
c) Help the speaker acquire or relinquish the floor, d
d) Delay tactic used to sustain discourse or the floor(act as a filler), m
e) Mark discourse boundary-indicate new topic, topic shift or resumption of an earlier topic

f) Denote new or old information as well as mark ‘sequential dependence’, r

g) Repair own or other’s discourse

h) Show subjectivity in discourse and finally

i) Indicate interpersonal relations such as showing cooperation or expressing deference/understanding

The above classification of functions of DMs was found suitable for application in this study since it focuses on the influence the DM (interjection) has on a conversation in terms of its organization. These functional categories of DMs were used to specify the functions, which the interjections under study performed, depending on the contextual circumstances in the data, when used as DMs.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This section focuses on the methods used in the present study and includes the following: research design, the site and population, sampling technique and sample size, research instruments and data collection, data analysis and presentation as well as the ethical considerations adhered to while conducting the study.

3.1 Research Design

This study was based on the descriptive survey research design, since it involves description of phenomena. Babbie (1990) defines descriptive survey as a type of field study that involves the collection of data or information such as opinions, attitudes and behaviours held by a group of people on a subject. This study adopts the design in studying the interjections in Kīmasaku. Blaxter et al (2006) further states that qualitative research is concerned with collecting and analysing information, which is in non-numerical form. The data collected consisted of descriptions on the nature and use of these interjections. On descriptive research, Kothari (2004) states that the approach describes the state of affairs, as they exist at present. This means that a researcher analyses readily available information in order to make a critical evaluation of the material.

In conclusion, the qualitative and descriptive approaches were employed here because of the need to explain the qualities of interjections in Kīmasaku.
dialect: the structural and functional aspects of the interjections as well as unveiling the categories of DMs and SAs constituted by Kikamba interjections.

3.2 Site of the Study and the Target Population

The study was carried out in Ivingoni/Nzambani ward, which is located in Kibwezi East constituency, Makueni County. In this ward, there are about 30,442 people according to the 2009 National house and Population census. The people in this area are the Akamba, speaking the Kimasaku dialect of the Kikamba language. This is a rural set up, and the level of Kīkamba language mix up with other languages is likely to be low. This means that the Kīmasaku dialect spoken here is likely to have less borrowing from other dialects or languages.

3.3 Sampling Technique

The researcher used two main approaches in sampling: judgement and social network technique. On judgement technique, Milroy (1987) observed that this sampling technique is suitable in a research where the researcher needs to identify in advance the “types” of speakers to be studied and seeks out the quota of speakers who fit the specified categories. The researcher used this sampling technique to identify a key informant.

The informant assisted the researcher (who is a native speaker of Kimasaku - born and brought up in Makueni County) to undertake the following tasks; first, formulate the questions for the questionnaire, generating the marking scheme for the questions in the questionnaire and lastly to confirm the analysis of meaning and usage of the sampled interjections. Here, native speaker
intuition / linguistic competence was used to generate and analyse appropriate data. Horrocks (1987) states that it is possible for a native speaker of a language to ask all the important questions regarding linguistic information, and answer them by himself/herself in a study.

Afterwards, the key informant (a native of the study area, who happened to be a specialist and a former Kikamba language teacher to the researcher in primary school) assisted in the selection of ten native speakers (questionnaire respondents) who participated in the research by filling in the questionnaires. The key informant through social network sampling technique selected the respondents. Social network is also called snowball sampling is a technique. This technique is usually used by researchers to identify a small number of individuals who have the required characteristics; such as ethnicity and some duration of stay as a teacher of Kikamba language teacher, for this study.

3.4 Sample Size

The sample of this study included 10 questionnaire participants selected through social networks with the assistance of the key informant mentioned in the section above (3.3). The respondents participated in the research by filling in the questionnaire. Milroy (1980) observed that linguistics surveys do not require large samples compared to surveys in other disciplines. The sample was well chosen and representative of both gender and age, even though these variables were not part of the objectives of the study. Labov (1972), cited in Makuto (2009) observed that gender and age influence an individual’s use of language in many speech communities. Further, Younger speakers are said to
be more innovative than older ones who tend to remain conservative (Trudgill, 1974). Therefore, the questionnaire respondents had the following characteristics:

a) Natives of the study area (having been born and brought up within the area of study)

b) All primary school teachers who teach Kikamba as a language in their respective school

c) Aged between 25-60 years; the active age of most primary school teachers

d) Five were to be male, and five female for gender representation

Only ten (10) questionnaire respondents were picked and the rationale for this number was: first, the fact that in qualitative studies more data does not necessarily lead to more information. Secondly, analysing a large sample can be time consuming and lastly, that qualitative research is concerned with meaning and not making generalized hypothesis statements (Mason, 2011).

Seven mini dialogues with interjections in them were also sample purposively from a book ‘Kikamba Self-Instruction Manual’ for analysis.

3.5 Data Collection Methods

The goal of this study was to collect data and analyse it for determining the structure and functions of interjections in their discourse contexts. The present study employed two methods of data collection: questionnaire and review of document.
The questionnaire and its marking scheme (for the close-ended questions) were formulated by the researcher in conjunction with the key informant. The key informant was a native speaker of the study area and had a wealth of knowledge after being a head teacher and a Kikamba language teacher for more than twenty years in a primary school setup.

The questionnaire consisted of both open-ended and closed-ended questions. The closed-ended questions used in the questionnaire were questions / statements that required the respondent to respond by writing or marking than answer sheet. This means that the most appropriate choice of interjection among the three interjection choices given was chosen, in order to correctly complete the meaning of the each statement. A blank option/space was also provided at the end of each close-ended question for another choice of an interjection to be provided by the respondent, if they did not find any of the three choices appropriate.

Fifteen (15) closed-ended questions were available. On the open-ended question, it was only one, the last question in the questionnaire, (QN 16). Bell (1999) explains that open-ended questions offer a range of responses that reflect the flavour of a respondent’s answers. In the questionnaire used in this study, the open-ended question required the respondents to give any other interjection known to him/her and the meaning/function of that interjection. The questionnaires were administered to a group of ten respondents sampled out, with the assistant of a key informant. They were identified through the informant’s social networks.
On the review of document method of data collection, the researcher settled on a textbook entitled ‘The Kikamba Self-Instruction Manual’ and was also picked purposively because of the availability of mini dialogues in it. The sampled mini-dialogues chosen (from The Kikamba Self-Instruction Manual resource) for analysis all had interjections in them. The text is (according to the knowledge of the researcher) written in the Kimasaku dialect, because the dialect is the one that is usually considered the standard dialect of Kikamba language (Kaviti, 2004).

The standard dialect is the one used in Kikamba media and instructional materials. At primary school level, Kīmasaku dialect is used as the language of instruction in lower primary and also taught as a subject. Print media such as Kikamba language Bible and storybooks are written in this dialect. Moreover, it is the dialect that is mainly used in Kikamba language radio stations and channels such as Mûsyi FM, Mbaitu FM, Athiani FM and Kyeni TV. The Kīmasaku is the dialect used in this study.

3.6 Data Collection Instruments

The study employed content analysis guide and a questionnaire as the data collection tools. The researcher used content analysis to analyse the samples secondary data from the ‘Kikamba self-instruction Manual’ mentioned above (3.5). It is an online Kikamba language learning resource hosted free on a linguistic website called Livelingua.com. The choice of the book was arrived at because of the following reasons; first, the book is divided into lessons tackling various linguistic contexts structured in form of dialogues such as a
conversation at the market place between a buyer and a seller, communication exchanges at the hospital among others. This contextualization of the dialogues was significant to the study since it made it easy to resolve objective three of the study, where the concept of communication scenario was introduced in the data analysis section (Chapter 4).

Secondly, dialogues in speech form such as those in this book have been used by other linguistic researchers whose focus was discourse, due to their availability and they have in the past provided credible data (Nina, 2006). Lastly, variables such as educational background and personal speech preference are less in a book situation than in recordings of spontaneous speech (Nina, 2006).

About the questionnaire, it is a structured tool for collecting primary data (Bell, 1999). The questionnaires were administered physically by the researcher; to the respondents sampled out purposively. The key informant was with the researcher at the time of the administration where all the respondents turned up at the agreed venue to participate in the filling in the questionnaires.

3.7 The validity and reliability of the data collection techniques

Field (2005) defines validity as the ability to measure that which is intended to be measured. On the other hand, reliability is concerned with repeatability. A scale is said to be reliable if repeat measurement made by it under constant conditions will give the same result (Moser and Kalton, 1989). In order to establish the validity of the research tools used in this study, a pilot study was undertaken before the actual study. The pilot study involved administering the
research tools to respondents not in the study before using the tools on the sampled population. Reliability has the main aim of testing the instruments used to collect data if they would yield the same results if repeated. In order to achieve this, the researcher administered the questionnaire to respondents and the process was repeated once more after a fortnight. This was done to ensure consistency and affirm the responses given to the specific questions of the questionnaires from the target population.

3.8 Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis approach was used for the analysis of the interjections. Content analysis guided by the working definition of an interjection adopted in this study was applied to identify the interjections present in the mini dialogues extracted from the textbook. The filled questionnaires were studied to establish the choice of interjection picked by most (at least three quarters of the total number) of the questionnaire respondents in the different contexts of the set questions. The choices identified as the correct ones were then confirmed from the marking scheme formulated by both the researcher and the key informant.

A description of the identified interjections from both the questionnaire and the ‘Kikamba Self-Instruction Manual’ was then done guided by the working definition of an interjection for this study (objective 1). This were further broken down into syntactical categories of sounds/non-sounds, word, phrase, clause or sentential structured level interjections.
Secondly, (Objective 2) followed the functions performed by the interjections in the discourse and the contextual conditions dictating the functions. This was mainly guided by the functional classifications of interjections by Ameka in his FTI theory (Ameka, 1992). For instance, some interjections may function as expressions of emotions (expressive interjections), attention seeking (conative interjections) or used in establishing/maintaining communicative contact (phatic interjections).

Further, there were instances where an interjection structured the communication process, for instance, the phatic interjections used in ordering discourse; the interjections having this characteristic were discussed as DMs. The taxonomy of DMs by Brinton’s (1996) analysed the DM functions of interjections. Moreover, there were instances when an interjection represented a mental or speech act and this was discussed guided by the SAT. Finally, (Objective 3) categories of the types of DMs and SAs constituted by the interjections were compiled. Data presentation was done in description forms that draw illustrations from the data, as well as tables and charts where applicable.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

It was entirely the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that the study adhered to the stipulated codes of ethics in research. The researcher obtained relevant authorization to carry out this study before conducting the research. The study was conducted based on respondents’ consent as preliminary introductions were done before administering the questionnaires. The key
informant, being familiar with all the respondents made this easy, as he introduced the researcher as ‘daughter of ’. The respondents were briefed by the researcher on the purpose of the study.

After the briefing, the respondents participated in the exercise and they all filled in the questionnaires individually. To ensure confidentiality, the researcher ensured that the questionnaire did not require the respondent’s name or details that may reveal their identity. The data collected was solely used for analysis in this study, and the findings were accurately presented without being taken out of context.

Moreover, the study followed the stipulated systemic procedures by Kenyatta University. The researcher was cleared to proceed for fieldwork by the board at the Graduate School (Appendix attached). Afterwards, the study was tested for anti-plagiarism and an originality report issued to that effect. Thus, this study observed the professional ethics of research all through.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter contains an analysis of the interjections present in the sampled mini dialogues of the Kikamba Self-Instruction Manual (henceforth KSIM) and the appropriate choices of interjections used for the questions in the questionnaire. The analysis is done in light of the objectives (cf. 1.3) and guided by the theories used in this study.

