KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LINGUISTICS

FORMS AND FUNCTIONS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN CONVERSATIONS AMONG SPEAKERS OF KABRAS

VICTOR MAKUTO MOLENJE
C50/10263/06

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND LINGUISTICS IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS OF KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER 2009
DECLARATION

This dissertation is my original work and has not been presented for examination by any other candidate in any other university.

Signature: __________________________ Date: 5th October 2009

Name: Victor Makuto Molenje

This dissertation has been submitted with our approval as the university supervisors.

Name Dr Emily A. Ogutu
Signature: __________________________ Date: 28/10/2009

Name: Dr Eunice A. Nyamasyo
Signature: __________________________ Date: 19/10/09
DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to two people: my mother Violet N. Makuto-Thank you for introducing me to love books at a tender age when you borrowed story books for me from the Kenya National library Service, while I was in primary school.

To my beloved the late Fousia W. Makuto- You have inspired us to work hard and achieve anything in life. God bless you.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This masters program provided me with an opportunity to grow and mature in the scholarly circles. There were challenges that I encountered, I am indebted to all the people who gave their time, money and other resources without which this study would not be a dream come true. It is not possible for me to name all of you; however the following deserve special attention.

I am grateful to my supervisors Dr Emilly A. Ogutu and Dr Eunice A. Nyamasyo who took their time to read my work right from the infant stage and also nurtured me into the person that I am today. You collectively took your time to read, analyze and give comments on the dissertation, bringing in your long expertise and knowledge that this document is a success, without the two of you; mine would be a different story. I would also like to thank my mum –Violet Makuto and dad Francis Makuto for emotional and financial support that you gave me throughout the entire period.

Special thanks to my cousin Charles R.S. Wambongo of Geography Department Kenyatta University, words can't express how invaluable you were to me “orio.” My friends Humphrey S. Maluti and Hillary S. Mulama I am glad we met. And to my brothers Eric, Dan and my sister Susan, thank you for the moral support. Lastly to baby Winrose Fau- may you grow to be a scholar.

Finally I thank God for bringing me this far. You are truly a wonderful God.
ABSTRACT

Natural spoken discourse contains many instances of redundant interjections and backchannel utterances, these utterances have not hitherto received much attention and few systematic analyses have been made, since they were regarded as useless spurious expressions. In this study, it is demonstrated that indeed these expressions henceforth referred to as Discourse Markers (DMs) are important elements in a conversation given the various functions that they serve.

The corpus of this study consisted of conversations captured through tape recording of native speakers of Kabras. The two variables are the gender and age of the respondent. The conversations were collected and analyzed by aid of the Edmondson (1981) model of spoken discourse for the presence of DMs. The results show that conversations in Kabras indeed have DMs just like those identified in English (Schiffrin, 1987, Blakemore, 2002). On the other hand, when it comes to the forms of the discourse markers, it is observed that given that Kabras is an agglutinating dialect, there were more categories for the markers as compared to those categories found in English. These DMs appeared in the beginning, middle and at the end of moves and exchanges.

Age comparison between young and old speakers of Kabras revealed no significant difference between speaker usage of DMs and age. The study however does show significant gender differences in the usage of DMs by the respondents. Women are observed to use more DMs in their speech as compared to men. It is also evident that women use more DMs that have polite forms as compared to men.

Finally, the study demonstrates that DMs are not spurious expressions or expletives, that is expressions whose function is no function at all, but expressions that serve a number of functions in conversations such as, serving to increase the interpersonal relationship among the speakers and also assist in letting the speakers interrupt others politely.
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

DMs-Discourse Markers

SAT-Speech Act Theory

RT - Relevance Theory

$M_m$ - Mean for men

$SD_m$ - Standard deviation for men

$M_w$ - Mean for women

$SD_w$ - Standard deviation for women
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Social networks: A given person’s day-to-day contacts. An individual may be linked to others in a number of role relationships. For example as friends, tribes mates, Church mates, college mates and work mates.

Discourse- A structured event manifest in linguistic (and other) behavior.

Discourse Markers: These are elements found in utterances or conversations. The elements are not part of the semantic or syntactic structure of the utterance but serve to the union of the utterance and other conversational functions such as increasing the interpersonal relationship between the interlocutors.

Utterance: Is a stretch of talk by one person before and after which there is silence on the part of that person.

Conversation- An informal talk between two or more people where there is exchange of information. The outcome of a conversation is communication.

Language- The system of human communication by means of sounds or their written representations combine to form larger units such as morphemes, words and sentences. A language is made up dialects or varieties.

Dialect- A regionally or socially distinctive variety of a language usually associated with a distinctive pronunciation. In this study, Kabras, which is a dialect of Luhya, is operationally defined as a language.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background to the study

This is a study on Discourse Markers in Kabras, a dialect of Luhya. Luhya is a Bantu language. Its speakers are referred to as Abaluhya and they inhabit over eight thousand square kilometers to the north of Lake Victoria in the Western Province of Kenya (ff appendix 5).

The Kabras dialect is among the seventeen dialects of the Luyia language namely: Luloogoli, Lwisukha, Bukusu, Nyore, Wanga, Tachoni, Marachi, Kisa, Nyala K, Nyala B, Tsotso, Khayo, Samia, Marama, Lwitakho and Tiriki (Osogo, 1996). The Luhya, also referred to as Luyia, or Abaluhya, belong to the larger linguistic stock known as the Bantu. They comprise of several subgroups with different but mutually understood linguistic dialects (ff Appendix 3).

Migration of the Luhya to their present Western Kenya location dates back to the second half of the fifteenth century. Immigrants into present-day Luhyaland came mainly from Eastern and Western Uganda and trace their ancestry to several Bantu groups, and to other non-Bantu groups such as the Kalenjin, Luo, and Maasai. However, some Luyia clans claim they came from West Africa. They did not migrate collectively as one group but came in small groupings which form part of their dialectal groupings (Osogo, 1960).
The Kabras are concentrated around the Malava constituency Kakamega north district Western Province (ff appendix 5). The ancestors of the Abakabalasi originally came from Judea in Bethlehem and settled in Egypt where the rest of the Abaluyia people also lived. After leaving Egypt they went to Karamoja in Sudan and then to Eyembe near Mbane where they found the Sebeyi and the Bagishu. Then they moved on to Tororo, Mumias, Isongo in Wanga (Mukulu), Emusire, and then to the Bunyala Forest. All these places were uninhabited at the time. After leaving Emusire they went to Mwihune near Inotse and then to Burundu in South Kabras then also uninhabited. They moved on to Maundukunyu in South Kabras, Sambuli’s, Chibole’s, and then to Mushiruku, all in South Kabras. Then they went to Bachekulo and Chiriboti in North Kabras which were also uninhabited. They gradually dispersed and spread out (source Http://www.ethnologue.com/show-language.asp?code=luy).

Since languages have universals, this is an investigative study to establish the presence of DMs from conversations in Kabras. DMs have been observed to occur in some languages such as English (Schiffrin, 1987: Blakemore, 2002). The DMs have been established to serve a variety of conversational functions. Below we introduce the notion of Discourse Markers.

1.2 Discourse Markers.

When speakers use language for communication they explore the formal aspects of language such as syntax and semantics for this is where the meaning of linguistic items is
carried and the structure is upheld (Blakemore, 1987). However, there is more than just the exploration formal of linguistic items. Schoroup (1985) notes that there are expressions that comprise a subset of those linguistic expressions thought not to reflect on the propositional content of the utterances in which they occur. In conversations, these are elements that do not belong to the semantic or syntactic structure of the utterance (Hirschberg and Litman, 1987). The elements instead of making a semantic contribution to an utterance (i.e. affecting its truth conditionals) are used to convey explicit information about the structure of the discourse.

These elements are described as Discourse Markers (Schiffrin, 1987). Shiffrin notes that there are sequentially dependent elements, which bracket units of talk. In other words, they refer to what comes before or after the utterance. The elements mark a boundary in a discourse, typically as part of the dialogue by occurring before or after an exchange or utterance.

Further it is noted that in conversations, there are linguistic expressions that signal the relation of an utterance to its immediate context with a function of bringing to the listener's attention a kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context (Radeker, 1990). These linguistic expressions are referred to as Discourse Markers.

Conversations further have poly-functional elements. These elements can be understood in two ways: first as elements, which serve to the union of utterances (In this way they
are equivalent to the term connective). Second, as elements which have a variety of conversational purposes. These poly-functional elements are referred also to as Discourse Markers (Http://www.wikipedia.com/show-language.asp?code=luy).

Blakemore (2002) similarly observes that in conversations, there are words or phrases that function primarily as structuring units of spoken language. To the listener, they signal the speaker's intention to mark a boundary in discourse. They are active contributions to the discourse and signal such activities as change in speaker, taking or holding control of the floor, relinquishing control of the floor, or the beginning of a new topic as illustrated in the following example.

That gets on my nerves, too. *Anyway*, tell me about your new job.

A: *So* how do you make this soup?
B: First you take a couple of carrots and chop them. *Okay* and then you sauté them in butter.

(Blakemore, 2002:45)

From the above example Blakemore (2002) identifies the words (*anyway*, *so* and *Okay*) as Discourse Markers given the functions that they serve in the conversations. For instance, *anyway* is used by the speaker to change the topic to talking about a new job.

Discourse Markers have been treated as fillers or an expletive that is elements whose function was no function at all. Since the emphasis on the study of language has tended to be laid on the formal aspects of language that included syntax, morphology, semantics and phonology. However, of late studies show that DMs have several functions that
include topic change reformulations, discourse planning, stressing, and hedging or backchannelling (Blakemore, 2002). Discourse Markers also serve not only to establish the relationship between speakers and message but also the relationship between speaker and hearer. The Discourse Markers serve the various functions as part of the discourse.

Studies on discourse show the identification of components from discourse. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) of the Birmingham School approach, identified Frames which belong to a closed class and include well, good, okay, now and alright. The frames are used in a classroom situation by the teacher to perform acts that include change of topic and giving feedback to a student after answering a question.

More studies demonstrate the presence of some elements as DMs in English, with a number of conversational functions (Sacks and Schegloff 1972: Deborah Schiffrin 1987). The DMs include oh, and, but, so and because and temporal adverbs like now and then and lastly you know and I mean. They have functions like acknowledging receipt of information and attracting the hearer’s attention.

The importance of Discourse Markers in conversations therefore can’t be underscored. A conversation is much less lively and personal without [Discourse Markers] signaling receipt of information, agreement and involvement (Stenstrom, 1997). The current study seeks to explore the DMs found in Kabras to establish whether the DMs are different from those found in English and other languages.
1.3 Statement of the problem

Spoken discourse contains instances of redundant interjections, backchannel utterances and speech fillers. These utterances which are referred to as Discourse Markers, have however not received much attention since they have been treated as speech fillers. A few systematic analyses document the importance of these utterances in conversations in English (Schiffrin, 1987).

A descriptive study on DMs in spoken discourse in an African language showing the various forms of DMs and their functions is lacking. It is therefore for this reason, that a study on DMs in Kabras will be an attempt to fill this gap and demonstrate the importance that DMs serve in conversations and more specifically how DMs behave in an African language such as Kabras. This study will also provide a basis for the comparison of the DMs already established in languages such as English and so add onto already existing knowledge on the importance of DMs in spoken discourse.

1.4 Objectives of the study

This study sought to investigate the Kabras language to achieve the following objectives:

1. To identify Discourse Markers in the conversations.
2. To describe the Discourse Markers present.
3. To establish the variation in the choice and use of Discourse Markers by speakers of Kabras.
4. To establish the functions of Discourse Markers in conversations
1.5 Research Questions

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. What is the form of Discourse Markers in conversations among speakers of Kabras?
2. What is the variation in the choice and use of Discourse Markers by the speakers?
3. What functions do Discourse Markers have in conversations among speakers in Kabras?

1.6 Research Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions about Kabras:

1. Conversations have Discourse Markers.
2. There is variation in the choice and use of Discourse Markers by speakers of Kabras.
3. Discourse Markers serve several functions in conversations for the speakers.

1.7 Justification and Significance

This study forms part of the increasing attention that is being paid to the analysis of everyday conversation. Carsaro (1985) says;

"There is need for more basic descriptive studies of discourse Processes in area such as adult socialization and aging, in Legal Occupational, criminal justice, bureaucratic and business Organizations............"
Most linguists have concentrated on the study of language at other levels of phonology, morphology and syntax. Given that discourse is a study of language above the sentence (McTear, 1982) this study on Discourse Markers, will offer an opportunity to demonstrate the complexity of language in use.

This study will further offer a fertile ground to demonstrate the importance of elements such as backchannel utterances, interjections and speech fillers, which traditionally have not received much attention; since they have been treated as expletives or elements whose function is no function at all in conversations.