4.2 The Structural Forms of Kikamba Interjections
This structural description of Kikamba interjections guided by the working definition adopted in the study. Ameka (1992) also calls this structural classification the formal classification. Before embarking on the structural analysis of interjection (objective 1), the following information sheds light on the presentation, representation and analysis of data throughout this study: that any word identified as an interjections in Kikamba language (from either the questionnaire and the KSIM) were written in the lower case and italicized.

For the questionnaire, the questions follow the order given in the questionnaire; that is QNI (Question 1) up to QN 16 (question 16). The closed-ended questions range from QN1 to QN15, and then there is the open-ended question, QN16, which is the last question in the questionnaire. As for KSIM, the mini dialogues were presented as MD1 (Mini dialogue 1) up to MD7 (Mini dialogue 7). The sampled mini dialogues used in this study were 7 in total. The data analysed and presented in the different sections was picked
depending on the phenomena being discussed, and were from either the questionnaire and or the KSIM.

The structural classification of interjections employed in this study was informed by the working definition of what makes up an interjection used in the study. This structural classification of Kikamba language interjections therefore built and enriched on the achievements of Leech et al (1982) and Ameka’s (1992) definitions and classifications of interjections.

As identified in the working definition used in this study (cf 2.1.2), interjections discussed here comprise of the following; primary interjections (true interjections), secondary interjections (interjectional phrases), formulaic expressions and some exclamatory expressions. From these categories, it is can be concluded that in terms of structure, interjections exist in the form of sound, word, phrase, clause and sentence levels. The following discussions involve each of these levels together with the appropriate interjections in each level.

4.2.1 Sound Level Interjections

Sound level interjections convey a specified impression when heard. By calling them ‘sound’ it means they are units consisting of phones but when pronounced, they convey some implied meaning. Ten sound level interjections from both the questionnaire and the KSIM were discussed. Most of them were from the questionnaire (Numbers 1 to 8) while number 9 and 10 were from the KSIM.
Below are the analyses of the said interjections, and the free translation of the utterances in which the interjections appear. However, the Kikamba interjection was not translated, unless it belonged to the secondary category. The meanings given for each interjection were arrived at through the researcher introspection and assistance from the key informant. A marking scheme was used for the confirmation of the correct choices of answers for the questionnaire questions. Below are the sound structured interjections:

1. **The Interjection ‘Mwa’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Mwa!</th>
<th>ninyie</th>
<th>ūkūuma?</th>
<th>Nītukwikwatana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme for morpheme with you</td>
<td>Mwa!</td>
<td>is it me</td>
<td>you insulting?</td>
<td>I will deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translated with you</td>
<td>‘Mwa!’</td>
<td>is it me</td>
<td>you are insulting?</td>
<td>I will deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was QN1 of the questionnaire, and the interjection ‘Mwa!’ was the correct choice. All the ten respondents chose this interjection as the correct choice for QN1 of the questionnaire. This interjection is an expression of shock at a negative thing / happening. It is also a primary interjection and can constitute an utterance by itself when used in isolation. The speaker in this utterance is shocked at the way the listener insulted him and the speaker vows to deal with him. This interjection has the quality of a true interjection and thus cannot be translated to English language.

2. **The interjection ‘kwikwi’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Kwikwi</th>
<th>naku</th>
<th>Nunginyite</th>
<th>Kyaa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td>Kwikwi</td>
<td>You</td>
<td>Are stepping</td>
<td>Toe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘Kwikwi’</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>are stepping on my toe’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interjection ‘kwikwi’ was chosen as the correct choice for the QN 3 of the questionnaire. Given the context of use, this interjection is an expression of pain, caused by another person stepping on the speaker’s toe. It is a true primary interjection and therefore cannot be translated. Morphologically, this interjection consists of full reduplication of the sound ‘kwi’. This interjection can also be realized as ‘kwi’, to indicate the same feeling of physical pain.

3. The interjection ‘eee’

Speaker A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Ilovi</th>
<th>Niw’o</th>
<th>Mũsĩyĩ</th>
<th>munene</th>
<th>Wa</th>
<th>Nthĩ</th>
<th>Yĩkã?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td>Ilovi</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Of</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Which?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>Nairobi is the capital city of which country?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaker B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Ilovi</th>
<th>Niw’o</th>
<th>Mũsĩyĩ</th>
<th>munene</th>
<th>Wa</th>
<th>Eee</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Of</td>
<td>Eee</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above interjection ‘eee’ was picked by the ten respondents as the correct choice and confirmed through the marking scheme as the most appropriate choice of answer for QN 4 of the questionnaire. The interjection is a hesitation marker. It is a primary interjection and appeared in the middle of an utterance to indicate the hesitation condition. Going by the context of use above, the interjection ‘eee’ can be used as a co-utterance with other units, since once it is uttered there is an expectation of a continuation of the utterances in order to complete up the meaning after the hesitation created by the interjection. In this
case, while the interjection is being uttered, the Speaker B has some time to think about the choice of answer to give.

4. The Interjection ‘fũũ..fũ’

The interjection ‘fũũ..fũ’ is a primary interjection which can stand on its own and communicate a complete message. There are times when it could also be ‘fũ!’. It was the correct interjection picked for QN6 of the questionnaire. This interjection is made up of partial reduplication of the sound ‘fũ’ . In the above instance of use, the speaker utters this interjection after possibly bringing the cup near their nose or possibly tries drinking from the cup, but in the process, s/he senses the awful smell of a raw egg. The speaker then proceeds to state that another person (Mwikali) may have used the cup to beat an egg in it. The interjection ‘fũũ..fũ’ could be replaced for ‘fũ’ without change of the expressed meaning. This interjection when interpreted therefore means ‘yuck’ which is an expression of a disgusting smell.

5. The Interjection ‘shii’

The speaker of this sentence is calling for a quiet moment using the Kikamba interjection ‘Shii.’ This Kikamba interjection is similar in function and
structure to the English interjection Shh which calls for some silence. It is a primary interjection and it is morphologically anomalous because it involves the use of the voiceless post alveolar fricative /ʃ/, which is not present in the Kikamba language phonetic symbols. The usage of this interjection calls for silence in the immediate environment, since the speaker of the utterance wants to listen from outside their environment, so that the speaker gets to know what could be happening there. Nine of the ten respondents picked this interjection as the correct choice for QN9 of the questionnaire.

6. The Interjection ‘ng’o!’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutie</th>
<th>Atumia</th>
<th>Kilaa</th>
<th>Wakwata</th>
<th>Kuta</th>
<th>Nzovi</th>
<th>nyie</th>
<th>Yu</th>
<th>Ng’o</th>
<th>Ndiamba</th>
<th>Kumunenga</th>
<th>Mbesa</th>
<th>Syakwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutie</td>
<td>Spend</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>gets</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>buy</td>
<td>Alcoh</td>
<td>ol,</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ng’o</td>
<td>I can’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mutie spends all the money he gets to buy alcohol, Ng’o, I cannot give him my money.

The interjection ‘ng’o!’ represents a vow / swear and is means that the speaker is not going to give out something to the hearer. It could have been borrowed from Kiswahili language since it exists in the same unchanged form and meaning; for example,

Kiswahili: ‘Sikupi pesa zangu ng’o!’
Morpheme gloss: Cannot give you money mine ng’o!
Free translation: I cannot give you my money, ng’o!

To mean the speaker is swearing or vowing not to ever give out his money. It appeared in QN10 of the questionnaire and was correctly picked and confirmed as the appropriate choice for the context. In this utterance, the speaker vows that he cannot give his money to Mutie since he misspends his money by
buying alcohol. It is structurally a primary interjection and when uttered in isolation, it can constitute an utterance by itself.

7. The interjection ‘uuii…uuii’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Mwaki</th>
<th>Uuii...uuii</th>
<th>Mwaki</th>
<th>Mwaki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Uuii...uuii</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘Fire uuii…uuii fire ! fire’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another interjections in sound form identified included uuii…uuii!, which is associated with a desperate cry for help. It is a primary interjection and does not enter into syntactic construction with other word classes, going by its context of use above. It can also constitute an utterance by itself. This interjection appeared in QN14 in the questionnaire. All the participants chose it as the correct answer for this question. This choice of interjection was also confirmed as the correct one for this particular question.

8. The interjection ‘Ooo’

Speaker A:  *Ninyie ndwaite Mwende*  
            I am the one married Mwende  
            ‘I am the one married to Mwende’

Speaker B:  *Ooo, kalivu kuu kwitu*  
            Ooo, welcome this place ours  
            ‘Ooo, welcome to our place’

This interjection together with the instance of use was provided by one of the respondents in the open question (QN16) of the questionnaire. The researcher and the key informant agreed that the interjection meant agreement/concurrence to a certain idea/notion. Further, the interjection ‘Ooo’ in the above context could also mark a positive surprise originating from a sudden realization by Speaker B that the person he is talking to (speaker A) is the
husband to Mwende. This primary interjection is a type of routine/formulaic expression, since it is a kind of a reaction to an element in the linguistic context of speech (Ameka, 1992). Morphologically, it is a full duplication of the vowel sound ‘o’.

9. The Interjection ‘asi’

The primary interjection ‘asi’ is also the same as ‘Si!’ or ‘asiasi!’. It is usually an indication of surprise, astonishment or amazement. The extract below was obtained from mini dialogue 1 (MD1) of the Kikamba Manual and had this interjection used in it.

Mũoki : Na ĕtukũ nĩkwĩthĩawa na mbevo?
And night are usually with cold?
‘And are the night usually cold?’

Mũlinge : Aiee, kwĩthĩawa na yuutia yingi mũno.
No, there is usually with sweat a lot very
‘No, they are usually very sweaty’

Mũoki : Asi, voule. Ũka twĩkalange kũũ kwitũ, kĩtoo kyambe kũthela.
Asi, sorry. Come we do stay here ours, dust until to be over
‘Asi, sorry. Come over to our place, we stay here until the dust is over’.

From the above extract, one of the speakers; Mũoki, is surprised at the response given by Mũlinge that the nights are warm and sweaty. The interjection can constitute an utterance by itself when used in isolation to depict disbelief at a negative thing that has happened

10. The Interjection ‘ai’

Kaloki : Nyie ivindi ya mbevo nendete kwĩkĩa ikoti na tai.
Me time of cold I like putting on a coat and tie
‘I like putting on a coat and a tie when it is cold’

Mwose : Ai, nyie ndyendete ikoti ñindi ninendete kwĩkĩa vulana na tai
Ai, me I don’t like a coat but I like putting on sweater and tie
‘Ai, I don’t like a coat, but I like putting on a sweater and a tie
The interjection ‘ai’ is another sound level interjection in the form of a response particle. In the above scenario, the interjection has been used to give a contrary opinion, different from the one given by the first speaker ‘Kaloki’; that the speaker (mwose) doesn’t like putting on a coat, instead prefers putting on a sweater and a tie. This primary interjection ‘ai’ was contained in MD4 extracted from the KSIM.

In conclusion, all the above-discussed structural form of Kikamba interjections at the sound level belonged to the category of true primary interjections identified by Ameka (1992) and Leech et al (1982). They were therefore not translated into English language.

4.2.2 Word Level Interjections

According to Halliday (1994), there are eight word classes namely: noun, adjective, numeral, verb, determiner, adverb, preposition and conjunction. Most secondary interjections according to Ameka (1992) come from these word classes. Secondary interjections are words having independent semantic value attached to them, and only become interjections when conventionally used as non-elliptical utterances that express emotions and mental attitude/state. Based on the data used in this study, word level interjections occurred mainly in form of verbs and nouns. The word level interjections are discussed below. The first five interjections were from the questionnaire, while number 6 to 10 were from the KSIM.
1. **The Interjection ‘Eka’**

   Eka! nũũvya nĩ kikaangi kiu.  
   *Stop! You will burn by cooking pan that*
   ‘Stop! You will get burnt by that cooking pan’

   The interjection ‘eka!’ in this sentence appears in QN 8 of the questionnaire.