1.8 Scope and Limitations of the study

This study focused on Discourse Markers as the elements in a move structure within a conversation. It looked at Discourse Markers among speakers of Kabras and not all the other Luhya dialects. The study did not delve into the entire structure of conversations among the speakers of Kabras. It also did not consider extraneous variables like education level of the speaker and borrowing from other dialects, which are in contact with Kabras geographically.

Since this is a linguistic approach towards discourse analysis issues like turn taking, adjacency pairs or conversational phases in the conversations were not considered in this study. Other issues that have also not been considered in the study include how the topic of the conversation could have an impact on the choice of the Discourse Markers.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

In this section literature review is presented in two main stages. First is literature on discourse and Discourse Markers. Second, is the theoretical framework which has two models and three theories.

2.2 Discourse

Discourse refers to written or spoken communication. It is any unit of connected speech or writing longer than the sentence. When a discourse occurs, what has happened is not the construction of sentences but the communication of a message hence discourse is language in use for communication. (MacTear, 1982)

2.3 Discourse analysis

The analysis of discourse is the analysis of language in use (Brown and Yule, 1983). As such, it is not restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions, which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs (Stubbs, 1983).

Discourse analysis considers language not as a formal system but as a part of the wider social and psychological context, where the people using the language are engaging in some kind of social activity. A conversation as discourse is a form of social activity. It is an interactional stretch of talk involving two participants and taking place in a non-
formalized setting, such that there are no special rules or conventions that may be said to operate (Edmondson, 1981). Other forms of discourse include doctor-patient interviews and classroom discourse.

Through Discourse analysis therefore there is an attempt to study the organization of the language above the sentence or clause and so it is a study of larger linguistic units such as conversation exchanges. (Stubbs, 1983)

2.4 Discourse structure

Until recently not much had been studied on the description of language structure above the clause. The clauses described in earlier studies have never had context. Halliday's (1967) discussion of the information structure of the clause and Hasan's (1968) discussion of cohesion features as anaphora and exophora do depend on the concept of a contextualized clause, but not the structure of a clause.

The earliest attempt to describe the structure of a spoken discourse was by Mitchell (1957) who described the language of buying and selling in Cyrenaica. He divided transactions into a series of stages, and then discussed the features of language typical of each stage. The findings of his studies generated interest in the study of language above the clause. Following closely, studies by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) on classroom discourse also show that discourse has structure. In these studies, it is revealed that in classroom discourse there are functional units which combine to form larger units along a rank scale. At the lowest level there are acts which combine to form moves. Moves in
turn combine to form exchanges and a transaction is composed of a series of teaching exchanges where topics are addressed.

### 2.5 Discourse Markers

A number of studies have attempted to specify meaning or function of DMs in various languages (Goldberg, 1980; Carlson, 1984; Schourup, 1985) and several other attempts have been made to characterize DMs in a more general way (Schiffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1990). It is however noted that, despite the quantity of research in this area, no consensus has emerged regarding fundamental issues of terminology and classification. Many studies have taken the functional approach to the study of DMs.

Functionally DMs consist of a group of expressions that are most often referred to as discourse particles or discourse operators (Schourup, 1985). In English these expressions include conversational particles such as *well* and *oh*, parenthetical lexicalized clauses such as *you know* and *I mean*. These expressions comprise a subset of those linguistic expressions thought not affect the propositional content of utterances in which they occur (Hirschberg and Litman, 1987).

In this study a functional approach to the definition of DMs is adopted. This approach broadens to include those elements of linguistic structure that appear to be more directly involved in the relation of separate utterances (Schiffrin, 1985). It is here that many elements sidelined in sentence based linguistic research are brought into limelight to include expressions such as *well* and *you know* which were traditionally considered as
unworthy of close attention. In order to give the functional definition of discourse markers, five characteristics of DMs are discussed below.

1. Connectivity

According to Fraser (1996) a DM is “an expression which signals the relationship of the basic message to the foregoing discourse”. Hansen (1997) defines DMs as “linguistic items of variable scope, and whose primary function is connective” and Schiffrin (1987) operationally defines DMs as “sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk”.

From the above definitions, one characteristic prominently featuring is that DMs are used to relate utterances or other discourse units. Schiffrin and Fraser’s definition specify that DMs relate two textual units, thus contributing to inter utterance coherence or connectivity.

2. Optionality

DMs are regarded as syntactically optional in the sense that the removal of a DM does not alter the grammaticality of its host sentence (Fraser, 1988). DMs are also widely claimed to be optional in the further sense that they do not enlarge the possibilities for semantic relationship between the elements they associate. If a DM is omitted, the relationship it signals is still available to the hearer, though no longer explicitly cued.

The following examples can be understood in the same way:

The others are going to Stoke. However, I am going to Paris.
The others are going to Stoke. I am going to Paris.
(Quirk et al., 1985:76)
Brinton (1996) notes that omitting the DMs does not render the text ungrammatical or unintelligible. Despite such observations, it is never claimed that the optionality of DMs renders them useless or redundant, they are used to guide the hearer toward a particular interpretation and simultaneously ruling out unintended interpretations (Brown and Yule, 1983).

3. Non-truth-conditionality

DMs contribute nothing to the truth-conditions of the proposition expressed by an utterance (Blakemore, 1988: Hansen, 1997). This is to mean that DMs do not affect the truth-conditions of utterances (Fraser, 1996). The non-truth-conditionality of DMs distinguishes them from ‘content’ words, including manner adverbial uses of words like sadly, and from disjunctive forms which do affect truth-conditions, such as evidential and sentence adverbials. As noted by Quirk et al (1985) a non conjunctive adverbial and a DM can give rise to similar overall interpretations, as seen in the following examples:

Owens is a respected drama critic. I tell you in addition that she has written.
Owens is a respected drama critic. In addition, she has written.

(Quirk et al., 1985)

The absence or presence of the DM I tell you in the second sentence does not contribute to the truth condition of the utterance.

4. Orality

Most forms claimed to be DMs occur primarily in speech for example by the way, well and after all (Brinton, 1996). However, no principled grounds exist on which to deny DM status to similar items that are largely found in written discourse such as moreover,
consequently and contrary. Association of a particular DM with the written or spoken channel is not strict and is often tied only to the relative formality/informality of the DM.

The meaning of a marker may also ally it to one channel or the other (Schoroup, 1985). For example, some putative DMs such as conversely and in contrast encode a high degree of utterance planning. Impromptu speech – linked DMs such as before I forget and by the way may also be associated with speech, because their meaning presupposes a familiarity with the addressee not typical of impersonally addressed writing. After all, for example, encodes that the speaker has grounds for believing that the premise introduced by after all is already accessible to the hearer (Blakemore, 1987).

5. Multi-categoriality

DMs are most often said to constitute a functional category that is heterogeneous with respect to syntactic class (Schoroup, 1985). On this view DM status is independent of syntactic categorization. An item retains its non-DM syntactic categorization but does ‘extra duty’ as a non-truth-conditional connective loosely associated with clause structure.

Grammatical categories to which extrinsic DM function has been attributed include adverbs e.g. now, actually, anyway, coordinating conjunctions for example and, but, because, interjections such as oh, gosh and clauses e.g. you see, I mean and you know. When DM status is seen, instead, as a matter of syntactic categorization, multi –
categoriality is viewed diachronically and DMs are taken to arise from other categories through historical processes (Schoroup, 1985).

The International Encyclopaedia of Linguistics also functionally defines Discourse Markers as a set of linguistic items in the cognitive, social, expressive, and textual domains (Bright, 1992). Markers (e.g. um, like, uh, you know, well, by the way) aid communicators in linguistic or conversational consistency and coherence (Bussman, 1984). Discourse Markers further help speakers develop language skills, feel more comfortable about their conversational skills, and allow speakers to collect their thoughts before officially speaking (Bussman, 1984).

In a 1996 dissertation, Johnson (1996) cited by Croucher, (2004) discussed how ok and related Discourse Markers in ESL grammar classes serve as linguistic soothers or verbal adapters. While learning English, Johnson argues that students use the markers to fill in gaps in speech and comprehension.

Another early study on Discourse Markers investigated the use of ok in service interactions between employees and their customers. By observing interactions and analyzing the conversations' content and context, (Merritt, 1984) concluded that ok serves a specific linguistic purpose in interactions between personnel and customers. Ok in fact "releases" the addressee to take the next step in the dialogue.
Schiffrin (1987) formalized the study of Discourse Markers. By observing various types of conversation, or discourse, Schiffrin identifies how certain terms and/or phrases indicate understanding or coherence in conversation. She concludes that each single marker in the communal lexicon has various functions, depending upon the situation of the speaker. She notes that a primary goal of discourse is the accomplishment of conversational coherence. Speakers and hearers each have their own responsibility, in that a speaker is expected to produce an utterance, which produces appropriate attention to that message.

Schiffrin's model of Discourse Markers is based on the notion of coherence in discourse, which is understood to be a relation with adjacent units of talk. Accordingly, the primary function of Discourse Markers is to indicate 'location of utterances within emerging structures, meanings and actions of discourses.

Functions of Discourse Markers have been outlined in linguistic articles and reference materials from the Rutledge dictionary of language and linguistics to Perinbanayagam's (1991) Discursive Acts. Four formal textual functions of discourse markers are identified:

i. To indicate a turn in conversation (you know and well)

ii. To identify a digression from the topic under discussion (oh, by the way),

iii. To share a speaker's attitude or sentiment (see)

iv. To frame the conversation. (like)

Davis (1992) designates two informal functions for Discourse Markers. These are:

1. To fill pauses in conversation

2. To act as nervous glitches in speech
Unfortunately, academic research on the forms and functions of Discourse Markers in an African language remains scanty. Two questions in particular remain to be addressed by linguistic or communication researchers:

1. How often are the markers used?

2. Are markers a conscious or unconscious decision? Furthermore, do the markers have an impact on an ongoing conversation.

These areas are of keen interest because Discourse Markers often function informally and are considered a part of the human psyche and intellect (Schiffrin, 1987). Discourse markers as sequentially dependent elements, bracket units of talk and exhibit multiple functions, usually a primary (more dominant) one and various secondary ones (Schiffrin, 1987). To account for this multi-functionality, Schiffrin postulates the following planes of talk in operation in conversations:

1. The ideational level (plane) covering the propositional content of the speech.
2. The level of exchange structures, covering the turn taking mechanisms
3. The level of action structures, coordinating speech events
4. The level of information states, covering the participants knowledge and metaknowledge regarding the ongoing discourse
5. The level of participation framework that marks the speaker-hearer roles and relations (i.e interpersonal) during the conversational event.

According to Schiffrin therefore Discourse Markers are defined in relation to units of talk instead of more defined units such as sentences, propositions, speech acts or tone units.
Although markers precede sentences that are syntactic configurations of an independent clause plus clauses dependent on it, they are independent of sentential structure; therefore the removal of a marker from its sentence position leaves the sentence intact.

For example:

A: I think he's done a terrible job in that position. If it were up to me I'd fire him.
B: See, if I were you I don't know if I'd go that far.

The word see as used by speaker B is a discourse marker for showing the attitude that the speaker has towards speaker A. Its removal leaves the sentence intact.

Discourse Markers are members of a functional class of verbal (and non verbal) devices, which provide contextual coordinates for ongoing talk. (Schiffrin, 1987). It is this definition that we see that many different items, which become used as markers, are so used because of certain characteristics, which make them available as sequentially dependent brackets of units of talk. This therefore caters for nonverbal cues or other stretches of discourse which depending on their functions in an utterance qualify to be defined as discourse markers.

The literature on Discourse Markers shows that there is no agreement on the definition and classification. In this study a functional approach is adopted which encompasses looking at the properties of DMs. In the next segment, we examine the Discourse Markers found in English as a background and basis for the study of Discourse Markers in Kabras.
2.5.1 Discourse markers in English.

Studies on conversations demonstrate that DMs are found in English (Schiffrin, 1987). They include *oh* and *well* whose uses are not clearly based on the semantic meaning or grammatical status within the sentence, but in their analysis particular attention is paid on the discourse slot where they occur. *Well* is a response marker: *well* anchors its user in a conversational exchange when the options offered through a prior utterance for the coherence of an upcoming response are not precisely followed. *Oh* is therefore seen as a marker of information management. *Well* is similar to *Oh* in that both lack inferential meaning but their main difference is that *well* marks responses at the interaction level and *Oh* marks responses at a cognitive level.

Schiffrin further identifies markers that have both semantic and grammatical status as conjunctions: *and, but, or, so* and *because*. She suggests that the discourse roles of *and, but, or* are parallel to their grammatical roles. Their coordinative role can also be thought of as their function in idea structures, their semantic roles as their textual meaning and their pragmatic role as their interactional effect.

*So* and *because* are identified as markers of cause and result. *So* and *because* convey meanings of “result” and “cause” which may be realized as fact based, knowledge and/or action based relations between units of talk. Just like *and, but, or, so* and *because* are used in discourses in ways which reflect their linguistic properties.
Schiffrin also identifies temporal adverbs like now and then. She notes that their deictic meaning influence their use on different discourse planes. In other words now and then are markers of discourse time. Now marks a speaker’s progression through discourse time by displaying attention for what is coming next. Then on the other hand creates a bridge to a prior discourse time created by an utterance from either the speaker himself/herself or from the other.