   The interjection serves to send out a warning to the listener, that the cooking pan is hot and that the listener should not try handling it lest s/he is burnt. It is a secondary interjection in form of a verb, and it could be translated to mean ‘stop!’ as already indicated above.

2. **The Interjection ‘Ngai’**

   Ngai! kana kau kayavaluka naĩ!  
   *God! Child that has fallen terribly.*
   ‘God! That child has terribly fallen!’

   The above interjection ‘Ngai’, is a secondary interjection in the form of a noun, and it means ‘God!’*. In the above context, it is used to express desperateness at the situation at hand (that the child fell terribly), by uttering the name of God, who is considered a supreme being. This statement appeared in QN15 of the questionnaire and the choice of the interjection ‘ngai’ was confirmed as the most suitable choice of interjection for the question.

3. **The Interjection ‘Niw’o’**

   **Speaker A:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mundu</th>
<th>Akwatwa</th>
<th>Ayuw aa</th>
<th>Nzou</th>
<th>Niwaile</th>
<th>Kwo vwa</th>
<th>Mia mi</th>
<th>T a,</th>
<th>Ii no</th>
<th>Ka na</th>
<th>Wio na</th>
<th>Ata</th>
<th>We?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>If caught</td>
<td>Killing</td>
<td>Elephants</td>
<td>Should be</td>
<td>Jailed</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>About</td>
<td>Fifteen</td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>Suggest</td>
<td>What</td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   ‘If a person is caught killing elephants, he should be jailed for about five years. Or what do you suggest?’
Speaker B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Nĩw'o$,</th>
<th>$Usu$</th>
<th>$Nĩ$</th>
<th>Woni</th>
<th>Mũseo</th>
<th>Viũ,</th>
<th>Nikana</th>
<th>$fĩ$</th>
<th>$Nzou$</th>
<th>Syikathele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True,</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very,</td>
<td>So that</td>
<td>The</td>
<td>Elephants</td>
<td>Don’t become extinct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“True, that is a very good opinion, so that the elephants don’t become extinct.”

Nine out of the ten respondents chose this interjection as the most suitable choice for this particular QN5 of the questionnaire. The interjection ‘$Nĩw’o$’ was confirmed and therefore discussed as the most appropriate choice of interjection for this question. Other than being an interjection in this case, ‘true’ can also function as a response particle.

The interjection in this case is ‘$Nĩw’o$’ to mean ‘true!’ . It is secondary interjection in the form of a formulaic expression. This is because it is a reaction to an aspect in the linguistic context by speaker A. It is also an adjective in terms of the word classes and it denotes conformity or consistency with the earlier stated statement; that if a person is caught killing the elephants, such a person should be jailed for about five years.

4. **The Interjection ‘sisya’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sisya!</th>
<th>$Kĩu$</th>
<th>$Nĩ$</th>
<th>$Kyaũ$?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look!</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Look! What’s that’

The interjection ‘sisya’ is a secondary interjection translated to mean ‘look’.

This interjection was provided by one of the respondents in the open question of the questionnaire (QN16), together with its context of use given above. The interjection ‘sisya’ is used in this context to call for attention from the part of
the listener, to look out for something that is in their immediate environment.

The interjection belongs to the verb word class.

5. **The interjection ‘Kino’**

Another word level interjection identified in the open question (QN16) of the questionnaire was in the form of an insult; that is ‘kino’, which is usually considered a taboo word in Kikamba language. It is a form of secondary interjection, which when given its near translation refers in a disrespectful way to the female genitalia.

6. **The Interjection ‘Nata’**

```
Kilian : Nata?
    hey
    'How are you?
Serena : Nĩkũseo, ũvoo waku?
    It is well, news yours
    'It is well, how about you?
Serena : Nĩ nesa wienda ata?
    It good want you what?
    'It is well, what do you want?
Kilian : Nienda kwona ndakitali.
    I want to see doctor
    'I want to see the Doctor’
```

The interjection ‘Nata’ is in the form of a greeting as reflected in the above dialogue. It is thus an interjection in the form of a formulaic expression. The above MN2 appeared in the KSIM. The interjection ‘Nata’ has a near translation of ‘How are you?’ as shown above; and therefore being a greeting, a response to the greetings is expected to follow, as shown above.

7. **The Interjection ‘aiee’**

```
Mũoki : Na ūtukũ nǐkwĩthĩawa na mbevo?
    And nights are usually with cold?
    'And are the night usually cold?’
Mũlinge : Aiee, kwĩthĩawa na yuutia yingi mũno.
    No, there is usually with sweat a lot very
    'No, they are usually very sweaty'
```
The secondary interjection ‘aiee’ is a response particle. It appeared in MN 1 extracted from the KSIM. Response particles show agreement or disagreement to a previous statement. This interjection ‘aiee’ means ‘No’ thus a disagreement to the earlier statement. It was triggered by the question indicated by the speaker, Mũoki; that is, ‘And are the nights usually cold?’

8. The Interjection ‘ĩĩ’

Mwongela:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nîwendete</th>
<th>Kîwũa</th>
<th>Kya</th>
<th>Masungwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you like</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Of</td>
<td>Oranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Do you like orange juice?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mwongeli:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ĩĩ,</th>
<th>Nîwendete</th>
<th>Mũno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES, I like</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘YES, I really like’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interjection ‘ĩĩ’ is also in the form of a response particle. It is an interjection in the form of a formulaic expression. It was triggered by a question as illustrated above. It is a positive response, in this case implying an agreement to the asked question by Mwongela; whether Mwongeli likes orange juice. This response was from KSIM. It is also a secondary interjection and thus translatable as shown below.

9. The Interjection ‘vole’

Mũoki : Na ũtukũ nîkwĩthĩawa na mbevo?
And night there is and coldness?)
‘And are the night cold?’

Mûlinge : Aiee, kwĩthĩawa na yuutia yingi mũno.
No, there is usually and sweat alot very
No, it is usually very sweaty’
Mūoki: Asi, vole. Ŭka twikalange kūũ kwitũ, kītoo kymbe kūthela
Asi, sorry. Come we stay here our place dust until it settles.
‘Asi, sorry. Come and stay here with us at our place until the dust settles’

The interjection ‘vole’ is a secondary interjection, in the form of a formulaic expression, and can be translated to mean ‘sorry’. It is produced as a reaction of disbelief,( to Mulinge’s comment) that the nights are sweaty. This interjection appeared in MN1 extracted from the KSIM. It co-occurred with the sound interjection ‘asi’ discussed earlier.

10. The Interjection ‘aaya’

Mwongela: Nūwendete Kūũ Kya Masungwa
‘Do you like water of orange’

Mwongeli: ñ, Nūwendete Mūno
‘Yes, I like a lot’

Mwongela: aaya kwata
‘Alright, take this.’

The interjection ‘aaya’ appeared in MD3 of the KSIM. It is a secondary interjection in the form of a concurrence response to a statement offered earlier by Mwongeli that it is true that he likes orange juice. It is not clear what is the most appropriate translation for this interjection, but the word ‘alright’ was the near translated arrived at.

4.2.3 Phrase Level Interjections

A phrase is a group of words, which together form a conceptual unit. Most of the phrase level interjections mainly appeared in the open question of the questionnaire (QN16). They were listed without an accompanying utterance /statement that could be analysed. Others phrasal interjections appeared at the
questionnaire as choices to be chosen if correctly fitting the context of any of the questions in there. Only one interjection appearing in a mini dialogue from the KSIM had an instance of use, which could be analysed. From the data analysed, a total of 6 interjections belonged to this category. They included:

a) ‘Mwa ngai wakwa’ (oh my God)
b) ‘Ngai wakwa’ (my God)
c) Naku ū (and you!)
d) Ata yu (how now)
e) Aii..aie (oh... no)
f) Ni muvea’ (it’s thanks)

In terms of the structural constituents of the phrasal interjection, most of the phrasal interjections were observed to consist of a word level interjection combined with a pre or post modifier; such as the interjection ngai (God) pre modified to become ‘oh my God’ (mwa ngai wakwa) and my God (ngai wakwa). The interjection naku ū (and you!) having the pre modifier ‘and’ and the word ‘you’. In other instances, phrasal interjections also consisted of two or more interjections put together. They include the interjections ata yu (how now) consisting of the interjection how and now, aii..aie (oh... no) has the interjections oh and no.

The interjection ‘ni muvea’ (thank you) which appeared in MD3 of the KSIM is discussed below;

\textbf{Mwongela:} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Kiwi:} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Kya:} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Masungwa}  
\begin{tabular}{l} 
Do you like \hspace{1cm} water \hspace{1cm} of \hspace{1cm} orange \\
\end{tabular}

‘Do you like orange juice?’
Mwongeli:        ĩĩ,                        Ñínendete                        Mũno
Yes,                   I like                    a lot
‘Yes, I really like’

Mwongela:                aaya                        kwata
Alright,                take this.

Mwongeli:        Ni                        muvea
Its                    gratitude
‘Thank you’

This interjection ‘ni muvea’ (thank you) is a routine indicating appreciation for something done to the speaker. In the context above, Mwongeli give out the interjection as a way of showing appreciation to Mwongela for giving her some orange juice. It is a secondary type of interjection.

4.2.4 Clause Level Interjections

A clause is a group of words consisting of a subject and a finite form of the verb, Halliday (1994). The researcher looked at the syntactic configuration of interjections to determine the clausal interjections. Only one example had been identified as belonging to this category and was at the open question (QN16) of the questionnaire. The interjection had been written down, without being used in a statement that would warrant an analysis.

The interjection was of the secondary type of interjection and thus was translated into English language. This example, eka naku (you stop!); consisted of the subject ‘you’ and the verb ‘stop’. Clausal level interjections were thus not common from the data collected from both the questionnaire and the KSIM. The researcher therefore concluded that the Kīmasaku dialect of
Kikamba has most of its interjections in simple structures of mainly sound, word and phrases.

4.2.5 Sentence Level Interjections

A sentence is a group of words usually containing a verb, which expresses a complete thought in the form of a statement (declarative), question (interrogative), instructions (imperative) or exclamations (exclamatory sentences). This is the highest construction on the rank scale by Halliday (1994). All the sentential interjections identified were of the secondary category of interjections. From the data collected, 5 sentential interjections were obtained from the questionnaire, with none from the KSIM. They include;

a) *Akiangai (i swear by God)*, which is an exclamatory sentence expressing strong emotions of swearing.

b) *Ekana na ngui (You stop joking!)* is a declarative sentence, stating a general statement. It consists of the subject ‘you’ the verb ‘stop’ and object gerund ‘joking’

c) *Ekela vau (you stop there!)* is also another declarative sentence made up of the subject ‘you’ the verb ‘stop’ and the object ‘there’

d) *Kwa sisya (You look out!)* with the subject ‘you’ the verb ‘look’ and the object ‘out’

e)Mbathuke *nivite (let me pass)* - this interjection was discussed afterwards in its context of usage.

Just like in the case of the phrasal level interjections, the first four ((a) – (d)) sentence level interjections were stated at the open question of the
questionnaire (QN16) by different respondents. The interjections did not have instances of their use in discourse nor functions performed.

The interjection ‘mbathuke nivite’ was the appropriate choice of interjection for QN2 of the questionnaire. Below is its context of use.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mbathuke nivite! okou niw‘a unthatisyे viu} \\
\text{Let me pass! You know I feel angered me really} \\
\text{‘Let me pass! You know you have really angered me’}
\end{align*}
\]

This interjection \textit{mbathuke nivite (let me pass)} is a form of an imperative sentence, giving instructions. The speaker utters this interjection in an agitated tone, while asking to be excused to pass by the listener.

In conclusion, the structural classification of interjections seems suitable and applicable for data from other languages such as Kikamba in this study. There were interjections from all the structural levels, starting from the sound, word, phrasal, clausal and finally sentential levels. The discussed interjections belonged to either the primary or the secondary categories of interjection.