Schiffrin finally identifies two Discourses Markers whose literal meanings directly influence their discourse use. The discourse markers are you know and I mean. You know marks transitions in information states, which are relevant for participation frameworks and I mean marks speaker orientation toward, own talk i.e. modifications of ideas and intentions. You know gains attention from the hearer to open an interactive focus on speaker provided information and I mean maintains attention on the speaker.

From the above study, it is therefore noted that languages such as English have Discourse Markers (as linguistic items) in their conversations and that the DMs identified serve a number of functions in conversations. These studies have also shown that discourse has a structure where there are linguistic units with functions. This current research seeks to find out if this applies to other languages and in this case an African language. Below is a discussion on the studies done on discourse. The studies form the background for the study of Discourse Markers in Kabras an African language.
2.5.2 Studies on Discourse in Kenya.

Borrowing from the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model of classroom discourse was a study on the structure of classroom discourse in Kenyan secondary schools by Juma, (1991). This study revealed that the transaction at the highest rank is a kind of topic unit which is typically marked by frames- words like right, well, ok, good and now are used. Teachers use the words in classroom setting to mark boundaries of their exchanges. The researcher further reveals that in classroom setting the frames are used to introduce the topic, change the topic, acknowledge an answer from a pupil or congratulate a student.

The structure of T.V interviews in KBC (Kenya Broadcasting Corporation) shows discourse organization, clarity, cohesiveness and coherence (Karanja, 1993). In the formal interaction, which is face to face, Karanja notes that interviewers use DMs in their conversations. The DMs include, well, okay, so and alright. From this study it is observed that DMs are used to organize the discourse. The conversations involved in this case are for an overhearing audience.

A study the discourse of the mentally handicapped highlights the incoherence in the talk of the mentally retarded and lack of joint production by the participants (Kimani, 1993). Topic change is frequent and repetition in their conversations does not work towards cohesion. It is evidently noted that Discourse Markers as organizational features of cohesion and coherence are missing.
In examining banking discourse Walya (1997) establishes the structure and strategies that the participants in a banking interaction employ. The bankers and clients engage in conversational code switching between English and Kiswahili. In this research it is further noted that the bankers use Discourse Markers in their conversations to introduce and sum up the transactions. Examples of elements identified as Discourse Markers in this study include so, okay now and alright.

The structure and pragmatic features in school counseling Discourse shows that DMs signal the various units that compose the structure of the school counseling discourse (Andera, 2003). The counseling takes place between the teacher and a student. In his study Andera identifies DMs such as okay, now and so. He refers to the three DMs as framing Markers, which mark the boundary of a transaction in school counseling session.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

This section has two models and two theories, which form the basis of this study.

2.6.1 The Sinclair and Coulthard Model of Classroom Discourse (1975)

This is a model on discourse that looks at classroom interaction. The model was a result of work that begun in 1970 as a research project to investigate the structure of verbal interaction in classrooms with an aim of anchoring this study within the discipline of linguistics.
Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) propose five ranks to handle the structure of classroom interaction.

Transactions have a structure expressed in terms of exchanges and Sinclair notes that the segmentation of lessons in English is typically marked by a framing technique. This involves the use of five markers namely *ok, well, right, now* and *good* in combination with strong stress, high falling intonation and an accompanying short pause.

It was observed that teachers frequently follow a frame indicating the beginning of the transaction with a focus—a metastatement about the transaction. For example:

**Frame**: Well

**Focus**: Today I thought we would do three quizzes.

(Coulthard, 1977:56)

Transactions have a structure expressed in terms of exchanges; they begin and often end with a boundary exchange which consists of a frame and a focus followed by a succession of informing, directing or eliciting exchanges. The structure of exchanges is
expressed in terms of moves. A three-move structure is proposed for exchanges-initiation, response, follow up. The moves themselves consist of one or more acts. Acts are defined principally by their interactive function. Sinclair et al proposes sixteen acts which can be grouped into three major categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta interactive</th>
<th>Interactive</th>
<th>Turn taking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marker</td>
<td>informative knowledge</td>
<td>cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta statement</td>
<td>directive, react</td>
<td>Bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Elicitation, reply</td>
<td>Nomination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starter, comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accept, evaluate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking the meta interactive acts, marker as the act which realizes framing moves. From this study, it is revealed that in classroom discourse transaction boundaries are marked by a closed class of frames namely *ok, well, right, now* and *good*. These markers help the teacher to do the following: alert the students that a lesson is beginning or the teacher is moving on to a new activity or topic in the lesson or to comment a student and therefore give feedback. The model by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) forms the basis for the study of Discourse Markers in this study. The closed class of items also referred to as frames are used to mark boundaries in classroom interaction. In this study these items are treated as Discourse Markers.

However the Sinclair and Coulthard model has its limitations, in that a while a three part exchange structure is clearly discernible in classroom discourse, there are no apparatus
for knowing whether this exchange structure might not be the result of a teaching strategy, and thus not appropriate both to some exchanges occurring in some classroom setting and to exchanges found in other non-pedagogic settings (Edmondson, 1981). This revelation limits the model to apply to classroom discourse and not other forms of spoken discourse like conversations.

2.6.2 The Edmondson Model (1981)

Edmondson (1981) provides an integrative model. The model is based on and applies to conversational data. In this model, at the lowest level, is a communicative act which is characterized as both an interactional and a locutionary act. Interactional acts combine to form interactional moves and the interactional moves are sequenced in various ways to produce exchanges. Exchanges of different kinds exhibit different types of linkages thus combining to form phases of a conversation. An ordered sequence of phases may be said to describe the structure of an encounter (Edmondson, 1981). This is summarized below:

```
Interactional Act
    ↓
Interactional Move
    ↓
Interactional exchange
    ↓
Phases of a conversation
    ↓
Encounter
```
In examining the structure of the move, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) come up with the following terms: pre-head, head and post head in which the first and third elements are optional. Edmondson (1981) proposes uptake, Head and appealer, to refer to the structure of the move (ff 4.2.3). Uptake and appealer are optional elements in this structure. The function of the uptaker is to validate the preceding move performed by the previous speaker as a contribution to the ongoing discourse. The interactional function of the head on the other hand, is derived from the type of move, which is the head exponent. The appealer solicits uptake from the hearer. While an uptaker therefore looks back creating a link with the preceding move, an appealer looks forward. This is summarized as follows:

According to Edmondson (1981) the above diagram shows the ideal structure of an exchange in a conversation. Edmondson, however, observes that in conversations there
are few instances of appealers. The rationale for the phenomenon of uptake is provided by considering what a speaker is enabled to do by utilizing this interactional slot. First is the issue of face. Second, the phenomena of uptake may be said to reassure the previous speaker that the channel of communication is open. Third, uptake may signal willingness to assume a speaking role without constituting an interruption. Fourth, uptake gives a replying speaker time to encode his communicative intentions in light of what he has just heard. Consider the extract below:

(Situation: Y has just discovered that X borrowed her jacket and spilt wine on it)
Y: Yeah well it's gonna be pretty hard to remove really isn't it?
X: well, most I can do is to offer to get it dry cleaned.
Y: Yeah but I mean it's not gonna come out with dry cleaning wine spots don't mean...........

(Edmondson, 1981:89)

In this extract it's noted that speaker Y uptakes at the beginning of her two turns with the words *yeah well* and *yeah but I mean* and produces an appealer at the end of the first. These words that utilize this interactional slot of uptake allow the speaker to take time before giving her response on how the dry cleaning will be done. In this case the words are fillers (Edmondson, 1981).

In this study the focus is on the exchange in the conversation because an exchange is the minimal unit of social interaction (Edmondson, 1981). Take for example greetings like “How are you?”-“Fine thanks” they constitute an exchange of illocutions; this exchange is felt by some responding members to place them under a social obligation to reciprocate by enquiring on the health of the co-member.
The researcher identified exchanges from conversations and examined their structure on the basis of the Edmondson model. The words, which utilize the interactional slot of uptake and appealer in the move structure, are treated as DMs because of their optional nature, non-truth conditionality and connectivity (Schiffrin, 1987; Blakemore, 1988; Fraser, 1996). The identification of the DMs is further guided and informed by the Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson (1986) and the Speech Act Theory by J.L. Austin (1962), which are discussed in the next segment.

2.6.3 The Relevance Theory

This is a theory of communication as developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986). The basic tenets of this theory are communication, inference and relevance. An utterance automatically creates expectations that guide a hearer towards the speakers meaning (Grice, 1975).

As observed in Schiffrin’s model (cf 2.5), DMs play multifunctional roles like coherence in utterances. The relevance theory suggests that these multifunctional roles can be explained in terms of the encoded meaning of these expressions with the assumption that the speaker intends to produce an utterance as optimally relevant as possible (Blakemore, 2002).

In Relevance theory there are two distinctive processes involved in utterance interpretation: linguistic form can encode either elements of the conceptual representations that undergo inferential computations or procedural information which
constrains the process of inferential computations (Blakemore, 2002). Discourse markers, in this theory are defined as ‘expressions that constrain the interpretation of the utterances that contain them by virtue of the inferential connections they express’ (Blakemore, 1987).

The Relevance theory does not therefore consider coherence as a primary function of discourse markers, but it concerns most importantly how an utterance achieves relevance. In other words given a trade-off between effects and processing effort in the degree of relevance, the use of DMs is considered to be ‘consistent with the speaker’s aim of achieving relevance for a minimum cost of processing’.

2.6.4 The Speech Act Theory

The Speech Act Theory (Henceforth SAT) was developed by a group of British philosophers in the 60s. Of importance to this study is the work of J.L. Austin (1962) one of the philosophers. SAT treats an utterance as an act performed by a speaker in context in respect to an addressee. When an utterance is made, a speech act is performed. Performing a speech act therefore involves performing three acts:

1. A locutionary Act—which is the act of producing a recognizable grammatical utterance in a language.
2. An illocutionary Act—Which is an attempt to accomplish some communicative purpose.
3. A perlocutionary Act—Which is the intended effect on the hearer.

In Austin’s theory, the notion of the perlocutionary act is an implicit recognition that a ‘speech act’ has an interaction component (Edmondson, 1981). A conversation therefore
has a series of locutions between speakers who have an aim of achieving communication (Illocutionary force). In a conversation, when a speaker makes an utterance there is an intended effect on the hearer.

The Speech Act theory therefore provides a framework inside which the researcher can characterize insightfully what is being done when something is said by a speaker as a contribution to an ongoing discourse like a conversation. Edmondson, (1981) observes that in a conversation an exchange is so defined that it must have an outcome. The nature of the outcome is determined by the illocutionary (and other) acts, which realize the elements of which the exchange is composed. Discourse Markers being part of the exchange were treated as locutions, which have intended illocutionary effect in the outcome of the exchange and the conversation. Therefore the illocutionary force of a DM is established in terms of the function that the discourse marker serves in the conversation.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study adopted a qualitative and quantitative approach. Unstructured interviews (ff appendix 2 and 3) were administered by the researcher to a group of respondents earlier identified through their social networks. The conversations from respondents were then tape recorded and transcribed on paper (ff appendix 4). This was then followed by an identification and analysis of discourse markers present on the basis of the Edmondson (1981) model for spoken discourse.

3.2 Area of Study and Study Population

The study was carried out in Kabras division of Malava constituency Kakamega North district, Western Province (ff appendix 5). In this constituency there are 105,000 speakers of the Kabras dialect. Majority of the population in this area are native Kabras speakers because this is a remote area, and given the history of Kabras, this is where they settled (cf 1.1).

3.3 Sampling Procedure

Two sampling techniques were used in this study. These were judgment sampling method and the social network approach (Milroy, 1987). The principle underlying judgment sampling is that the researcher who uses this method identifies in advance
the “types” of speakers to be studied and then seeks out a quota of speakers who fit
the specified categories (Milroy, 1987).

Since one objective of this study was to identify sex and age variation in the choice
and use of Discourse Markers, then these social variables had to be equally
represented in the sample, in order to achieve goals of this research. The choice of
another sampling procedure like random sampling could lead to obtaining a sample
with the same gender and age and therefore make it impossible for the realization of
this goal.

The chief characteristic of any kind of network procedure of speaker selection is that
the unit of study is the preexisting social group rather than the individual as the
representative of a more abstract social category (Milroy, 1987). This approach allows
the researcher to take part in conversations that are initiated by one of the respondents
with the members of his/her social group, thereby being part of the social group.

In this way the researcher controlled the effects of the observer’s paradox where the
respondents change their behavior due to the presence of an outsider. If a stranger is
identified as a friend of a friend, he may easily be drawn into the networks mesh of
exchange and obligation relationships, thus resulting into conversations that are more
relaxed and natural (Milroy, 1987).