Next follows the discussion on objective two of the study, which focuses on the function of interjections in Kikamba language and the conditions defining their functions in Kikamba language discourse.

4.3 The Functional Classifications of Kikamba Interjections

Kikamba interjections in the present study were functionally classified based on the Functional Theory of Interjections (FTI). The interjections analysed in this section were those that were identified and discussed in objective one,
under the structural classification. The analysis follows this order: once the functional classification is done, the conditions defining the role the interjection is playing in discourse will follow. Ameka (1994) put the (FTI) forward. The approach involves the functional classifications of interjections. The section below dealt with these functional classifications, which focus on the specific communicative functions that interjections fulfil and the types of meanings they predicate. The functional categories are likened to the functions of a language according to Ameka (1992). They include the expressive, conative and phatic functions of interjections.

4.3.1 The expressive function of interjections.

As discussed in the FTI by Ameka (1992), expressive interjections are vocal gestures used to indicate the mental state of a speaker. Expressive interjections are subdivided into the emotive and cognitive functions. The emotive interjections express the speaker’s mental state relating to emotions and sensations they have at the time of an utterance. The cognitive interjections pertain to the knowledge state and thought at the time of utterance.

Examples of interjections belonging to this expressive functional category are discussed below;

a) The interjection ‘kwikwi’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Morpheme-for morpheme</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
<th>Free translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kwikwi</td>
<td>Nunginyite</td>
<td>Kwikwi you</td>
<td>‘Kwikwi you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naku</td>
<td>Kyaa</td>
<td>are stepping Toe</td>
<td>are stepping on my toe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Free translation: ‘Kwikwi you are stepping on my toe’
The interjection ‘*kwikwi*’ belongs to the emotive sub category of the expressive function since it focuses on the emotional status of the speaker (s/he is in pain) at the time of the utterance of the interjection, as shown above.

### b) *fuu..fu!*-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Mwamba</th>
<th>Kiu</th>
<th>Kinyung</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Mwikali</th>
<th>Nitauku</th>
<th>Matumba</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Nthi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>fũũ..fũ</em></td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Tha<em>t</em></td>
<td>Smelling</td>
<td>Ba<em>d</em></td>
<td>Mwikali</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td><em>fũũ..fũ</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘<em>fũũ..fũ</em>, that cup is smelling bad, Mwikali may have beaten eggs in there’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interjection ‘*fũũ..fũ*’ as used in the above context is an emotive interjection, indicating the emotional status of a bad/awful smell at the time of uttering the interjection.

### c) *Ng’o!* (a form of swear)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutie</th>
<th>Atum ıaa</th>
<th>Kii</th>
<th>Wak wata</th>
<th>Kũũ a</th>
<th>Nčovi</th>
<th>nyi e</th>
<th>Yu</th>
<th>Ng’o</th>
<th>Ndũmba</th>
<th>Kum unenga</th>
<th>Mb esa</th>
<th>Sya kwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutie</td>
<td>Spen ds</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>He gets</td>
<td>To buy</td>
<td>Alco hol</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>N o w</td>
<td>Ng’o</td>
<td>I can’ t</td>
<td>Give</td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Min e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Mutie spends all the money he gets to buy alcohol, Ng’o, I cannot give him my money.’

This interjection is a form of swearing in Kikamba language. In this utterance, the speaker vows that he cannot give his money to Mutie since he misspends his money by buying alcohol. Therefore, the interjection *Ng’o!* is a cognitive expressive interjection, since the speaker has the knowledge that Mutie is a spendthrift, thus the speaker would rather not give his money to him.
d) The interjection ‘asi!’

Mũoki: Na ūtukū nǐkwĩthĩawa na mbevo?
And night there is and coldness?)
‘And are the night cold?’

Mũlinge : Aiee, kwĩthĩawa na yuutia yingi mũno.
No, there is usually and sweat alot very
‘No, it is usually very sweaty’

Mũoki: Asi, vole. Õka twĩkalange kũũ kwĩthũ, kĩtoo kyambe kũthela
Asi, sorry. Come we stay here our place dust until it settles.
‘Asi, sorry. Come and stay here with us at our place until the dust settles’

The interjection ‘asi!’ is a cognitive expressive in the above context, since by uttering the interjection, the speaker expresses disbelief to Mũlinge’s statement that nights are sweaty. This is possibly because normally, the nights out to be cold. The co-occurring interjection, sorry is however an emotive expressive, since the speaker expresses sorrow at Mũlinge’s statement that the nights are sweaty.

e) The interjection ‘ai’!

Kaloki: Nyie ivindi ya mbevo nendete kwikia ikoti na tai.
Me time of cold I like putting on a coat and tie
‘I like putting on a coat and a tie when it is cold’

Mwose : Ai, nyie ndyendete ikoti indi ninendete kwikia vulana na tai
Ai, me I don’t like a coat but I like putting on sweater and tie
‘Ai, I don’t like a coat, but I like putting on a sweater and a tie

This interjection is a cognitive expressive, giving a contrary thought to what Kaloki says in the first statement above.

Other expressive interjections in their subcategories are listed below;

f) ‘Mwa!’- Emotive interjection indicating shock at a negative thing (QN1)

g) Ngai!(God)-Emotive interjection, showing fear and thus the mention of a supreme being(QN15)

h) niw’o!(true)- it is a cognitive expressive interjection(QN5)
i) *mwa ngai wakwa* (oh my God!),

j) *Ngai wakwa* (my God!),

k) *Naku ii* (pleading)

l) *Ata yu?* (how now)

### 4.3.2 The conative function of interjections

Conative interjections on the other hand are usually aimed at getting someone’s attention or demand a response /action from someone. The following is an example from the open question of the questionnaire (QN16):

*Sisya!* $kū$ $nī$ $kyaũ$?

Look! that is what?

‘Look! what is that?

The above interjection *Sisya!*(*look*), is an attention calling interjection. It is calling for a ‘watch out’ from the listener concerning something. *Sisya!*(*look*), is thus a conative interjection. It can therefore be said that this interjection plays the conative function in the above context of its use. Other conative interjections include; *Shii..., uui uui* (a desperate cry!), *eka* (stop), *sisya* (look!), *kwa sisya* (you look!) and *nata* (greetings).

### 4.3.3 The Phatic function of interjections

On phatic interjections, Ameka (1992) states that they are used to start and maintain a communicative contact. He classifies back channelling and feedback signals in this category of interjections. Also included in this category of interjections are interactional routine interjections such as greetings, leave taking and expressions of discourse organization. For example;
Mwongela: Nįwendete Kĩwũ Kya Masungwa
Do you like water of orange
‘Do you like orange juice?’

Mwongeli : ĩĩ, Nĩnendete Mũno
Yes, I like a lot
‘Yes, I really like’

Mwongela: aaya kwata
Alright, take this.

Mwongeli : Ni muvea
Its gratitude
‘Thank you’

From the above mini dialogue extracted from the KSIM, the interjections ĩĩ (yes), Aaya (alright) and Ni muvea (thank you) are phatic interjections for they aid in sustaining the communication process. Other phatic interjections identified from both the questionnaire and from the KSIM dialogues include; Eeee..., ooo, aiee (No), aii-aie , Ekela vau...(you stop there), ekana na ngui (you stop joking), akiangai (swearing), and eka naku(you stop it.),

In conclusion, The Kikamba interjections discussed easily fit to the interjection functions identified by Ameka (1992), thus building on this FTI by Ameka. All the functional categories (Expressive- emotive/cognitive, Conative and Phatic) identified by Ameka were present in Kikamba language. Table 4.1below is a summary of the interjection and their functions analysed according to the FTI by Ameka (1994)
Table 4.1: A Summary of Kikamba Interjections according to FTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY INTERJECTION</th>
<th>SECONDARY INTERJECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPRESSIVE INTERJECTION</strong> (Emotive/cognitive)</td>
<td><strong>Kwikwi</strong> (indicates pain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>fuu..fu!</em> (signs bad smell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ng’o!</em> (a form of swear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>asi!, ai!, mwa!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ngai!</em> (God), <em>niw’o!</em> (true),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>mwa ngai wakwa</em> (oh my God!),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ngai wakwa</em> (my God!),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Naku ii</em> (pleading),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ata yu?</em> (how now)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONATIVE INTERJECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shii...</strong>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>uui uui</em> (a desparate cry for help!),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>eka!</em> (stop),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>siyana</em> (look),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kwa siyana</em> (you look), <em>nata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHATIC INTERJECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eeee.., ooo, , aii-aie ,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ekela van...</em> (you stop there), <em>ekana na ngui</em> (you stop joking), <em>akiangai</em> (swearing), <em>eka nakur</em> (you stop it.), <em>ni muvea</em> (thank you),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Aaya</em> (Alright), <em>aiee</em> (No), <em>ii</em> (yes),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Discourse Marking and Speech Acts Functions of Interjections

There is a variety of discourse functions performed by Kikamba language interjection. Other than the functional categories of interjections identified by Ameka (1992), it was evident that interjections have an additional function of structuring discourse as well as representing information acts; that is Discourse Marking (hence forth DM) function or speech act (hence forth SA) function of
the interjection (Objective 2). The functions performed by the interjections in the various instances was done based on a number of factors such as: the position of the interjection in the discourse, the tenets of the Functional Theory of Interjection (henceforth (FTI), the Speech Acts Theory (henceforth SAT) and the Brinton’s taxonomy of Discourse Markers. The concept of Communication Scenario (henceforth CS) cited by Nina (2006) was also incorporated since the researcher found it a fundamental aspect in interjections versus their role in discourse.

4.4.1 The Distribution of Kikamba Interjections in Utterances

An interjection may appear in initial, middle or final position in an utterance. The position of an interjection in a conversation/utterance is of great significance since the positioning has an effect on the interpretation and meaning of that particular interjection in respect to the communication scenario. Goffman (1974) states that DMs (in which interjections are part of) in initial position in an utterance play a more significant role compared to those positioned at the final position. The following extracts from the data reveal the various positions of interjections in utterances made in Kikamba language.

4.4.1.1 The Initial Position in an Exchange

Kilian:  *Nata?*
Serena:  *Nĩkũseo, ũvoo waku?*
Serena:  *Nĩ nesa wĩenda ata?*
Kilian:  *Nienda kwona ndakitali.*

The above MN2 extracted from the KSIM shows a speaker (Kilian) using the interjection ‘*Nata*’ (how are you?) in form of a greeting at the beginning of an exchange. The interjection begins an exchange between Kilian and Serena who
are presumably friends. It is expected that Serena will respond to the interjected greetings from his friend Kilian and answer on how he feels as enquired.

4.4.1.2 The Initial Position of a Move

A move is a single contribution or utterance made by a speaker. It is also called a turn of speaking. This could be a response given back after a posed question or enquiry. It was observed from the collected data that a good number of interjections appear at this capacity in an exchange. The mini dialogue below, MN5 involves two friends trying to trace their origin. It involves the use of the interjection Kikamba interjection ‘Ooo’ at the initial position in a move.

*Rian:* Mwaitu aumite Masaku vandu vetawa Iveti.

Mother comes from Machakos a place called Iveti

‘My mother comes from Machakos, a place called Iveti’

*Matinda:* Ooo, Ninisi iveti, na ekalaa va? Ekalaa Amelika

Ooo, I know Iveti, and where? She lives in America?

‘Ooo, I know Iveti, and where does she live? in America?’