3.4 Sample Size

The sample of this study included a total of 36 informants selected through the social
network groups of 12 informants earlier identified through judgment sampling. The
sample was well chosen and representative of all subsections that the researcher wished to generalize.

Linguistic surveys tend not to require large samples as compared to other surveys (Milroy, 1980). Further large samples of more than 150 individuals tend to be redundant, bringing increasing data handling problems with diminishing analytical returns (Sankoff, 1980).

To ensure equal representation in the sample, there were six male informants consisting of three young men and three old men, and six female informants consisting of three young women and three old women. Each of the twelve respondents identified two more respondents according to his/her social network.

The gender of a speaker does influence an individual’s use of language in many speech communities (Labov, 1972). Similarly age equally influences a person’s use of language, since young speakers have been observed to be more innovative than older ones who tend to remain conservative (Trudgill, 1974). In this view, the age of young respondents ranged from 18-40 years old and older respondents from 41-65 years. Table 3.1 shows the sampling population by age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age/Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Data Elicitation

The goals of the research determine among other things, the methodology to be used and amount of data required (Chesire, 1982). The goal of this study was to collect conversations from the respondents and analyze them for the presence of the Discourse Markers. For the success of the study, two methods of data collection were employed: Participant observation and open unstructured interview.

In participant observation the researcher became part of the situation by making remarks and talking freely about the range of issues being discussed. This is because apart from building trust, participant observation efficacy lies in the inability of the respondents to be aware that they are in the presence of a researcher (Burton, 1978).

However earlier studies have observed that although participant observation technique is a rich and useful source of data, it has considerable problems of its own. “Participant observation contributes to the effects of observer’s paradox in that the researcher, by joining the group, disturbs what s/he would like to hold constant.........” (Milroy, 1987)

To reduce the effects of the observers’ paradox, which can’t be eliminated completely during data collection, the social network technique was used. The researcher approached the informants as ‘a friend of’ or a ‘friend of a friend of’ or a ‘son of’. Having established a close relationship over a period of two weeks, the researcher then started administering the unstructured interviews to the respondents and finally tape recording their conversations. The close relationship with the respondents
ensured that the conversations recorded were as natural as possible and in a relaxed atmosphere.

The length of each tape recording was 10-15 minutes. It is hard to be categorical about the appropriate length of an interview. However, when an interviewee agrees to be interviewed, he/she has contracted to answer questions cooperatively and therefore the conversation will be natural (Levinson, 1983).

3.6 Data Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative approaches to data analysis were used in this research (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). The tape-recorded conversations in Kabras were transcribed on paper, translated and analyzed through content analysis for the Discourse Markers present. The functions of the Discourse Markers were then accounted for.

In order to account for the variation of the variables of gender and age of the respondents, on the choice of Discourse Markers, a quantitative analysis was carried out. Four discourse markers were selected by judgment sampling. Their frequencies and means were then calculated. For comparison purposes the standard deviation for each was calculated on the basis of gender and age.

All the data collected was analyzed on the basis of the tenets of the Speech Act Theory by Austin (1962), the Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson (1987) and the Edmondson (1981) model for spoken discourse. Generalizations were based on the findings of the study drawn from these analyses.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 FORMS AND FUNCTIONS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter there is an analysis of the transcribed conversations in light of the objectives (cf 1.3). Extracts are presented here to show the identification of Discourse Markers (Henceforth DMs) from conversations on the basis of the Edmondson (1981) model of spoken discourse. The identified DMs are then categorized into syntactic classes using the Halliday (1994) grammar. Further an exploration into the variation of use and choice of DMs across gender and age of the respondents follows. The distribution of the DMs in the utterances is given and followed by a discussion of the functions that the DMs serve in conversations in Kabras.

4.2 Discourse Markers in Kabras

The Edmondson (1981) model of spoken discourse, (cf 2.2.1) aided in the identification of DMs from the conversations. According to this model, the underlying structure of a conversational episode lies in its interactional structure, which is the sequential relevance of interactional acts that give coherence to a conversation.

In order to account for the structure of a conversational episode, Edmondson (1981) proposes a hierarchy of exchanges, moves, uptake, head and appealer. The researcher identified the exchange from the conversations since it is the minimum unit of interaction and it is communicative (Edmondson, 1981). The exchange consists of at
least two interactional moves and each of the moves is analyzed for uptake, head and appealer. Extracts are given here to show the structure of the exchange.

4.2.1 Exchange

According to Edmondson (1981) an exchange is the minimal unit of social contact. In a technical sense, it is a tied pair of sequentially relevant and complementary illocutions whereby persons involved in the exchange are under social obligation to engage in it without exhibiting superior social skill. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) point out that it is at the exchange where transmission and negotiation of information occurs. An exchange consists of at least two or more moves. Consider the following examples.

**Example 1** (Situation: Two speakers are engaged in an exchange of greetings)

Speaker A: Mulembe vosi  
[Greetings to you all?]

Respondents: Mulembe.  
[Greetings]

Speaker A: Muvere avalamu?  
[Are you fine?]

Respondents: Eeh  
[Yes]

Speaker A: Ahsandi  
[Thanks]

Example 1 above shows an exchange of illocutions in the form of greetings. Speaker A poses the greetings and all the respondents are socially obliged to respond. The speaker completes the exchange by saying thanks.

**Example 2** (Situation: the speakers are talking about how a traditional wedding was done)

Speaker A: Shole khuchache nende eshiselelo shali shirie?  
[Shole, lets start with a traditional wedding. How was it done?]

Speaker B: Khale eshiselelo .......avandu varulanga ango saa kumi.........  
[Long ago.....during a wedding people left their homes at five.......]
Speaker C: Yaani sasa omwana omusiani alatsanga wanga omukhanga?
[I mean now the boy is going to the girls home]

Speaker B: Eeh mulatsia avandu kama kumi, nimuyenjile amalwa
[Yes you will go around ten people they will have prepared a local brew]

Speaker A: Valetsa angolove kama saa kumi hivi.
[They will come in the evening]

Speaker B: Arusi yaliwo tawe tawe, vareranga vali khulenyanga omukhana
wokhuteshia niveyama nevavukula amalwa
[There was no wedding as such, they just asked will you give us your
Daughter? if they agree, they will take the beer and drink it]

Example 2 shows speaker A asking a question about a traditional wedding directed to a speaker B who begins to answer but is interrupted by speaker C who gives a clarification before the speaker goes ahead to answer the question.

These two examples show an exchange whereby there are tied pairs of illocutions such as greetings in example 1 and a question-answer in example 2. The speakers in the two exchanges are reciprocating (in example 1) while in example 2 speaker B and C are replying to a question earlier asked.

The examples above show that an exchange consists of passing of an item or good from A to B and a reciprocal passing of an item or good from B to A (Edmondson, 1981). When an exchange occurs therefore there is an outcome. In the above two examples there is successful outcome through the exchange of greetings and answering of a question.

Example 1 shows an exchange, which has five moves while example 2 shows an exchange with six moves. The moves are sequentially relevant and this contributes to the outcome of the exchange.
4.2.2 Move

A single contribution or utterance made by a speaker is seen as a move. It is also referred to as a turn (Edmondson, 1981). An utterance cannot be held to constitute a communication act unless it constitutes an element of structure inside an exchange. The reason is that as the name suggests an exchange consists of at least two interactional moves and it is at this level that turn taking operates (Edmondson, 1981). Sequentially relevant moves constitute an exchange in a conversation. Examine the example given below.

Example 3 (Situation: The speakers are talking about the ability of women to rule)

Speaker C: Yaani koo yona olavelanga ori avakhasi shivanyala okhuruka ta? [You mean Yona you are saying that women cant rule?]

Speaker B: Valaruka lakini ovulai tawe [They can rule but not well]

Speaker A: Nee ni kweli shololanga ata avakhasi avaskari navavii sana [Yes it is true but don’t you see policewomen are bad people]

Speaker B: Omanye omundu musatsa alakhukholela eshisaa lakini omukhasi ta [You know a man can feel sorry for you but a woman no]

In the example above, the exchange that has four interactional moves. In each move a speaker is given a chance/turn to contribute to the ongoing conversation. The first move gives speaker C a chance to pose a question regarding the ability of women to rule or not. The second move is about speaker B answering that they can rule but not well. Move three gives speaker A an opportunity to agree that “Don’t you see that women policemen are not good”. Finally move four allows speaker B to add on that if it were a policeman he could feel sorry for you as opposed to as policewoman who is perceived to unforgiving.
Just like the exchange, which has structure, demonstrated in sequentially relevant moves, the move also has structure. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) give the structure of a move as prehead, head and posthead. Edmondson (1981) suggests the terms uptake head appealer in which the first and third elements are optional.

4.2.3 Interactional acts in a Move structure

The smallest units of interactional structure are interactional acts which combine to form an interactional move (Edmondson, 1981). These are (uptake) head and (appealer). In the next section we exemplify these elements.

4.2.3.1 Uptaker

Uptaker validates the preceding move performed by the previous speaker as a contribution to the ongoing discourse. It looks back as it were creating a link with the preceding move. The following example illustrates this.

**Example 4** (Situation: Speakers are talking about giving women financial freedom)

Speaker C: Tawe shikali kario tawe sonyala okhuvola ori shichila uvere ne mali omushere yekhale ing tsa.
[No you can’t insist that because you are wealthy your wife should just stay at home.]

Speaker A: Okhulondokhana nasie somanyile ka mukamba tawe niwanasia omushere okhwikhala tsa norulao alanyola etabu.
[To me it is not good for a wife to just sit at home because in case you die she will suffer]

Speaker B: Kho ori omushere paka yesi avekho neshishie
[So you are saying that a woman must have something of her own]

Speaker A: Eeh! paka yekase
[Yes! she must work hard]

In this Exchange speaker B uptakes at the beginning of his turn with the word *kho* (*so*). The word occurs in the initial part of the move. It establishes a link between what speaker A had been saying regarding making women independent financially. It
therefore creates a link between the move made by speaker A and what speaker B goes ahead to say which is in agreement that it is important for women to have something of their own so that they stand on their two feet.

4.2.3.2 Head

This is the act derived from the type of move from which it is the exponent. It is the obligatory act in a move structure. The head is a central interactional act in a move structure and it is therefore cemented into the discourse structure via the facultative interactional acts of uptake and appealers (Edmondson, 1981). Take a look at the example below.

Example 5 (Situation: The speakers are talking about trust in marriage)

Speaker A: avandu vakhasi vaaminanga avandu vasatsa?
[Do women trust men]

Speaker B: Vaamina avasatsa tawe.sichila avandu vasatsa vara obubei imberi nee wanyola omukhana paka omukate sichila nomuvolela katoto aleyama kako ta.
[No they don’t because men like telling lies if you meet a girl you must cheat her because if you tell her the truth she will not accept you]

Speaker A: Avakhana vayaza obubei?
[Do girls like lies?]

Speaker C: Eeh
[Yes]

Speaker B: onyala okhumukata ori oyinziranga Nairobi ass olanyola ori aleyama akako
[You can cheat her that you work in Nairobi and you will see her follow you]

This extract reveals an exchange that has moves that consist of the head only. Speaker A poses the questions that can men be trusted? Speaker B gives an answer directly without uptaking. In the third move, speaker A then asks the question “Do girls like lies?”- This is a head only move without uptake.
4.2.3.3 Appealer

An appealer solicits for uptake from the hearer; it links closely with signals for managing turn change. Therefore while an uptake looks back an appealer looks forward (Edmondson, 1981). Examine the example below.

Example 6 (Situation: Speaker A is giving speaker B directions)

Speaker A: Otsie paka khu soko yenei olaulilanga?
[You go to that market you are hearing?]

Speaker B: Yaani esoko ye Malava
[You mean malava market]

Speaker A: Eeh ass awenao elivukana lia israel lio mukhono mukhasi.
[Yes there there is an Israel church]

In this extract speaker A uses an appealer olaulilanga (You are hearing) to solicit for uptake from speaker B who begins his turn uptaking with the word Yaani (You mean). The appealer olaulilanga (You are hearing) signals to speaker C to start talking by asking if his is hearing or not. The extracts above show the uptake, head and appealer conversations from Kabras. In this study these elements are regarded as Discourse Markers.

Appealers and uptakers are optional elements in the move structure since the item, which realises the head of the move itself, implies or presupposes uptake (Edmondson, 1981). Thus if I ‘agree’ to your request that I do P via an utterance of the form ‘okay’ it is clear that I have heard and interpreted your request (Edmondson, 1981). Similarly the interactional work that may be done via an appealer act may be done by other means (cf example 6) where its implicit that the move is an elicitation, asking a question and therefore the presence of an appealer at the end is optional since the question itself solicits for response without the presence of an appealer olaulilanga (are you hearing).
The nature of many illocutions which may appear as heads of interactional moves, implicitly require some form of relevant response from the hearer by the performer of such an illocutionary act (Edmondson, 1981). This creates a scenario for the optional presence or absence of uptake and appealer in the move structure. Indeed very few instances of appealers occur in the corpus on which this study is based.