4.4.1.3 The Middle Position of a Move

**Speaker A:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Ilovi</th>
<th>Niw’o</th>
<th>Mũsyĩ</th>
<th>munene</th>
<th>Wa</th>
<th>Nthĩ</th>
<th>Yikũ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Of</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Which?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘Nairobi is the capital city of which country?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speaker B:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Ilovi</th>
<th>Niw’o</th>
<th>Mũsyĩ</th>
<th>munene</th>
<th>Wa</th>
<th>eee</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Of</td>
<td>eee</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘Nairobi is the capital city of eee Kenya’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following statement (utterance) from the questionnaire has the interjection \textit{eee(e:)} which is and it was in the middle position of a move.

\textbf{4.4.1.4 The Final Position of a Move}

The data did not reveal any interjections in Kikamba language at the final position of a move. However, this does not mean such cases do not occur in Kikamba. With a variety of data sources, there could be interjections that appear at the end position of a move. For example; the exchange below was generated by the researcher and involves an interjection at the final position in a move/exchange;

\begin{quote}
\textit{Speaker A:} Yu \textit{naku} weekania ata? Ai…
\textit{Now} and you \textit{have done} what? Ai…
\textit{What have you done now? Ai…}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Speaker B:} Pole \textit{mwa} nyie ndyiiši kana ni ūthuki
\textit{Sorry for sure} me didn’t know if is wrong
\textit{‘I am sorry for sure; I didn’t know it was wrong’}
\end{quote}

The interjection \textit{‘ai’} in this case indicates disappointment at the action which speaker B has undertaken. It was therefore concluded that interjections in final position of a move are marked in Kikamba a language. However, the same interjection \textit{‘ai’} can appear at the word initial position. The following mini dialogue extracted from the KSIM shows this;

\begin{quote}
\textit{Kaloki :} Nyie ivindi ya mbevo nendete kwikia ikoti na tai.
\textit{Me time of cold} I like putting on a coat and tie
\textit{‘I like putting on a coat and a tie when it is cold’}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Moses :} Ai, nyie ndyendete ikoti ūndĩ ninendete kwikĩa vulana na tai
\textit{Ai, me} I don’t like a coat \textit{but} I like putting on sweater and tie
\textit{‘Ai, I don’t like a coat, but I like putting on a sweater and a tie’}
\end{quote}
Based on the data collected from both the questionnaire and the KSIM, the following conclusions were made about the distribution of Kikamba interjections in discourse:

1. That many interjections in Kikamba language appear at the initial position of an utterance/exchange or a move.
2. There are also interjections that appear in the middle position in a move.
3. Interjections in Kikamba language discourses may appear at the final position in a move /exchange although such cases may not be very common.

The researcher attributed this initial, middle and final positioning of interjections in moves, to the fact that a speaker may portray emotions by inserting an interjection at any point of an utterance to convey the emotions and the intended meaning their mind. It however was clear that the distribution did not appear to influence the role a given interjection played in discourse, thus the concept of CS was brought in to examine its influence to the role an interjection plays.

4.4.2 The Concept of Communication Scenario

Nina (2006) argues that interjections used in discourse may function as either DM or SA. In order to differentiate the two functions, she introduced the concept of CS. This study borrowed this concept in order to determine the DM and SA function of Kikamba interjections in Kikamba language discourses. According to Nina (2006), Panther and Thornburg (1998) first introduced the concept of CS. They defined a CS as a communicant’s knowledge based on
previous experience, of a specific sequence of actions (verbal and non-verbal) that is most likely to take place in a specific situation of communication.

### 4.4.2.1 The Structure of Communication Scenario

The structure of a CS is in such a way that there are preliminary conditions /states that make a communication scenario possible, by encoding some extra linguistic parameters of a situation (Nina (2006)). The conditions are grouped into; the **pre suppositional branch** and the **motivational** branch. Other than the preliminary conditions, Nina (2006) identifies the following components of a CS from the broad CS concept by Panther and Thornburg (1988).

- a) The first component is the **before** component, which refer to the conditions which must be fulfilled before the action proper can take place.
- b) There is the **core** component, which refers to the action itself.
- c) Next is the **result** component, which is usually a proof that some action took place.
- d) Lastly is the **after** component, which refers to the intended consequences of the performed action.

The unintended consequences are normally encoded at one position of the **realization** branch called the ‘other consequences’. Nina (2006) suggested various models of CSs such as greetings, requests, inquiry, order, promise, and suggestion among others. The following is a general structural schema of a CS extracted from Nina (2006).
Figure 4.1: Abstract Schema of CS (Nina 2006)

**Presuppositional branch**

- **S and H exist** / **S bears some attitude towards X**

**Motivational branch**

- **Entity X exists** / **S wants H to perform X**

**Preliminary**

- Action X is possible

**Conditions**

- S can perform action Y

**BEFORE:** S expresses his / her desire concerning X to H

**CORE:** S performs action Y that involves H

**RESULT:** Y affects H

**AFTER:** H performs action X / involving X because of Y

Other consequence / **Realization branch**

In terms of the SAs, the preliminary conditions mentioned in the schema refer to the illocutionary force of the core component SA. The **before** and the core components represent a locutionary act while the **result** component represent the perlocutionary effect. The study used these conditions and components mentioned above, to analyse the data in order to show the various SA or DM functions of the Kikamba language interjections in discourse.

**4.4.2.2. Communication Scenario and Meaning Transfer**

According to Panther and Thornburg (2003) cited by Nina(2006), an indirect SA is made possible due to metonymic transfer between components of a CS. Metonymy here to mean using one entity to refer to another that is related to it. This means that a speaker may refer to the core component of a scenario by
referring to some other of its component, thus performing an indirect SA. This is because the components of a CS belong to the same domain.

Nina (2006) in her study on the discourse functions of phatic interjections, points out in one of her hypothesis concerning the English, Russian and Japanese languages that phatic interjections function as DMs when used **Scenario –Externally**, that is the interjection does not occupy any position within the structure of the CS. Moreover, phatic interjections fulfil their S.A function when used **Scenario-Internally**, to mean that the interjection occupies a position within the structure of the CS. This study sought to test these propositions by Nina (2006) using Kikamba language. Figure 4.2 below is a summary of the propositions by Nina (2006).

**Figure 4.2: A summary of Nina’s (2006) proposition**

Next is the application of these to the analysis of the data collected.

**4.5 Analysis for SA or DM Function of Kikamba Interjections**

This section deals with the extracts that have interjections in them; from either the KSIM or the questionnaire, in order to analyse and determine the SA or the
DM functions of the interjection in the specific discourse, which the interjection appears in. By so doing, objective 3 of the study was resolved. This is because the study objective 3 sought to come up with categories of DMs as well as categories of SAs constituted by interjections in Kikamba language.

Below is an extensive mini dialogue (MN1) from KSIM. It had several interjections, which were analysed. Alphabetic numbers in bold type were used to identify the various parts of the mini dialogue for ease in identification.

In terms of presentation of the analysed data, the SAs aspect is first discussed and later the DMs

**MD 1**

Mũlinge : *Mbāa ndînamba kua?*  
Rain not started raining  
‘have the rains not started?’  

Mũoki : *aiee, kū nŷ kāmu vyū.*  
No, this place is dry really  

Mũlinge : *Kū kwitũ kwĩna ũnyenyẽ tũ na mbevo nŷ mbingi vyũ*  
This place ours has drizzles only and coldness is a lot very  
This place of ours has only drizzles and it is very cold’  

Mũoki : *Kwĩna kĩseve?*  
Is it there wind?  
‘Is it windy there?’  

Mũlinge : *Iī kīla mūthenya masaa ma wīo kwĩthĩawa na kĩseve kingĩ; na kītoo.*  
Yes, each day hours of evening there is and wind a lot and dust  
‘Yes, the evening hours of each day are windy and dusty’  

Mũoki : *Na ũtukũ nĩkwĩthĩawa na mbevo?*  
And night there is and coldness?)  
‘And are the night cold?’
Mülinge: *Aiee*, kwĩthĩawa na yuutia yingi mũno.

No, there is usually and sweat alot very
No , it is usually very sweaty

Mũoki: Asi, vole. Ḱa twĩkalange kũũ kwitũ, kĩtoo kyambe kũthela
Asi, sorry. Come we stay here our place dust until it settles.
‘Asi, sorry. Come and stay here with us at our place until the dust settles’


Yes. I will organize myself. Thinking will come Saturday
‘Yes. I will organize myself. I think I will come on Saturday’

Mũoki: Aaya, ngakweteela.

 Alright, I will wait for you
‘Alright, I will wait for you, ’

4.5.1 The Interjection ‘aiee’

The first interjection ‘aiee’ (which could be translated to mean ‘no’) identified as part (b) of the above utterance has various definitions, including it being an adverb, noun, determiner and an exclamation. Since the researcher adopted the working definition to include formulaic expressions such as the above response particle ‘aiee’ as interjections in the Literature Review section, this formed the basis its analysis. Going by the context of use of this interjection ‘aiee’ (no) is a confirmation of a negative statement; the negative statement here being ‘have the rains not started?’

The interjection was triggered by this negated question, which in terms of speech acts, form a direct directive. This is because a directive SA requires the listener to do something, in this case requesting for information in the form of a response. The negated statement denoted by letter (a) belongs to the core component of the ‘Inquiry’ CS. The interjection in (b) therefore serves to give
the information that the speaker sought (responding to the negated statement) and therefore belongs to the after component of the Inquiry CS. The interjection thus functions as a direct assertive since it involves the speaker putting forward a response to the negated sentence in (a).

The same interjection appears again in utterance (g) MN 1 and it serves the same function of a direct assertive SA as in the earlier context. This is because it provides the information which is being sought by the speaker (that it is usually quite warm) and the interjection was triggered by the direct directive in (f) that is ‘and are the nights cold?’. It can therefore be concluded that the interjection ‘aiie’ in the above contexts of use ((b) and (g)) form part of the CS structure (Scenario internal), and are therefore functioning as SA.

4.5.2 The Interjection ‘ĩĩ’

The interjection ‘ĩĩ’ appears in part (e) of MN 1 above. It is ordinarily a phatic interjection, and it may be translated to mean ‘YES’ since it belongs to the Secondary category of interjections. This utterance is the opposite of the above discussed interjection ‘aiie’. It is both a noun and an exclamation. There are various definitions originating from the exclamative nature of the interjection. However, going by the context in which the interjection appears, it is used to give an affirmative response to the core component of the ‘Inquiry CS’ ‘Is it windy there’ as in part (d) of the utterance. The interjection ‘ĩĩ’ thus serves the SA function of giving information to the direct directive (d). It is thus a direct
assertive SA belonging to the after component of the Inquiry CS. Another instance of this interjection appears on utterance (i) of Mini dialogue 1.

However, the context of use for this interjection is different from the one in part (d) of the above mini dialogue. This is because this interjection on part (i) does not seem to perform any informative function other than indicating continued attention to what is being said. It has no place within the CS of “inquiry” and serves the phatic function of language. In this case therefore, the interjection is used scenario-externally and thus a DM that serves to sustain the discourse floor (or act as filler).

4.5.3 The Interjection ‘Nata?’

MD2

Kilian : Nata?

hey
‘How are you?"
Serena : Ňikũseo, ũvoo waku?
It is well, news yours
‘It is well, how about you?’
Serena : Ň nesa wienda ata?
It good want you what?
‘it is well, what do you want?
Kilian : Nienda kwona ndakitali.
I want to see doctor
‘I want to see the Doctor’

The interjection ‘Nata’ is an interjection in the form of a formulaic expression - greetings. In the context of its use above, it is a component of the ‘greeting CS’. The interjection belongs to the core component of the CS for it represents the actual action itself in the form of a question, which should be responded to. The interjection is thus a SA for it is part of the ‘Greeting CS’ structure. It constitutes a directive SA in this context of use.
4.5.4 The Interjection ‘Mbathuke nivite!’