However the rationale for the phenomenon of uptake may be provided by considering what a speaker is enabled to do in utilizing this interactional slot. According to Edmondson (1981), first there is the issue of face and the general social desirability of supporting a speaker. In the case of a head interactional act constituting a contradiction or disagreement, the possibility of uptake allows the speaker to pay ritual service to the speaker’s social standing vis a vis himself in that he/she may ratify the speaker’s preceding head illocution as a contribution to the discourse, before producing the head of his own move. Second, uptake is said to help reassure the previous speaker that the communication channel is open. Third, uptake signals willingness or readiness to assume speaking role without constituting an interruption. Fourth, uptake gives a replying speaker time in which to formulate and encode his communicative intentions in light of what has just been said.

Discourse Markers utilize the interactional slot of uptake and appealer. Their role is to signal how one proposition should be interpreted given the other(s) in the discourse (Millis et al., 1995; Moore and Pollack, 1992). The relation between the propositions may exist regardless of whether a DM is used (Scott and de Souza, 1990; Knott, 1995). A DM is therefore an explicit signal of a specific relation between two or more
propositions. The non-occurrence of a marker does not mean that the relation is absent. Consider the example below.

1. The museum does not intend to sponsor a particular aspect of modern art; it intends to make a report to the public by offering material for the study and comparison.
2. The museum does not intend to sponsor a particular aspect of modern art, but rather to make a report to the public by offering material for the study and comparison (Leech et al, 1994)

In the above example obtained from the British National corpus, Leech (1994) demonstrates that the presence/absence of a DM in an utterance, does not alter the meaning of the utterance. Utterance 1 still carries the same meaning like utterance 2 despite not having the DM but rather.

Since DMs are optional in nature, their presence in an utterance does not contribute to the content/meaning of an utterance. They may instead of making a semantic contribution to an utterance (that is affecting its truth conditions), be used to convey explicit information about the structure of a discourse (Hirschberg and Litman, 1987). The following example illustrates this.

**Example 7** (Situation: The speakers are talking about the causes of poverty)

Speaker A: *Kho sasa* eshida ivere ena
So now where is the problem?

Speaker B: Eshida ne mingonye okhwikhala mukunda luono.
The problem is canes overstaying in the farm for long

Speaker C: Omanye luonyola etsisendinewarunga amadeni ova ukalushe mumadeni.
You know when you get money and pay debts you are back to poverty

In this extract Speaker A uses the words *kho sasa* (so now) in the interactional slot of uptake. The whole utterance as a move is divided into two parts. The DM, and the rest of the utterance, which carries the content of the utterance (A question). The DM does not have a connection with the question since the removal of the DM from the
utterance does not alter the meaning being conveyed (Leech, 1994). This is illustrated as below:

Example 8
Speaker A: Kho sasa eshida ivere ena?  
DM  Question  [So now where is the problem?]
DM  Question

The Question in the utterance consists of an interrogative pronoun (Where), a verb (is) and a noun phrase (the problem)

In this study therefore the elements in a move that utilized the interactional slot of uptake and appealer were identified as DMs and their forms categorised on the basis of the Halliday (1994) model of grammar.

4.3 Forms of Discourse Markers

According to Halliday (1994), the meaning of a text is constructed from its component parts: its sentences, clauses, phrases and words. Halliday provides the notion of rank, which states that a sentence consists of one or more clauses; a clause consists of one or more groups; a group consists of one or more words; and a word consists of one or more morphemes.

In English, DMs appear in different syntactic categories. For example, there are word-level DMs like oh, well, and, but, or, so, because, like, now, and then on the other hand, DMs such as I mean, let me think, and y’know are classified as clauses. (Shiffrin, 1987)

However it is important to note that when classifying a DM into a syntactic category, the relation between a DM and the rest of the utterance is not propositional in nature
but between discourse spans in terms of their illocutionary force. For example in English numerous cases of the use of conjunctions as signals of textual relations bear little or no affinity with their original propositional meaning. (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos, 1997). The use of *because* for instance may establish coordinate, rather than subordinate relations. Instead of creating a relationship of causal dependency between clauses, *because* signals continuation or elaboration of previous statements in conversation. Therefore a conjunction like *and* may signal textual relations as well as indicators of speakers orientation and attitudes towards what is being said and towards their addressees. (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos, 1997).

Having identified the DMs, Halliday (1994) model of grammar therefore formed the basis for the classification of the DMs. The DMs were classified into a rank that includes which those occur at word, phrase, clause and sentence level.

4.3.1 Word level markers

Excerpts from the present study show that there were DMs, which occurred at word level. Halliday (1994) classifies words into eight classes namely: noun, adjective, numeral, determiner, verb, preposition, adverb and conjunction. The corpus on which this study is based shows that the DMs occurred in the following word classes: conjunctions, nouns, adverbs and verbs.

*Conjunctions*

These are words that link other words, phrases or clauses. Some of the DMs identified from the data in the present study were found to be in this category. The markers did not serve the function of linking in the utterances but they were categorized into this
class after their English equivalents being established. Excerpts from the data show the presence of the DMs.

**Example 9** (Situation: the speakers are talking about the disparities between men and women)

Speaker A: Khuli mwakhumenyile shichila shina avandu vasatsa vanyal okhuheya ne omundu mukhasi nanyolekha na makhwa amatinyu. [As a man and a woman are married how come if a man is engaging in extra marital affairs, this is not an issue but for a woman it is a crime?]

Speaker B: Sasa omanye awenao mundu musatsa nomuvolole sasa omusatsa nie uvukulanga omukhasi okhurula ewavo nakhwa etsingombe. [Now you know a man is free to do anything now he is the one who takes the woman and pays dowry for her.]

Speaker C: Sasa olavolanga ori okhurunga ovukhwe ne sababu yokhuhea. [Now are you saying that paying dowry is reason to be adulterous?]

Speaker C: Akholanga namanyile ari na makoso lakini nianua ari ayire alayira tsalakini mwene uvere omuvolole shichila okhuruka khale vakaya vari omukhasi sanyala okhutekha khu vasatasa vavili tawe. [He does that knowing that it is wrong but if he decides to marry, he will just marry, he is free because since immemorial a woman cant marry two men, its impossible]

The extract above shows the use of the conjunction **sichila (because)** in the utterance made by speaker A. Apart from linking the utterances that come before and after it the DM prepares the hearer to expect more from the speaker. In this example the speaker uses the DM to add on that a man is free to marry and that since time immemorial a woman can’t marry two men.

**Example 10** (Situation: Speakers are talking about how to tackle poverty)

Speaker B: Nee sasa serikali inyala okhukhola irie?inyala yeresia emiisaada khu maskini. [So now what can the government do? Can it bring aid to the poor?]

Speaker C: Eeh.Yaani nivaherwa eshindu novulai shichila eshida nomusingi omulai lakini koo avandu vanyolanga etisendi okhurula muvul.imi lakin vavatakha. [Yes I mean if they are given something it is good because the problem is good foundation but people get money from farming but they are still poor.]

Speaker B: Onyala okhuva nende etisendi lakini novula omupango shivula sholakholela tawe.Ata avandu vanyolanga etisendi ne vangua amalwa. [You can have money but without a plan it's useless. Even people get the money but they go on drinking sprees]

This extract shows the DM **lakini Koo (but)** coming between two utterances speaker C’s utterance. Given that it is a conjunction, it is expected that it links the two
utterances showing contrast, but instead the marker serves to introduce an utterance that begs to differ politely on the issue of giving aid to poor people. Examples of other discourse markers identified and categorised as conjunctions in this study are: Kho (so), Nee koo (and politely), Lakini koo (But politely), Khandi (again), Ass (ok) and Lakini (But).

Nouns

According to traditional grammar nouns are words that name a person, animal place, thing or an abstract idea. The corpus on which this study is based shows two DMs occurring in this category: Vulano (today) and lano kho lano (today so today). They were established to be nouns after they were translated. The following extract shows the DM vulano (today) in an utterance.

**Example 11** (Situation: The speakers are talking about what happens in payment of dowry)

[The boy would come and see the girl. After seeing the girl, ok they will agree and then ten cows will be brought]

Speaker B: Awenao omukhana ashiri okhwitsa?
[By that time the girl has not come?]

Speaker B: Ass tsingombe nitsiakhetsa, vulano valalomba amalwa mukhana sasa alalanga aveshe ne asinjila khumachina avashwe amafure keingombe vulano valasisa ombiri kukwe ne papa uwe amuvolela ari wivule omusiani khorekho omukhana.
[Ok when the cows have been brought, today they will prepare alcohol, the girl she will besmeared with oil on her body then her father will tell her to give birth to a boy first then a girl]

In this extract the DM Vulano (today) is used by a speaker A in her second move/turn. It occurs in the middle of her utterance to cement the discourse and keep the conversation going.
Example 12 (Situation: The speakers are talking about traditional games)

Speaker B: Nee emibayo cha khale
[What about games]

Speaker C: Avana avasiani nakhana mulapimana amani. Sasa mulatsia musaa lano muchesiane amani lano avasiani na avakhana lano kho lano mulachesiananga amani....
[Girls and boys will wrestle in the arena. So girls and boys would wrestle and wrestle]

Speaker A: Avakhana vanyala okhupa avasiani asi?  
[Can girls wrestle the boys down?]

Example 12 further shows the use of the DM lano (today) and lano kho lano (today so today) in the utterance. The corpus on which this study is based reveals that two markers fell in this category.

Adverbs

Traditional grammar defines adverbs as words, which describe or give more information about a verb, adjective, adverb or phrase. From our data there were Discourse Markers, which were categorized as adverbs. The Discourse Markers were ata (Even) and sasa (Now). The following examples show their presence in utterances.

Example 13 (Situation: The speakers are talking about grinding cereals)

Speaker A: Iwamwasietsanga amachina shikalio tawe?  
[When you were grinding where there stone is the floor?]

Speaker B: Sasa eshindu shalinjio ......  
[Now there was something............]

Speaker C: Ata norera simsim newachaka okhusia solanyolakho amachina ta sasa esimsim yarumikhanga okhulia ovusuma  
[Even if you bring simsim and grind it, there will be no small stones, now the simsim was used to eat ugali]

Speaker A: Avandu vasireanga mukinu  
[There are those who used pestle and mortar]
In this extract speaker C uses the DM *ata (even)* in her utterance after speaker B has spoken. *Even* is an adverb that is used to emphasize a comparison. In this extract it is used to emphasize the utterance that talks about the uses of simsim.

**Example 14** (Situation: Speakers are discussing the issue of traditional medicine)

Speaker A: *Sasa* wolasalilanga niho wavalafutula  
[Now where you are feeling pain is where they pierce?]

Speaker B: Vafutule amavanga karule. Sasa shisumbulanga namavanga  
[They will pierce so that you bleed the problem is blood that is not flowing]

Speaker A: Nee omurwe nikulakhulumanga?  
[What if your head is aching?]

Speaker B: Valakhusalaka.  
[They will make small cuts on the head]

In this extract the DM *Sasa (Now)* is used by speaker A in her first utterance. The DM is an adverb but in this extract it comes before a question emphasizing the question being asked.

**Verbs**

These are words used to denote actions. The corpus on which this study is based reveals that one Discourse Marker fell in this category. The discourse marker is *chenda*, which means *walk*. The example below shows it in exchange.

**Example 15** (Situation: Speaker A introduces the issue of conflicts in homes)

Speaker A: *Chenda* khuchache na makhuva ka mutsinzu.  
[Let us start with issues regarding homes]

Speaker B: Etsishida tsia mutsinzu  
[Problems in homes?]

Speaker A: Eeh shina shireranga eshida mungo?  
[Yes what brings problems in homes]

The extract above shows the DM *chenda (walk)* appearing in the utterance made by speaker A in the first turn of the exchange. It comes before the main utterance, which
is a request by the speaker that they begin by looking at the source of conflicts in homes.

4.3.2 Phrase level Markers

A phrase is a group of words, which together form a unit. From the corpus of this study, this category of DMs formed the bulk of the markers identified. The corpus further reveals that Kabras shows the characteristics of an agglutinative language.

An **agglutinative language** is a language that uses agglutination extensively: most words are formed by joining morphemes together. This term was introduced by Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1836 to classify languages from a morphological point of view. It was derived from the Latin verb *agglutinare*, which means, “to glue together”. For example the utterance *Enzie?* When translated to English means “should I go?” the word *enzie* has an affix *e* and a prefix *e* attached to the root *tsia* which means go. Each of the prefix *e* stands for *I* and *should*.

The researcher observed that DMs in this category involved joining two or more DMs together. For example **Sichila omanye** which means *(Because you know)* involves taking two Discourse Markers and putting them together. The discourse markers are **shichila (because)** and **omanye (you know)**. The following exchange shows the DMs in exchanges.