Let me pass! You know I feel angered me really

‘Let me pass! You know you have really angered me’

The exclamative statement ‘Mbathuke nivite!’ appears in QN2 of the questionnaire. It is a conative secondary interjection, calling for attention from the listener. In the context of use below, this interjection forms a key component in the CS structure. It could have been triggered by an earlier occurrence where the speaker of the utterance was angered by the person the utterance is directed to.

In this case, the interjection belongs to the core component of an ‘Order CS, since it commands the listener to ‘get off the speaker’s way’. It is therefore a directive SA ordering the listener to stay off the path of the speaker. It is expected that by hearing this interjection; the listener will undertake some actions and comply.

4.5.5 The Interjection ‘Niw’o!’

Speaker A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mun</th>
<th>Akwat</th>
<th>Ayuw</th>
<th>Nzou</th>
<th>Niwaile</th>
<th>Kwovwa</th>
<th>Mika</th>
<th>Ta</th>
<th>Ita</th>
<th>Kan</th>
<th>Wi</th>
<th>At</th>
<th>We</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pers</td>
<td>If</td>
<td>caught</td>
<td>Killin</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Elepha</td>
<td>nts</td>
<td>Should</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>Jaile</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>rs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a person is caught killing elephants, he should be jailed for about five years. Or what do you suggest?
Speaker B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niw’o,</th>
<th>Usu</th>
<th>Ini</th>
<th>Woni</th>
<th>Mâseu</th>
<th>Viu,</th>
<th>Nikana</th>
<th>Ìì</th>
<th>Nzou</th>
<th>Syikathele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUE,</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very,</td>
<td>So that</td>
<td>The</td>
<td>elephants</td>
<td>Don’t become extinct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘TRUE, that is a very good opinion, so that the elephants don’t become extinct.’

This secondary interjection ‘Niw’o!’ means ‘true’. In the above instance of use, it is an adjective meaning ‘accurate’ or ‘exact’. This interjection appeared in QN5 of the questionnaire. The interjection seems to concur with the statement made by Speaker A, that poaching should attract a heavy penalty so that elephants do not become extinct. In this case, it is a direct commissive and the triggering remark by Speaker A is in the form of a statement in imperative mood. The interjection thus a SA belonging to the after component of a suggestion CS.

4.5.6 The Interjection ‘Kwa sisya!’

Kwa sisya! Kíu ní kyaú! Nikwatyá tì nzoka!

Look out! What is that! I hope not a snake

‘Look out! What’s that! I hope it is not a snake’

The secondary conative interjection ‘Kwa sisya!’ appears in QN7 of the questionnaire. The interjection is carrying information for it seems to be calling for an action from the listener. It forms the core component of a Persuasion CS. The interjections could have been triggered by some sound heard around the speaker’s environment. The interjection is a directive SA for its ordering the listener to undertake some action (to be on the lookout)
4.5.7 The Interjection ‘Eka!’

This secondary conative interjection ‘Eka!’ appeared in QN8 of the questionnaire. It is used to command or order a stop to an intended action. Going by the contextual use of this interjection, the interjection belongs to the core component of an ‘Order CS’. It is carrying information for it seems to be calling for an action from the listener. The speaker seeing the listener stretching his bare hands to handle a hot cooking pan could have triggered the interjections. The interjection is thus a directive SA.

4.5.8 The Interjection ‘uuii…uuii’

The ‘uuii…uuii’ interjection is a desperate cry for help. The interjection appeared in QN 14 of the questionnaire. This interjection is in itself used to alert and convey information that help is desperately required; in this case, to put off fire. Even when used in isolation, this interjection is usually an information-carrying unit. Contextually, this interjection belongs to the core component of a persuasion CS; for it is after this utterance is uttered, that we expect action from the people around, coming on board to help put off the fire. It is a thus a directive SA for gets the audience to undertake an action.
The following interjections had the DM functions, going by the contextual circumstances of their usage. The mini dialogue (MN1) below has been used to analyze the DMs as well, and the alphabetical

4.5.9 The Interjection ‘asi’

**MD 1**

**Mũlinge:** Mũa ndĩnamba kua?
Rain not started raining
‘have the rains not started?’ .............................................a

**Mũoki:** aiee, kũu nĩ kũmu vyũ.
No, this place is dry really
No, this place is really dry .............................................b

**Mũlinge:** Kũũ kwitũ kwĩna ũnyenyẽ tũ na mbevo nĩ mbingĩ vyũ
This place ours has drizzles only and coldness is a lot very
This place of ours has only drizzles and it is very cold’ .................c

**Mũoki:** Kwĩna kĩseve?
Is it there wind?
‘Is it windy there? ........................................................d

**Mũlinge:** Iĩ kĩla mũthenya masaa ma wĩoo kwĩthĩawa na kĩseve kingĩ; na kĩtoo.
Yes, each day hours of evening there is and wind a lot and dust
‘Yes, the evening hours of each day are windy and dusty’...............e

**Mũoki:** Na ũtukũ nĩkwĩthĩawa na mbevo?
And night there is and coldness?
‘And are the night cold?’ ..................................................f

**Mũlinge:** Aiee, kwĩthĩawa na yuutia yingi mũno.
No, there is usually and sweat alot very
No, it is usually very sweaty’.............................................g

**Mũoki:** Asi, vole. Ĭka twĩkalange kũũ kwitũ, kĩtoo kyambe kũthela Asi, sorry. Come we stay here our place dust until it settles.
‘Asi, sorry. Come and stay here with us at our place until the dust settles’ ..........h

**Mũlinge:** Ji. Nĩsĩlya ngoooka wathanhatu.
Yes. I will organize myself. Thinking will come Saturday
‘Yes. I will organize myself. I think I will come on Saturday’..............i

**Mũoki:** Aaya, ngakweteela.
Alright, will wait for you
‘Alright, I will wait for you, ...............................................j
The interjection ‘asi’ belongs to the primary expressive interjection category of interjection by Ameka (1994). It may take other forms such as si! or asiisi!

This interjection can be solely used or used together with another interjection as in the case of part (h) of MN 1 above. In this context, the interjection ‘asi’ is used first then followed by the secondary interjection in form of a formulaic expression ‘vole’.

This combination of interjections produces the effect of not only an understanding of the on-going discourse (surprised that the weather has been unfriendly-‘asi’) but also sympathizing with the situation as portrayed by the triggering remark (vole). ‘Asi’ in this case fulfils the DM function signalling the understanding of the on-going discourse and ‘vole’ belongs to the result component of the ‘inquiry CS’ and was triggered by utterance (d). ‘Asi’ as a DM here is used to acquire floor without change of topic while ‘vole’ is an expressive SA of empathy. When used in isolation, this interjection functions as a SA since when uttered, it communicates some mishap.

4.5.10 The Interjection ‘aaya’

This secondary phatic interjection ‘aaya’ could be translated to mean ‘alright’. According to the context of use on utterance (j); (Mũoki : aaya, ngakweteela……….j) the interjection ‘aaya’ does not occupy an informative position and since it indicates concurrence to the statement in (i). Moreover, the expression that comes after the interjection can as well communicate the meaning that the interjection seems to convey. The interjection therefore
functions as a DM that seems to summarize the entire conversation between the two speakers since it is at the conclusion part of the MN1.

4.5.11 The Interjection ‘Ngai wakwa’

MN6

**MWAITU:** Kwina kivosya kya muthelo? is there cure for HIV/AIDS?
‘Is there a cure for HIV/AIDS?’ ............................................. (a)

**OVISA:** Aiee, vai kivosya ona vanwe
No, there is no cure at all.
‘No, there is no cure at all’ ..................................................(b)

**MUTUMIA:** Ngai wakwa! nayu twiika ata ovisa
God my now we do What Officer?
‘My God! Now what should we do Officer?’ .................(c)

This expressive secondary interjection could be translated to mean ‘my God’. It may take other forms such as *mwa ngai wakwa*! or *ngai*! And it appears in part (c) in MN6 above. According to the context of usage for this interjection above, it is a reaction to the preceding utterance denoted by (b), that there is no cure for AIDS. The interjection does not seem to convey information that is crucial in the CS, other than expressing disbelief indicated by the interjection ‘Ngai wakwa’. This interjection therefore functions as a DM that shows subjectivity in form of a reaction in this discourse.

4.5.12 The Interjection ‘Ooo’

MD7

**Mary:** Wĩenda kuthi sukulu yĩva?
You want to go school which?
‘Which school do you want to go to?’

**Tom:** Nienda kuthi ila yĩtawa Vyũlya masii.
I want to go that called Vyulya Masii.
‘I want to go to that school called Vyulya Masii.’

**Mary:** Ooo ona sukulu īsu yĩ vaasanga ,kwoou enda na lelu āyũ ....
Ooo, even school that is not far so go and road this.....
‘Ooo, even that school is not far, so you go by this road’
(Gives out the direction to Vyulya Masii School)

Tom: Nüseo muño kiveti.
It is good very woman.
‘That is very good woman’

It is a primary interjection of the phatic subcategory. Going by the context of use above, the interjection serves to introduce the speaker (Mary) to acquire the floor and give directions to Vyulya Masii School. It is thus a DM of turn taking, as per Brinton’s taxonomy of DMs.

4.5.13 The Interjection ‘Mwa’

Mwa! ninyie ūkūuma? Nītukwikwatana nīnaku!
Mwa! is it me you insulting? I will deal with you

‘Mwa! is it me you are insulting? I will deal with you’

The interjection ‘Mwa’ appeared in QN1 of the questionnaire. According to the use in the above context, it is an expressive interjection, showing subjectivity by reacting to the preceding discourse. It could have been triggered by an action or remark. Going by Brinton’s taxonomy of DM, it is functioning to structure discourse, and specifically to show subjectivity.

4.5.14 The Interjection ‘kwikwi’

Kwikwi naku Nunginyite Kyaa
Kwikwi You Are stepping Toe
‘Kwikwi you are stepping on my toe’

The interjection ‘Kwikwi’ appeared in QN3 of the questionnaire was classified as an emotive expressive interjection. It is an expression of pain. According to the use in this statement, it was triggered by the listener’s earlier action of physically stepping on the toe of the speaker. It functions to show subjectivity
by reacting to the action of the listener stepping on the speaker’s toe. It was thus concluded that the interjection functions to structure discourse by showing subjectivity. Moreover, this interjection may function as a SA when used in isolation. When a speaker utters it, those around her environment are likely to move or ask if there is any matter since the interjection is used to indicate pain. That way, the interjection would be an information-carrying unit.

**4.5.15 The Interjection ‘Eee’**

**Speaker A:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Ilovi</th>
<th>Niw’o</th>
<th>Mūsyì</th>
<th>munene</th>
<th>Wa</th>
<th>Nthì</th>
<th>Yiķì?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Of</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Which?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘Nairobi is the capital city of which country?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speaker B:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Ilovi</th>
<th>Niw’o</th>
<th>Mūsyì</th>
<th>munene</th>
<th>Wa</th>
<th>Eee</th>
<th>kenyà</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme-for morpheme</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Of</td>
<td>Eee</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘Nairobi is the capital city of eee Kenya’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interjection ‘eee’ is a primary phatic in nature. The above instance of use of the interjection ‘Eee’ shows that this interjection serves as filler by Speaker B to hold the floor in an attempt to remember the country whose Capital City is Nairobi. It serves to organize discourse and therefore a DM since it is not carrying any information. The interjection appeared in QN4 of the questionnaire.
4.5.16 The Interjection ‘fũũ..fũ’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Mbi</th>
<th>Kiko</th>
<th>Mbe</th>
<th>Kiu</th>
<th>Kinyung</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>ini</th>
<th>mwik</th>
<th>Nitaiku</th>
<th>Matum</th>
<th>Vau</th>
<th>Nth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fũũ..fũ</td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Tha′t</td>
<td>Smelling</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Mwikali</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>beaten</td>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>There</td>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbi</td>
<td>fũũ..fũ</td>
<td>Be quiet</td>
<td>We listen</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>What</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘fũũ..fũ that cup is smelling bad, Mwikali may have beaten eggs in there’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interjection ‘fũũ..fũ’ is a primary expressive interjection for a bad/awful smell. From the above QN6 of the questionnaire, the interjection is a reaction given out after a previous experience of handling a cup. It is the speaker’s way of showing subjectivity. This therefore means that in the above context, the interjection functions as a DM. However, if this interjection is solely used in a given context, it could be a SA since once it is uttered, those around will definitely understand that there is an awful smell originating from somewhere.