**Example 16** *(Situation: the speakers are talking about why girls like being cheated)*

Speaker A: *Nanywe avakhana mwanyanza okhukatwa katoto muulilanga ta.*
   *And you girls you like being cheated, if you are told the truth you*
   *do not want to hear*

Speaker B: *Sichila omanye fakhukata yenyanga ari akhulombe oyanze*
   *Because you know if he cheats you he wants you to be happy*
4.3.3 Clause level Markers

Halliday (1994) defines a clause as a group of words consisting of a subject and a finite form of the verb. DMs as clauses were identified by the researcher by looking at the syntactic configuration of the DM. The researcher identified DMs, which had the subject and the verb. For example, the DM *omanye* which means *you know* has the subject *you* and the verb *know*. The same applies to the DM *Yaani*, which means *I mean*. The subject is *I* while the verb is *mean*. The following examples show the DM in exchanges

**Example 18** (Situation: The speakers are talking about the relation between the Nandi and Luhya)

Speaker A: sasa avanandi vetsanga na mavere mulolo
[Now the Nandi would come with milk in a gourd]

Speaker B: Kho vulano yetse vamwe ovusie vua vule atsie alombere avana ovusala
[So today the Nandi would come and be given floor to go and prepare porridge for their children]

Speaker A: Sasa avanandi patala yokhulima varukanga tsa etsingombe *omanye* wakati yeneyi vali avefi ve etsingombe tsia avaluhya
[Now the Nandi did not farm they reared animals *you know* those days they like staling animals from the luhya]

The above excerpt shows the DM *Omany*e (*you know*) being used by speaker A in his second utterance as a contribution to the ongoing discourse.

**Example 19** (Situation: The speakers are talking about what happens before a girl and a boy get married)

Speaker A: Mwana mukhana yesi avetsanga wiyamile?
[Will the girl have accepted?]

Speaker B: Tawe
[No]

Speaker C: Ata ashili okhulola omusiani
[She will not even have seen the boy]

Speaker B: *Yaani* ne shindu sha lazima omukhana alove ayanze?
[You *mean* it is by force if the girl accepts or not.]
Example 19 shows an example of the DM *Yaani* (*You mean*) being used in an utterance made by speaker B in the ongoing conversation. From the corpus on which this study is based other discourse markers which were found to fall in this category include: *Yaani omanye* (*I mean you know*), *Mani omanye* (*You know*), *Yaani koo* (*I mean politely*) and *Sasa lola* (*Now you see*)

### 4.3.4 Sentence level Markers

This is the highest construction on the rank scale (Halliday, 1994). A sentence is a group of words usually containing a verb, which expresses a thought in the form of a statement, question, instruction or exclamation. Sentences are therefore:

1. **Declarative** – They are used to make a statement
2. **Interrogative** – They are used to ask questions
3. **Exclamatory** – They are used to show strong emotion
4. **Imperative** – They are used to give direction or command

From the corpus on which this study is based, the DMs that were classified as sentences include *Endikoo*, which translated means "I was saying that". The following excerpt below shows the DM in an exchange.

**Example 20** (Situation: the speakers are talking about the burial ceremony of a senior person)

Speaker A: *Endikoo* amakhuva kano kekholekhanga saa ngapi
*I was saying at what time does this happen?*

Speaker B: Mushitere kama saa hii
*During the day like now*

Speaker C: Avasakhulu nivo valinjio lakini avashere na vana tawe
*Only old men were present but not children and women*

The DM *Endikoo* (*I was saying*) is used by speaker A at the beginning of his turn. The DM is an example of a declarative statement.
Example 21 (Situation: the speakers are talking about a burial ceremony)

Speaker B: Olalolanga, eshibala shiamera shirio
[You are seeing that the world is like that]

Speaker A: Nee vamuyavira eweneyo?
[And did they bury her there?]

Speaker B: Lwavarunga etsingombe ne vamuyavira.
[Yes, when they paid two cows, she was buried at the man’s home]

The DM olalolanga (Are you seeing) is used by speaker B at the beginning of her turn. The DM is an example of an interrogative. From the corpus of this study the researcher noted that this category had the least number of DMs.

Studies done in English language, Schiffrin (1987) and Blakemore (2002) show that DMs occur at word level as conjunctions e.g. so and because. DMs also occur as clauses e.g. you know and I mean and as phrases e.g. but rather. This study reveals that the following categories of DMs are present in Kabras just like in English. The categories are word, phrase and clause level. Whereas there is need for research to document the presence of the sentence level markers in English, this category of DMs was observed to occur in the corpus on which this study is based.

4.4 The distribution of Discourse Markers in exchanges and utterances

A DM may appear in initial or final position in an utterance or an exchange. Goffman (1974) says that the position of a DM does affect the function it serves in a conversation. He further notes that the DM in initial position has more important functions as compared to the markers in final position. The following extracts from our data reveal the various positions of DMs in exchanges and utterances in conversations in Kabras
4.4.1 Initial position of an exchange

The exchange below shows that speaker A using the DM **haya nee (ok and)** at the beginning of the exchange. The DM begins an exchange that talks about why girls like boys who are not upright.

**Example 22** (Situation: The speakers are talking about why girls like bad boys)

Speaker A: **Haya nee**, likhuvu lindi livreomby avakhana shivenyanga avasiani avalunji tawe venyanga avasiani vakholanga efituko.
[Ok and, the next issue is that girls do not like boys who are straight forward but Like boys who do bad things]

Speaker B: Omanye aundi avakhana valondanga avasiani vano shichila vavere nende etsisendi nomba vafualanga ovulai
[You know girls follow them because they have money or they dress well]

Speaker C: Mba olanyola akatanga avakhana avanyinji shichila uvere nende etsisendi.
[Yes you may find that he cheats girls because he has money.]

4.4.2 Initial position of a move

The exchange below shows the DMs **nee koo (and)** appearing in the initial position of the move.

**Example 23** (Situation: The speakers are talking about the issue of girls wearing trousers)

Speaker A: Mufualanga etsiloti?
[Do you wear trousers?]

Speaker B: **Nee koo** Khufualanga lakini olaparanga ori omanye avevuli shivenyanga ta
[And we usually wear but you think parents like it? They do not want]

Speaker C: Shina eshivi nende okhufualu etsiloti?
[What is wrong with wearing a trouser?]

4.4.3 Middle position of a move

In the following exchange the DM **sichila** (because) is observed to occur in the middle of the move made by speaker A.

**Example 24** (Situation: Speakers are talking about men empowering women)

Speaker A: Avasatsa shivenyanga avashere okhuva nende etsisendi tawe **Sichila** omukhasi nava nende etsisendi alava nende eshireche.
[Men do not like their wives to have money because when Women have money they become rude.]
Speaker B: Tawe shikali kario tawe sasa shonyala okhuyinga tso ori shichila uvere ne mali omushere yekhale tsa ingo tsa
[No it is not like that, you can not insist that because you are rich your wife should stay at home.]

Speaker C: Noyinzilanga elwanyi Kenya omushere aven nende eshindu Shishie
[If you work away from home you must ensure that your wife is independent economically]

4.4.3 The final position of a move

Extracts from our data reveal that discourse markers occur in the final position of moves. It was however noted that there were very few instances of markers in this position. In the exchange below speaker A uses the discourse marker *olaulilanga* (*Are you hearing?*) at the end of his move. The outcome of the exchange is that the speaker gives directions.

**Example 25** (One of the speakers is giving directions to the other)

Speaker A: Otsie paka uleyo *olaulilanga*
[You go until you reach there you are hearing?]

Speaker B: Eeh
[Yes]

Speaker C: Ass awenao olalola elivukana lia Israel
[Ok there you will see an Israel church]

The corpus on which this study is based reveals the following:

1. That many DMs in the Kabras dialect occur in the initial position of the exchange and move.
2. That there were very few instances of DMs in final position of the move and exchange.

The researcher attributed this to the fact that there were few instances of appealers (cf 4.1.3) from the conversations that were obtained from the respondents sampled according to their age and gender.
4.5 Discourse Markers and age

This study sought to investigate how sociolinguistic factors like age of speaker affected the use of DMs in conversations. From the data it is established that there is no marked difference in the use of the DMs among young and old speakers. Most of the DMs are used by all speakers irrespective of age. However, it is observed that one DM is found in conversations among young speakers only. This is Khandi otushe okhumanya ori (again you should come to know that). The researcher noted that this DM was evidently absent in conversations of older speakers. It is also found out that there are DMs in the speech of older speakers but the same are not be found in conversations of young speakers.

The DM found in the speech of older speakers are Lano (Today) and kho lano (so today). These DMs are evidently absent in the speech of young speakers. The researcher gathered that the DMs are older forms of language. It was observed that older people are the repository of older forms of language while the young are prone to use and embrace new forms of language (Chambers, 1980). For the DMs in the conversations of young speakers the researcher attributed their use as a marker of identity by the speakers with same members of their age group either as young boys or girls.

4.6 Discourse Markers and Gender.

The gender of a speaker is a socio feature which linguistic differences have been found to correlate (Chambers and Trudgill, 1980). From the data on which this study is based, it was observed that there was a marked linguistic difference in the choice
and use of DMs in relation to the gender of the respondent. For example, the speech of women had more DMs as compared to the speech of men.

In order to account for this linguistic difference, the researcher transcribed the conversations of both men and women. Table 4.1 shows the number of DMs used by men and women. The number of markers in the speech of each gender was counted and documented. It was found that men had a total of 128 DMs while women had a total of 150 DMs in their speeches. By judgment sampling four DMs were selected for observation in the data and these were sasa (Now), yaani (I mean), Nee koo (and) and Lolakho (See). The mean of each of the markers was established by looking at the number of times a DM occurs in the speech and dividing it by the total number of discourse markers present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Discourse Markers and Gender.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above table female speakers used sasa (now) 90 times, yaani (you know) 71 times, Neekoo (and) 101 times and lolakho (see) 117 times. While male speakers used sasa (now) 73 times, Yaani (you know) 65 times, neekoo (and) 52 times and lolakho (see) 53 times. This therefore shows that women used more DMs in their speech as compared to men. While there is need for research to document why this is so, the researcher attributed this to be a cultural trait among the Kabras whereby women were observed to talk more than men. The women in Kabras utilize the
relational function of language which accounts for them talking more than their men counterparts.

Averages for each marker were then categorized into male, female and combined sexes for quantitative comparison purposes.

**Table 4.2 The correlation between Discourse Markers and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasa (Now)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaani (You know)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neekoo (and)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolakho (see)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 above shows that out of the four markers designated for observation, two of the markers *sasa (now)* and *yaani (I mean)* were used equally by both genders, while the remaining two markers *nee koo (and)* and *lolakho (See)* were overwhelming used more often by women than men.

An analysis of the correlation from the above table reveals the following:

1. For *sasa (now)* the men have a mean of 1.75 while the mean for women is 1.66 Their SD is 6.21 for men and 7.15 for women.

2. For *Yaani (I mean)* the mean for men is 1.96 while for women it is 2.1. The SD is 5.40 for both men and women.
3. For *nee koo* (*and*) the mean for men is 2.46 while for women it is 1.28. The SD is 2.71 for men and 9.46 for women.

4. For *lolakho* (*see*) the mean for men is 2.66 while for women it is 1.28 and the SD is 2.71 for men while for women it is 9.46.

The following conclusions can therefore be drawn from the table:

1. That there is no significant difference between the usage of *sasa* (*now*) un men and women

2. There is also no significant difference between how men and women use *Yaani* (*I mean*)

3. There is significant difference between how men and women use *nee koo* (*and*) and *lolakho* (*see*) since women use *nee koo* (*and*) and *lolakho* (*see*) more than men.

4. Women used many DMs in their speeches as compared to men.

5. More polite forms of the DMs are used more by women than men.

6. In Kabras the politeness marker is marked by an affix *kho* (*so*) and *koo* (*and*)

Since the corpus on which this study is based reveals that women used more polite forms of the DMs as compared to men, the researcher felt that the reason could be that men in our society have traditionally been rated socially by their occupation, their earning power, and perhaps by their abilities - in other words, by what they do. On the other hand, women have to be rated instead, to a greater extent than men, on how they appear.

Another reason could be that, by using polite forms, a woman is trying to protect her *face* (*a term often used in sociolinguistics to denote a person's needs and wants in*
relation to others see (Brown and Levinson, 1978). In other words, a woman tries to
claim more status in society. Her greater use of polite forms may also imply that she
does not attend solely to her own face needs but also to those of the people she is
interacting with, thus avoiding disagreement and seeking agreement and rapport.

Since a speaker may use a DM in his or her speech to sound polite and appear social
(Brown and Levinson, 1978), a speaker may also use a marker to attain conversational
consistency (Bussman, 1984). Research done in English shows that DMs function as
linguistic soothers or verbal adapters that allow speakers to fill gaps in their speeches
(Croucher, 2004). The corpus on which this study is based reveals that the DMs
present in the conversations had many functions. These functions are discussed in
details in the next segment.