4.5.17 The Interjection ‘Shii’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kikamba</th>
<th>Shii</th>
<th>Kwakilya</th>
<th>Twithukiisye</th>
<th>Kiu</th>
<th>Ni</th>
<th>Kyau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mbi</td>
<td>Shii</td>
<td>Be quiet</td>
<td>We listen</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>Is</td>
<td>What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free translation</td>
<td>‘shii be quiet we listen to what that could be’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Kikamba interjection ‘Shii’ could have been borrowed from English language for it is similar to the English interjection ‘Shh’. The conative interjection calls for silence from the listener and it is a reaction to a previous incident of may be some noise outside the house. This makes the interjection a DM serving to show subjectivity to the immediate previous occurrence. Just like the earlier discussed interjections fuu...fu and kwikwi, this interjection will function as a SA if used in isolation; because if someone utters this interjection
in a given place, those around will get the information that silence is expected from them.

4.5.18 The Interjection ‘Ng’o!’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutie</th>
<th>Atumīaa</th>
<th>Kīla</th>
<th>Wakwata</th>
<th>Kāāa</th>
<th>Nzovi,</th>
<th>Nyi e</th>
<th>Yu</th>
<th>N ’go</th>
<th>Ndiam ba</th>
<th>kumun enga</th>
<th>mbe sa</th>
<th>syakwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutie</td>
<td>Spends</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>He gets</td>
<td>To buy</td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>N’go</td>
<td>I can’t</td>
<td>Give</td>
<td>money</td>
<td>mine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Ng’o!’ means vowing not to do something. It exists in Kiswahili language in the unchanged form as ‘Ng’o!’ . This interjection was chosen as the correct choice for QN10 of the questionnaire. According to this instance of use above, this is a cognitive expressive interjection that is showing subjectivity by reacting to the preceding discourse, that Mutie is a spendthrift. For this reason, it is a DM showing subjectivity. The interjection is optional in this context and its omission cannot change the intended meaning.

4.5.19 The interjection ‘ai!’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaloki</th>
<th>Nyie ivindi ya mbevo nendete kwikia ikoti na tai.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Me time of cold I like putting on a coat and tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I like putting on a coat and a tie when it is cold’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mwose</th>
<th>Ai, nyie ndyendete ikoti indi ninendete kwikia vulana na tai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ai, me I don’t like a coat but I like putting on sweater and tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Ai, I don’t like a coat, but I like putting on a sweater and a tie’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This interjection ‘ai!’ means giving a contrary opinion about something. It appeared in MN4 of the KSIM. From the above mini dialogue, this interjection was used by the speaker (in this case Mwose ) to air a contrary opinion
regarding his dress code on a chilly day. It was used to aid the speaker acquire the floor and voice his opinion. This makes this interjection function as a DM.

4.6 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, interjections in Kikamba language were identified as belonging to various structural categories (objective 1). It was established that interjections occur at sound, word, phrase, clause and sentential levels. 10 sound level interjections were analysed, 10 word level, 6 phrase level interjections, 1 clausal interjection and 5 sentential level interjections. This brings to 32 interjections from both the questionnaire and the KSIM. This structural description of interjections was guided by the working definition adopted in this study. The working definition of an interjection was borrowed from Leech et al (1982) and Ameka (1992).

In attaining objective 2 of the study, the functions of interjections and the contextual conditions defining their functions in Kikamba language discourses was done. This was guided by Ameka’s (1992) FTI. The contextual conditions defining the interjectional functions that were discussed include; the position of an interjection in discourse and the concept of CS. It is worth noting that Kikamba interjections can be classified following Ameka’s (FTI). These were the Secondary and Primary broad categories of interjections. They were identified were further narrowed down to the expressive, conative and phatic functions of interjections, which were all, present in Kikamba language. In terms of the distribution of these interjections in discourse, it was established that most of the interjections appear at the initial position of an utterance.
However, others appear at the middle position of an utterance with few appearing at the final position of an utterance. This distribution did not however appear to influence the role a given interjection played in discourse, but the positioning of the interjection within the CS.

The concept of CS by Nina (2006) mentioned above proved useful in further identifying and differentiating the DM/SA functions that interjections in the collected data appeared to play. In doing this, objective 3 of the study was achieved, since the objective aimed at compiling the categories of DMs and SAs constituted by the interjections in Kikamba language discourses. The research findings revealed that any interjection might function as either a SA or a DM. It was established that the role played by an interjection in discourse (either as SA or as DM) was dictated by the context and position in which the interjection appeared in discourse.

The SAs functions of interjections were done guided by the SAT by Austin (1962). Regarding the SA function of an interjection in discourse, the study established that, when an interjection is used to convey some information, they are in that case information transmitting units and thus a SA, just as Nina (2006) had observed. In addition to this, for an interjection to perform a SA function in discourse, the interjection must be triggered by some other remarks, the general situation of communication or by the actions of one of the participants. Nina (2006) had established this and thus the study provided more information by building on her claim. Concerning the position of the interjection serving the SA function, Nina (2006) had observed that the
interjection must occupy one of the earlier mentioned components of a CS, since it should be used scenario-internally. This claim was substantiated and supported in this study. The main types of SA constituted by the interjections analysed here were mainly two; the assertive S.As and the directive S.As.

Finally, about the DM function of the interjections, the following was established; guided by the Brinton’s (1996) taxonomy of DMs. Here, interjections had to appear to be structuring or organizing discourse for them to be termed as DMs. The interjection had to be used outside the CS (Scenario-External), and should not occupy an integral part of the CS. A number of categories of DM constituted by the interjections were established. The categories included, DMs functioning to acquire floor, Serve as fillers in order to sustain discourse floor, Show subjectivity and DMs used to summarize a communication situation. The category that was common was that of DMs used to show subjectivity by expressing a response/reaction to the preceding discourse or situation.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter dealt with the data analysis, presentation and interpretation, and a chapter summary given to consolidate the findings. Next is the last chapter of this study; the Summary of findings, Recommendations and Conclusions.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter consists of a consolidated summary of the findings, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of findings
The study examined the discourse functions of interjections in Kikamba language. It first focused on the structural forms of interjections (Objective 1) in Kikamba language. The structural analysis of the interjections was informed and guided by the working definition. The working definition was formulated from the studies by Leech et al (1982) and Ameka (1992). The interjections analysed were belonging to any of these categories derived from the working definition; primary interjections (true interjections), secondary interjections (interjectional phrases), formulaic expressions and some exclamatory expressions as identified by Ameka (1992).

Out of these categories, the researcher concluded that in terms of structural classifications, the categories would fit in various levels, which were: sound, word, phrase, clause and sentential levels. The interjections that were categorized as belonging to the sound level structure were 10 in number. At the word level, the interjections were 10 in total, 6 phrase level interjections, 1 clausal interjection and 5 sentential level structure interjections. Thus, 32 interjections from both the questionnaire and the KSIM were analysed to
determine their structure. The following were the analysed interjections in their respective structural levels;

a) At sound structure level (10) - kwikwi, fîũ..fũ!, shii, uuui..uuui, eee, ooo, ng’o, ai, mwa and si(asi).

b) At word structure level (10); eka, Ngai, niw’o, nata, aiee, ũĩ , kino,aaya, pole and sisya.

c) Interjections at phrase level also called the interjectional phrases were six in number and they were; mwa ngai wakwa, ngai wakwa, naku ũĩ, ata yu, aii...aie and ni muvea.

d) The interjections which were clauses in nature were few, that was one in number and according to the data analysed they were eka naku.

e) At the sentence structure level, interjections were five in number and they included; akia ngai(I swear by god!), ekana na nguî (You stop joking!), and mbathuke nivite!ekela vau (You stop there!)and kwa sisya(you look out!) The sentence level interjections mainly comprised of exclamation statements.

These interjections belonged to the broad categories of primary (true interjections) and secondary interjections (semantically independent words used contextually as interjections).

On objective 2 of the study, the functions of interjections and the contextual conditions defining their functions in Kikamba language discourses were done. This was guided by Ameka’s (1992) FTI. The contextual conditions defining the interjctional functions that were discussed include; the position of an
interjection in discourse and the concept of CS. It is worth noting that Kikamba interjections could be classified following Ameka’s (1992) FTI. The functional categories identified were; expressive, conative and phatic functions of interjections, which were all present in Kikamba language.

a) The expressive function of interjections refers to the mental state of a speaker. Expressive interjections are further subdivided into the emotive and cognitive functions. The emotive interjections express the speaker’s mental state relating to emotions and sensations they have at the time of an utterance. The cognitive interjections pertain to the knowledge state and thought at the time of utterance. Interjections belonging to this function were; kwikwi, fũũ..fũ!, ng’o, ai, mwa, si(asi), Ngai, niw’o, mwa ngai wakwa, ngai wakwa, vole, naku ĩĩ and ata yu

b) Conative interjections are auditor directed and usually aimed at getting someone’s attention or demand a response /action from someone. The following interjections belonged to the conative function; shii, uuu..uuu, sisya, eka, and nata.

c) Phatic functions of interjections involve starting and maintaining a communicative contact. The interjections responsible for this function included; ekana na ngui, kwa sisya, ĩĩ,aaya,ni muvea, eee, ooo, aiee,aii-aie,ekela vau,akiangai and eka naku.

In terms of the contextual conditions defining the role of an interjection in discourse, the distribution of these interjections in discourse was established.
Most of the interjections appeared at the initial position of an utterance. However, others appeared at the middle position of an utterance with few appearing at the final position of an utterance. It was however revealed that this distribution of interjections did not influence the function of an interjection. What influenced the role of an interjection in discourse was the context of use of an interjection and its position within the CS.

This distribution did not however appear to influence the role a given interjection played in discourse, but the positioning of the interjection within the CS. The concept of CS by Panther and Thornburg (2003) cited by Nina (2006) was thus used in further identifying and differentiating the DM/SA functions that interjections in the collected data appeared to play. In doing this, objective 3 of study was achieved, since the objective aimed at compiling the categories of DMs and SAs constituted by the interjections in Kikamba language discourses. The research findings revealed that any interjection could function as either a SAs (information carrying units) or a DMs (discourse structuring). The same interjection would be a DM in a conversation A and function as a SA in conversation B. The SAs were analysed using Speech Acts Theory (SAT) by J.L Austin (1962) while the DMs functions were analysed using Brinton’s (1996) Taxonomy of DMs. Interjections performed the SA function due to their aspect of occupying a key part of the CS components. There were mainly two SA functions identified in the data analysed. These were the assertive S.As and the directive SAs.
As for the DMs, the DM functions constituted by the analysed interjections included; DM functioning to acquire floor, Serve as fillers in order to sustain discourse floor, Show subjectivity and DMs used to summarize a communication situation. The category that was common was that of DMs used to show subjectivity by expressing a response/reaction to the preceding discourse or situation.

5.3 Conclusions

The study has demonstrated that the presence of interjections in Kikamba language discourses (and especially in Kîmasaku dialect) serve a variety of important roles. They are information-carrying units and they help in structuring discourse. This therefore means that interjections should not be seen as expletives; that is elements whose function is no function at all or spurious expressions. Instead, interjections should be viewed as significant elements just like the other word classes such as nouns and verbs.

5.4 Recommendations

Going by the findings of the study, the following are the recommendations directed to different language users and developers. First, different language users and speech writers ought to be enlightened on the importance of interjections in language use. This is so because interjections are structurally diverse elements loaded with information, acts and expressions, which are important in any meaningful communication.

Secondly, in educational curriculum, the language subjects developers need to provide fleshy information concerning interjections just the same way other
word classes have adequate details. The interjection have scanty details in both the primary and secondary school English/ Kiswahili curriculum, and this scantiness trickles down to interjections details in other languages, of which this should not be the case. A lot can be said about the structural and functional aspects of this important word class across different languages.

Thirdly, although interjections are mainly associated with informal communication, it is worth noting that interjections should be incorporated into formal language use for the purposes of achieving effective communication; particularly in public speaking and in performing literary art. The use of interjections in such fields will enhance the style of language presentation such as use of speech acts and proper structuring of discourse, expressive communication and delivery of information, both directly and the implied form.

5.5 Suggestions for further Research

The study used Kîmasaku dialect of the Kikamba language. A research can be conducted in another dialect of the Kikamba language such as the Kitui dialect, which to some extend differs from the Kîmasaku dialect. This will provide a basis for comparison and conclusion on the nature of interjections in Kikamba language.

Interjections use in discourse in other native Kenyan languages should also be researched on, since interjections are largely said to be language specific (Aijmer, 2004). This will provide more information on the nature and
behaviour of interjections, thereby enriching this area of study, which in the past has been considered marginal in most languages.

Since the study analysed data from a questionnaire and a book, a research can be undertaken using other data sources such as radio setup discourses or real-life conversations of native speakers in order to determine the importance of interjections; which for a long period have largely been ignored and considered useless in meaning delivery.

Moreover, a study on the impact and significance of interjections on perception of communicative competence should be carried out since individuals judge others going by the manner in which a speaker communicates (Eastman 1975, cited in Makuto 2009). This will go a long way in determining whether the lack or use of interjections in mainly informal conversations hinders the perceptions of the intended meaning.

From this study, it has come out that interjections is a broad word class, ranging from the primary/secondary interjections, to the sub categories of expressive, conative and phatic interjection. A detailed research study into one of these sub-categories of interjections can be conducted, either using Kikamba language or any other African language. This could provide clear and critical information on each of the categories studied. Variables such as gender and age could also be incorporated and find out how interjections use among people of different ages and gender varies.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1-QUESTIONNAIRE

I am a Masters student at Kenyatta University, Department of Literature, Linguistics and Foreign Languages. Currently, I am conducting a research for a thesis in Partial fulfilment of course as required by the university. My research topic is: Discourse functions of interjections in Kikamba.

I humbly request your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. Information collected from this questionnaire will be handled with high confidentiality and will only be used for academic purposes by the researcher.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Please tick the appropriate option

1. Gender
   [ ] Male                      [ ] Female

2. Age
   [ ] 25 and below    [ ] 26-35    [ ] 46-55    [ ] 56-60

Dear Participants,

This questionnaire aims to find out whether you are aware of commonly used Kikamba interjections and their related use in different contexts. Part d).......in the choices is left blank for any other interjection which the respondent feels can feel the gap correctly as per the instructions. Pick the correct choice by underlining it.
NB: Written in italics are the utterance and the interjections in Kikamba language. 
What is enclosed in brackets is the English translation version of the Kikamba utterance/statement.

1 ______Ninyie ũkũuma? Nũtukwikwatana intake!
   ______(Is it me you are insulting? I will deal with you appropriately)
   a) Mwa! b) ũ, c) ata? d).........................

2 _________! Okou ni iw’a unthatisye viũ.
   _________(you know I feel you have really angered me.)
   a) mbathũke nũvitũke! b) nata c) nayu? d) .....................

3 ______ naku nũnginyĩte kyaa.
   ______(You are stepping on my toe)
   a) Wee..., b) kwikwi! c) haha, d) ............... 

4 Speaker A: Ilovi nũw’o mũsyĩ munene wa nthĩ yĩkũ? (ilovi is the Capital City of which country?)
   Speaker B: Ilovi nũw’o mũsyĩ mũnene wa ______ kenya.
   (Nairobi is the Capital City of ______ Kenya)
   a) eie..., b) eee..., c) aaa... d) .....................
5 Speaker A: Mündü akwatwa ayūwaa nzou nǐwaile kwovwa miaka ta ikūmi.....kana wĩona ata wee?(When a poacher is caught killing an elephant, he should be jailed for about ten years...or what do you think?)

Speaker B: ______, ūsu nì woni mūseo viū, nikana ii nzou syĩkathele. (_______That’s a good opinion, so that our elephants don’t become extinct.)

a)Eka., b)uka.., c)nĩw’o (true!) d) .............

6 ______Kikombe kū kĩnyunga naĩ, mwĩkali nĩtaũkũniĩie matumbī vau nthĩnĩ.

_______(That cup has a bad smell, Mwikali may have beaten some eggs in there).

a)fiũũ...fũ! b)ayiee..., c)ia....., d) .............

7 ______Kū nĩ kyaũ! Nikwatya ti nzoka!

_______(What’s that? I hope it is not a snake)

a)Kwa sisya!...(look out) b) mmm.. , c)aaa.. , d) .............

8 ______Nūvya nĩ kikaangi kīu.

(______That cooking pan will burn your hands).

a)eka! (stop!) b)ia!, c)osa! d) .........................
9 Kwakilya twithukisye kũ nĩ kyaũ....

(_________ be quiet we listen to what that could be.)

a)atayu?  
b)mmm..... ,  
c)shii.... ,  
d)...........

10 Mutie atũmũaa kĩla wakwata kũũa nzovi, nyie yu ______ ,Ndiamba kũmũnengwa mbesa syakwa. (Mutie uses all the money he gets to buy local brew, I________ cannot give him my money.)

a)Nĩw’o?  
b)aaa..... ,  
c)Ng’o!  
d).........................

11 ______, īw’a nthoni ůyũia mana mũndũ wĩana taku!

(_______shame on you, such a mature person like you shouldn’t cry for no good reason)

a)Si! /asiisi!  
b)eee..,  
c)aie,  
d).........................


(I cannot fear him regardless of whom he is ______ there is nothing he can do to me. I can even call the police if he jokes around with me.)

a)eka!  
b) kyaũ yu! (what now!)  
c)ata....,  
d).............

13 ______ weekanya ata naku?Ndawa īsu kote nthũku mũno.

(_______what have you just done? That drug substance is very dangerous).
a) ya!,  b)mwanaku(and you!)  c)mwangai/ngai   d) ............... 

14 Mwaki! Mwaki!_______ mwaki! mwaki.
(Fire! Fire!_______ fire! fire).

a)Hahaa    b)weeee    c)uuii...uuii   d) .........................

15 ______________kana kau kayavalũka naĩ!
(that baby has terribly fallen!)

a)aaa....   b)eee....   c)ngai!   d) .........................

16 List other Kikamba interjections that you may know and their possible meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interjection</th>
<th>Meaning of the interjection/example of its usage in a statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation.

Faith M. Muthoka
APPENDIX 2: MINIDIALOGUES FROM THE KIKAMBA SELF-INSTRUCTION MANUAL

MD 1  Mũlinge : Mbũa ndĩnamba kua?
    Mũoki : aiee kũu nĩ kũmu vyũ.
    Mũlinge : Kũũ kwitũ kwĩna ũnyenyeũ tũ na mbevo nĩ mbingĩ vyũ.
    Mũoki : Kwĩna kĩseve?
    Mũlinge : Ji kĩla múthenya masaa ma wĩoo kwĩthĩawa na kĩseve
             kingĩ; na kĩtoo.
    Mũoki : Na ūtukũ nĩkwĩthĩawa na mbevo?
    Mũlinge : Aiee, kwĩthĩawa na yuutia yingi mũno.
    Mũoki : Asi, vulè. Õka twĩkalange kũũ kwitũ, kĩtoo kynambe
            kũthela.
    Mũlinge : Ji. Nĩngwĩyũmbanya. Nĩĩsǐlya ngooka wathanthatu..
    Mũoki : aaya, ngakweteela

MD 2  Kilian : Nata?
    Serena : Nĩkũseo, ũvoo waku?
    Serena : Nĩ nesa wĩenda ata?
    Kilian : Nienda kwona ndakitali.

MD 3  Mwongela : Nĩwendete kĩwũ kya masungwa?
    Mwongeli : ĩĩ nĩnendete mũno
    Mwongeli : Aaya kwata.
    Mwongela : Ni múvea mũno

MD 4  Kaloki : Nata Moses?
    Moses : Nĩ kũseo muno, ũvoo waku?
    Kaloki : Ti múthũku. Wĩkĩite ngũa nyingi ũu nĩki?
    Moses : Nũndũ nĩrra mbevo. Nĩkĩite múvuuto, sati ya moko maasa,
            sokisi, iatu, ngovia na músvi.
    Kaloki : Nake Mũeni ekĩite kyaũ?
Moses : Mũeni ekīite īlinda, kavuti na kītambaa kya mútwe.
Kaloki : Nyie ivindi ya mbevo nendete kwikia ikoti na tai.
Moses : Ai, nyie ndyendete īkoti īndī ninendete kwīkīa vulana na tai.
Kaloki : Eka nīīthī mūisyī, ngose ikoti, niiwa mbevo mūno.

MD 5 Rian: Mwaitu aumite Masaku vandu vetawa Iveti.
Mutinda: Ooo ninisi iveti, na ekalaa va?ekalaa Amelika.

MD 6 Ovisa: Muthelo ni kyau?
Atui: Muthelo ni kuowa kana kiumo.
Ovisa: Muthelo ni uwau ula uetawe ni kwaa vinya wa mwii.
Atui: Ata?.
Ovisa: Uetawe ni kwisila kwanana ki mwii na na mundu wina muthelo, kwikiwa kana kukwata nthakame ila yina muthelo, kutumia syindu ta sindano, kawembe, vamwe na mundu muwau, ona mwana no akwatwe ni muthelo ivindya ya kusyawani mundu muka wina muthelo Mwaitu: Kwina kivosya kya muthelo?
Ovisa: Aiee, vai kivosya ona vamwe.
Mutumia: Ngai wakwa? nayu twiika ata ovisa
Ovisa: Ikulyo iseo mutumia, ithiwa mwikiiku kwai mwendwa waku, ndukonane kiimwii utena kondomu, ethiwa nomuvaka wonane kiimwii nuseo kutumia kondomu, na omuno ndukatumie kindu ta kawembe, sindano ndumie.

MD 7 Tom: Wĩ mūseo kīveti.
Mary: Nīmūseo kwewa ata?
Tom: Eka kūina āthūkū nutonya kūmbonia lelu wa kūthī sukulu?
Mary: Wienda kuthi sukulu yīva?
Tom: Nienda kuthi ila yītawa vyūlya masii.
Mary: Ooo ona sukulu īsu yī vaasanga kwoou enda na lelu ūyū mūvaka wone vandū ve kīth kīasa kwoko kwa aūme ītīna wa kwona kīthī kīu enda vanini na nūona lelū wa mūthanga vau kūna kona kwoko kwa
aka na ündee na mbee, nüona kivwaũ kya sukuku īsu kwoko kwa aũme.

**Tom** : Nüseo mũno kiveti.

**Mary** : Thi na ûseo.
APPENDIX 3: CONTENT ANALYSIS GUIDE

This research tool was used in analysing the mini dialogues from the Kikamba Self-Instruction Manual

THEME - Kikamba language interjection
The interjection should have the following feature;

a. Primary interjection- true interjection in the form of sound, word, phrase, clause and sentence

b. Secondary interjection-semantically independent word, but used as an interjection. In the structural form of sound, word, phrase, clause and sentence

c. Interjectional phrases

d. Formulaic expression – also called routines , and include greetings, apologies, appreciation words among others
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