4.7 Functions of Discourse Markers

In this section a discussion of the functions of the DMs earlier identified is presented.
The markers were identified from the exchanges in which they occur. In a
classification, the exchange is so defined that it produces an outcome. The nature of
the outcome is determined by the illocutionary (and other) acts, which are realized by
the elements of which the exchange is composed (Edmondson, 1981). A DM being
part of the utterance is produced by a speaker in reference to an addressee (Schiffrin,
1987). It therefore has an illocutionary force realized in the functions that it serves in
the outcome of an exchange.
Schourup (1983) notes that Discourse Markers have multiple functions and one of them is that it allows the speaker to show his or her mental processes in an appropriate manner:

There is room in the tone of a conversation for much private thought. We form overall judgements, plan provisional responses, rank and revise them store questions, foresee the need for further conversation and routinely do these things while someone else is talking or while we ourselves hold the turn.

According to Georgakopoulou and Goutusos, (1997) the functions of Discourse Markers are essentially traceable to Halliday's (1994) tripartite division of language functions into ideational, textual and interpersonal. The textual function covers the stringing together and segmenting of units for example, the signalling of topic shifts and continuities, the return to topics after digressions the interpersonal function covers the relation between addressor and addressee and the expression of the subjective elements of linguistic communication e.g. feelings and attitudes. It is on this basis that the functions of discourse markers were categorized. Excerpts from the corpus on which this study is based, show the functions of Discourse Markers in conversations in Kabras.

4.7.1 Starting a new turn/conversation/topic

In the data analyzed below there are cases where the Discourse Markers **Aya (ok)** and **khuisie (To me)** were used to start a new turn/conversation. The DMs were produced at the beginning of the utterances. Consider the example below; the Discourse Marker **aya (ok)** is used at the beginning of the turn to start a new topic in the conversation. The marker is produced by speaker A in his turn to change the topic from talking about how the society is biased towards girls as compared to boys to a new topic about the widening gap between the poor and the rich.
Example 26 (Situation: The interviewer changes his topic from the biasness of the society to the gap between the poor and the rich)

Speaker A: Ata avandu vakhasi vene vaaminanga vari avasiani nivo avana kho avandu vakhasi ninywe shida.
[Even women also believe that girls are not children so you women are the problem]

Speaker B: Kenako na matukhu ka khale saa hii amakhuxva ka chenja
[That is what used to happen long time ago nowadays things have changed]

Speaker A: Aya elirebo lindi livere ombu avandu avainda nende avamaskini yaani avatajiri vaenedeleanga okhuva nende efindu ne avamaskini navo vaenedeleanga okhutakhana
[Ok the next question is about the rich and the poor how come the rich continue being rich and the poor continue to be poor]

Speaker C: Avainda shivakhonyanga avamaskini tawe.
[The rich do not help the poor]

Speaker B: Yaani vavahee etisendi?
[You mean they should be given money?]

Speaker A: vavahee etsikasi?
[Should they give them jobs?]

Example 27 (Situation: The speakers are talking about why girls say no when they sometimes mean yes)

Speaker A: Ass nee mwana mukhana navola ari yee avetsanga wiyamile no tawe?
[And if a girl says yes does she mean it]

Speaker B: Khuisie ndalolanga endi nivavola vari tawe vavetsanga veyamile sichila vekanganakhane veyamile
[To me I think that when they say no they mean yes because sometimes they say no when they have accepted]

Speaker A: Kho mwana mukhana niyeyama vuangu avetsanga ulovire no alakatanga .Ne navola ari lindakho avetsanga wiyamile
[So if a girl accepts quickly she will be lying or refused but if she says wait she will have said yes]

Speaker C: Shichila omundu musatsa nomukaya eshindu alaendelea okhulaonda
[Because if you tell a man no he will still be following you]

Example 27 above shows the initial DM khuisie (to me) produced by speaker A being used to start a new turn in the conversation through which the speaker takes the opportunity to offer her contribution regarding the debate about what a girl means by saying no or yes.
4.7.2 Interrupting politely

Politeness seems to be an important value that occurs in all societies, even though the social norms relating to what is and what is not considered polite behaviour may vary across cultures (Brown and Levinson, 1978). It is a form of emotional control serving as a means of preserving face. Politeness or tact as it is sometimes called, is a “strategic conflict avoidance” (Leech, 1973) or a device used “in order to reduce friction in personal interaction” (Lakoff, 1977). The corpus on which this study is based reveals that in verbal interaction politeness manifests itself through the use of certain Discourse Markers.

Excerpts from our data show the Discourse Markers that were used by speakers in conversations to interrupt other speakers politely. The speakers used the Discourse Markers to interrupt the other speakers but effectively avoided making the interrupted speaker feel interrupted rudely. From the corpus the DMs that were found to perform this function are shichila lenjela (because see) and nee koo (and politely). The markers were produced with a falling intonation. Consider the following extract.

**Example 28** (Situation: The interviewer is talking to young female respondents about how unfair people can be to girls compared to boys)

Speaker B: Aya elirevo lia khaviri livere ombu avandu shivalalamikanga nivalola omwana omusiani nali nende avakhana avanyinji lakinik nail omwana omukhana valalamikanga sana shichila shina? [The second question is that how come people do not complain when they see a boy with many girls but when it comes to a girl they complain so much]

Speaker C: Khuisie ndalolanga endi shichila avakhana avanyinji vaumianga shichila itukjha avundu Kenya omwana omukhana ateshe sasa Kenya vekhale ngumu lakini omwansa omusiani vaparanga vari kho alakhavanga omukhana omulai ……… [To me I think that they think that boys are looking for the best girls but for the girl you have to be married and there are so many problems………]

Speaker B: Shichila lenjela kava vari Peter anyala wetsa saa inne tsia mushiro nawe witse saa mbili pfka ovole wolarulanga novulai kweli? [Because see if peter comes home at ten in the night and you come home at eight do you know that you must explain, is that fair]
The above extract shows the speaker C beginning her turn while the first respondent is still talking about how unfair the society is to girls as compared to boys. She begins her turn with the DM *shichila lenjela* (*because see*) and goes ahead to make her contribution on the topic by adding that if Peter who is a brother to the speaker C respondent comes home late he is not reprimanded but if the speaker C does the same she could even be beaten. This happens to be a specific example of how the society is unfair to girls and the previous speaker does not feel offended by being interrupted because the second respondent begins her turn with the Discourse Marker *Shichila lenjela* (*because see*). The DM softens the utterance so that the speaker does not sound rude. Example 29 below further illustrates how another Discourse Marker *Nee koo* (*and*) is used by speaker A to interrupt speaker B politely.

**Example 29** (Situation: The interviewer is asking respondent if they wear trousers)

Speaker A: *Mufualanga etsiloti?*  
[Do you wear trousers?]

Speaker B: *Khufualanga lakini omanye avevuli shivenyanga ta .... shichila.....*  
[We wear but you know parents do not want ........because......]

Speaker A: *Koo shina eshivi nende okhufuala etsiloti?*  
[And what is wrong with wearing trousers]

Speaker C: *Vaaminanga varinofuala eloti olaviya*  
[They believe that by wearing trousers you will be spoilt]

Speaker A: *Kho enywe mulalolanga muri etsishida tsino tsinyala okhuwa tsirie?*  
[So you think that how can these problems be solved]

Speaker B: *Sasa nokhwifira tsa*  
[Now it is to persevere]

Speaker A: *Sonyala okhulakaya na vevuli tawe?*  
[Can’t you talk to your parents]

Speaker C: *Vaveli shivaelewanga tawe shichila..........*  
[Parents do not understand because..........]

Speaker A: *Nee koo........nikhuva nende etsifamili miting.*  
[And ......what if we have family meetings]
This excerpt shows that the speaker A abruptly interrupts speaker C to ask a question regarding whether it is wrong for girls to wear trousers. It is noted that the speaker A produces the Discourse Marker *koo (and politely)* before producing the question. The marker *koo (and politely)* produced with a falling intonation politely appeals to the listener. Therefore the marker produced before the question makes speaker A to sound polite and therefore the previous speaker does not feel offended by the interruption.

This scenario is repeated when speaker A also abruptly interrupts to pose a proposal that in order to solve problems in homes there should be family meetings. If the question and the proposal are posed without the Discourse Markers they would appear rude because they are interruptions. The discourse markers *Nee koo (and politely)*, *shichila lenjela (because see)* and *koo (and politely)* help a speaker redress Brown and Levinson (1987) face threatening act through which a speaker interrupts a listeners freedom of action with orders, requests or suggestions.

4.7.3 Highlight of a proposition that immediately follows

From the data it was established that there were Discourse Markers that were used to give a hint to the listener on the upcoming utterance. The markers were used to refer to the utterance that follows immediately. From this point of view, these Discourse Markers were seen as cataphoric markers since it is the utterance that comes after these markers that was emphasized. In this way the speaker can draw the listener’s participation in the conversation because it draws his attention to expect what follows. The following examples illustrates this
Example 30 (Situation: the interviewer is asking the respondent about the medicine they used to use)

Speaker A: Sasa khwitse khu malesi anyuma yao avandu vesirikhanga varie? [Now let us go to medicine, how did people treat themselves]

Speaker B: Omundu nalwalile vakhalakanga ....sasa nolalwalanga eshirifu valakhusalaka khu shirifu [If someone is unwell they would cut you ....... for example now if you are having chest pains they used make small cuts on your chest]

Speaker A: Valakhukhalaka awene wo lalulalnga [Will they cut you where you are feeling the pain?]

Speaker C: Khushilifu valakhalaka ovupande vuo mukhono omukhasi [On the chest will they cut on the left hand side?]

Speaker B: Omanye omundu nakhuuna omuvano yino olafwa lakini yino tawe [You know if someone pierces you here you will die but not here](Showing the left hand side of the chest)

Speaker C: Ass valatsoma ano ass nivakhatsoma olekhala ne eshitonda shieneshi valavakhao amafura [So they will pierce here and then on the wound they will appear cow oil]

In this extract speaker B uses the Discourse Marker omanye (you know). The marker is said with a rising intonation followed by a short pause. Initially the speaker had been talking about making cuts on the chest if someone was unwell. The speaker then uses the marker omanye (you know) before introducing an utterance that talks about the exact place where the cuts can be made. The marker hints on what to expect in the utterance since the speaker had been talking about the areas to be cut.

In the following example speaker B while talking about girls, uses the marker alafu otushe okumanya ori (again you come to know that) before giving the utterance that a girl can like because she knows that you have money. The marker highlights a proposition about why a girl can like you and the proposition is that it could be because of money.

Example 31 (Situation: The interviewer is asking young male respondents if there are any good girls?)

Speaker A: Avakhana avalai vavereho vanyala okhuyanza omundu ata navula etsisendi? [Are there good girls who can love someone even if he does not have money]
Speaker B: Vaho vanyala okhuyanza mani mumenyake lakini nivatiti.
[They can love you but they are very few]

Speaker C: Halafu otushe okhumanya ori omuhana anyala wakhuyanza khane ulolile
eshindu shalenyanga...
[Again you should come to know that a girl can like because she knows there is
something she has seen]

4.7.4 Listener’s attention

Whenever two people are talking, there is need for a person to get the listener’s
attention in the conversation in order to be listened to. Excerpts from our data show
that there were discourse markers that helped the speaker achieve this. The presence
of these Discourse Markers helped to index the interpersonal relationship between the
interlocutors thereby increasing the interpersonal relationship between them. Look at
the following example.

Example 32 (Situation: the interviewer is talking to young male respondents about
gender equality)

Speaker C: Kho olavolanga ori omundu musatsa nie wa maana?
[So are you saying that a man is important?]

Speaker A: Olalolanga ati niitsa khu mikunda avandu vakhasi shivanyolanga tawe
[You are seeing even when it comes to land women do not inherit]

Speaker C: Mba likhuva lienelo liali mukatiba yene ya kwaa eyo Kava vari omundu
musatsa avere nende avakhana venyene shanyala okhuvakavira omukunda
ta?Lenjela omundu niyevule avakhana venyene olaulila ombu ata wane
avula avana
[Yes that issue was in the constitution, if a man has daughters only
why cant he give land to them when he dies? Look if someone has
daughters only you will hear people saying that he does not have
children]

Speaker A: Valolanga vari avasiani nivo avana avakhana tawe
[They say that boys are children but girls are not]

Example 32 shows speaker C using the discourse marker olalolanga (you are seeing)
before the main utterance. During the interview it was noted that when the respondent
used the marker, which means you are seeing. The marker aligned the speaker and the
listener face to face and therefore this captured the listener’s attention. Another
Discourse Marker, which performed the same function, is **Lenjela**, which means *see/look*. In the above extract, the marker is produced in the middle of the utterance before the speaker goes ahead to ask what is wrong with a man giving his daughters land after his death. The question seems to be serious and in order to capture the attention of the listener; the speaker uses the marker before posing the question.

**Example 33** (Situation: the interviewer is talking to old female respondents about how a traditional wedding was done)

Speaker A: **Sholola** Shitukha wefu vatira tsa ngorwa omuimo kwali ena? Omusiani sha okwiri yatsia tsa na mutira ne vatsia nnae. Ata Waronya yesi yavukulwa kwa lazima. [Don’t you see Shitukha was taken by force and married a strong boy like Okwiri would do it even Waronya was taken by force.]

Speaker B: Lakini awenao yali ambichiti [But it was not far]

Speaker C: **Sholola** etofauti ivereho nende etsiharusi tsia vulano [Don’t you see there is a difference with these modern weddings]

In the above example both speaker A and C use the Discourse Marker **sholola** (*don’t you see?*) before their main utterances. For speaker A, the marker captures the listener’s attention since it asks the listener if he is seeing or not, before the respondent goes ahead to list the girls who were customarily taken away by force to be married. In the second incident **sholola** (*don’t you see*) comes immediately before the interviewer comments that traditional weddings were different from modern ones.

The marker makes the listener to take note about the differences between modern and traditional weddings. These markers when produced appeal to the listener to see and therefore his/her attention is captured before the speaker goes ahead to say what he intended to say.
4.7.5 Holding the floor and keeping ones turn

In a conversation when a speaker is making a contribution, the listeners are tempted to interrupt and therefore also try to make their contribution. Excerpts from our data show that one of the ways to keep ones turn or hold the floor, speakers used discourse markers in their utterances and therefore continued talking despite attempts by the listeners to interrupt. Let us examine the following examples.

Example 34 (Situation: the interviewer is talking to old female respondents about games that people used to play)

Speaker B: Ne emibayo nacho? [What about games]

Speaker A: Avana avasiani na vakhana mulachesiana amani sasa mulachesiana musaa vulano muchesiane amani vulano avakhana na vasiani vulano mulachesiananga amani kho avasiani........ [Boys and girls would go in an open place to wrestle]

Speaker B: Avakhana vanyala okhupa avasiani asi? [Can boys wrestle girls down?]

In this extract speaker A is making her contribution regarding the games that people used to play. At the same time speaker B wants to make her contribution by asking a question. In order to keep her turn so that he can complete his current contribution, talking about the games, speaker B uses the discourse markers sasa (now) and vulano (today), to keep on postponing speaker A from making her contribution. In the meantime she continues making her contribution regarding how boys and girls would wrestle. However before she finishes speaker B grabs her turn to ask if girls could wrestle boys down.

Example 35 (Situation: the interviewer is asking the respondents about how a traditional wedding was done)

Speaker A: Awenao omukhana ashili okhwitsa [By that time the girl has not come?]

Speaker B: Ass etsingombe nitsiakhetsa lano valalomba amalwa sasa omuhkhana alanje aveshe ne atsie asinjile amudodo saasa valomba amachina kalashinjilakho ass vamuvase amafura ne lano avandu vasinjile eyo. Ass papa alasinjila amuvolele ari yevule avana avanyinji.
The above example shows speaker B using the following Discourse Markers to keep the floor: ass (ok), lano (today), and sasa (now). She uses the DMs when making her contribution regarding how a traditional wedding was done. The DMs make the listener not to interrupt because they show that the speaker is still talking and therefore this enables the speaker to hold the floor. In this regard the Discourse Marker is used as speech filler.

4.7.6 To disagree politely

In a conversation there are times when speakers do disagree. It was observed that when a speaker disagrees with the listener, the usage of Discourse Marker serves as a positive politeness strategy (Cook, 1983). The Discourse Marker helps to mitigate the face threatening act of disagreeing with the listener and therefore to ensure cooperation in the conversation.

In example 36 below speaker A is asking speaker B what he would do if she had a young brother who was a drunkard and she is living with her. In her first turn the respondent uses a Discourse Marker sasa omanye (now you now) before giving an utterance that disagrees with the suggestion that speaker A had given. When speaker A presses on, arguing that the brother could be a young one, speaker B accepts that she can persevere and to bring in an utterance that disagrees, she uses the Discourse Marker lakini omanye (but you know), before giving a warning that if the brother persists then she would kick him out.
Example 36 (Situation: The interviewer is asking respondents about the causes of problems in the family)

Speaker A: Nee avana navo ?kama okhuva nende wanda uwo omumesi
[What about children? like having a drunken brother]

Speaker B: sasa omanye esie sienyala okhwikhala nende omundu sha omwenoyo ta.
[Now you know I can not live with someone like that]

Speaker A: Ata nali omwana wenyu omutiti.
[Even if he is your young brother]

Speaker B: Ta ndamenya nnae lakini omanye naendelea ndamukhuma
[Ok I will stay with him but you know if he continues I will chase him away]

In the above extract the Discourse Markers sasa omanye (now you know) and lakini omanye (but you know) occur before utterances that disagree with what the previous speaker had said. The occurrence of these markers before these utterances softens the utterances that disagree.

Example 37 (Situation: The interviewer is asking the respondents about the gender equality in homes)

Speaker A: Halafu ndatasakhoo endi omusatsa anyala wakhola eshindu shiosi shichila niye wayira omukhasi.
[And then I can add that a man can do anything because he is the one who married the wife]

Speaker B: Kho amakhuva ka ovusawa kavulao
[So the issue of equality is not there]

Speaker C: Lenjela amakhuva kovusawa niko kapomolanga etsinzu yaani sasa ewe olere omukhasi munzu nemulekhane?
[Look equality is what destroys homes, you bring a wife into your home and you become equals?]

Example 37 above reveals that speaker C when disagreeing with the interviewer about equality uses the Discourse Marker lenjela (look) before saying that equality is what destroys homes. The presence of the marker before the utterance softens it so that it does not appear to threaten the listener. Further on speaker C uses the Discourse Marker Yaani sasa (I mean now) before pausing the question that how can you marry a wife and the two of you become equals. This is a question in disagreement and to
sound polite in disagreement there is a Discourse Marker that appears before the utterance.

Summary

In this chapter DMs have been identified from conversations in Kabras. It has been established that the DMs occur at word, phrase, clause and sentence level. The DMs are distributed in the utterances of the speakers where they occur in initial and final positions of the move and exchange.

Despite there being no significant difference in the choice and use of DMs among the different ages of the respondents, it was evidently noted that the gender of the speaker does affect the choice and use of the DMs.

Finally in this chapter it has been established that DMs have functions that they serve in the conversations. The functions include making the conversations coherent, enhancing an interpersonal relationship among the speakers and allowing speakers to interrupt each other politely.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the findings in this study. This is then followed by recommendations and conclusion.

5.2 Summary of study

This study examined the forms of DMs and established the functions that are served by the markers in conversations in Kabras. The study was informed by two theories: The Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson (1986) and the Speech Act Theory (1962) by J.L. Austin. Using the Edmondson (1981) model of conversation analysis, the DMs were found to utilize the interactional slot of uptake and appealer. It was however noted that conversations in Kabras have few instances of appealers as compared to uptake. A similar observation has been made in some languages such as English (Edmondson, 1981).

The following DMs are present in conversations in Kabras. The DMs are found at word level e.g Kho (so). Phrase level; Sichila omanye (because you know), Clause level; omanye (you know) and Sentence level Endikoo (I was saying). Many of the DMs appear at phrase level. This is possibly because Kabras shows the characteristics of an agglutinative language whereby words tend to lump together. There are DMs
which occurred at sentence level a category observed to be missing in some languages like English (Schiffrin, 1987: Blakemore, 2002).

In this study, the DMs are observed to occur at the initial, middle and final position of the exchanges and moves. The study further demonstrates that the position of a DM is crucial in determining the function that the DM serves in a conversation. The DMs which were observed to appear in the initial part of an exchange or move served many functions in the conversations.

Whereas there is no significant difference in the choice and use of DMs across age, there is a marked difference in the choice and use of DM according to gender. It is observed that women used more DMs in their conversations as compared to men. It has also been noted that women used more DMs with polite forms as compared to men. The reason for this is that women were observed to utilize the expressive function of language that reports feelings or attitudes of the speaker or evokes feelings in the listener. Ordinary language discourse is the expression of emotions, feelings and attitudes where the speakers reach out and establish rapport while communicating (Halliday, 1994).

This study further established that DMs present in Kabras have many conversational functions. The functions include starting a new topic, interrupting politely, highlighting a proposition that immediately follows, getting a listeners' attention and disagreeing politely. It is also noted that DMs show anisomorphism and multiplicity or non-exclusivity in the relationship between DMs (as Forms) and their Functions. This means that a single marker can exhibit more than one function that is it can
convey meanings and relationships in more than one discourse component. The opposite is also valid in the sense that more than one Discourse Marker may realize the same function.

5.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following are the recommendations:

First, speechwriters and other professionals who use language in their day to day work ought to be enlightened on the importance of DMs, given that DMs play an important role in conversations. This will go a long way as part of the expansion into the art of good communication.

Second, DMs can be of importance to people in the practice of public speaking since it will enhance their prowess as efficient speakers. People targeted in this group include politicians and public relations persons. With use of DMs they will enhance the speed of delivery, style of presentation, formal rhetorical structure of what is uttered and delivery of longer periods of speech without unnecessary interruption.

Further, a study on the impact and importance of DMs on perceptions of communicative competence and credibility should be carried out since individuals judge others based on the manner in which they communicate (Eastman, 1975). It is therefore necessary to determine whether the use or lack of use DMs in an individual’s speech hinders the perceptions of speaker’s competence or credibility.
Third, in a classroom situation, DMs should be used by teachers in serving important pedagogical functions such as separating ideas, indicating temporal relationships and providing emphasis and contrast. This will improve on clarity and effectiveness of pedagogical communication.

Since the study has drawn and analysed data drawn from adult speakers, it is necessary therefore to use data drawn from children below 5 years. Research done in this area will be useful to teachers and it will demonstrate the developmental aspects of the use of DMs. It will show at what stage children acquire and start using DMs in their speech.

Finally the study looked at DMs in Kabras, there should be research to delve into the DMs present in other dialects because this will provide a basis for comparison and conclusions on DMs found in the Luhya language. And research on other Kenyan Languages would even be a good idea.

5.4 Conclusion

Based on the findings in this study, the Edmondson (1981) model on spoken discourse can be applied in the identification of DMs in other African language as demonstrated in Kabras. The model is useful in showing the interactional slot of appealers and uptake in a move structure, thereby aiding in the identification of DMs from conversations.
This study has demonstrated that the presence of DMs in conversation serves a variety of purposes. In utterances therefore, DMs should not be seen as expletives that is elements whose function is no function at all or useless spurious expressions but as important elements in conversations as demonstrated in this study.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Dialect divisions of Luyia

Adapted from Agongo (1980: 9)
Appendix 2: Unstructured Interview I

The open interview is directed to both male and female respondents who are aged between 41 and 65. It’s aimed at generating a discussing on issues being discussed by the respondents. All the respondents are encouraged to participate in the discussion freely. The researcher will ask each of the respondents two questions. Contribution from the other respondents is highly welcome.

What are your names? Sex M/F

R1 ___________________________ _______

R2 ___________________________ _______

R3 ___________________________ _______

When were you born?

R1 ___________________________

R2 ___________________________

R3 ___________________________

**Questions.**

1. How were traditional weddings conducted back in your days?

2. How was dowry negotiated?

3. How were young men courting girls in your days?

4. What is your take if you compare traditional weddings and modern ones?

5. Do you believe that an African woman should be beaten in order for the man to assert his authority?

6. Should parents give part of their wealth to their daughters?

7. AIDS has killed many young people. Parents have been blamed for not advising their children on matters regarding sex. Do you think parents should take an active role in talking to their children over this issue?
Appendix 3: Unstructured interview II

The open interview is directed to both male and female respondents who are aged between 18 and 40 single or married. It’s aimed at generating a discussing on issues being discussed by the respondents. All the respondents are encouraged to participate in the discussion freely. The researcher will ask each of the respondents two questions. Contribution from the other respondents is highly welcome.

What are your names?  Sex M/F  Married/Single

R1 ______________________  __________________  ______________
R2 ______________________  __________________  ______________
R3 ______________________  __________________  ______________

When were you born?

R1 ______________________
R2 ______________________
R3 ______________________

Questions.

1. If you were to be rich would you allow your wife to go seek employment or she should take care of your children and wealth?

2. Society seems to be blind or accommodating when men engage in extra marital affairs outside marriage but it is very harsh on women. What do you think about this?

3. Don’t you think it should be entrenched in the constitution that if the president is a man this time then it should be a woman next time?

4. The gap between the poor and the rich is wide. What measures should be taken to reduce this gap.

5. Girls nowadays like getting money from men in the name of relationships. Is it true or false? If it’s true why?

6. Men can’t be trusted for serious relationships. What’s your take on that?
Appendix 4: Sample of the transcribed conversations form Kabras

Resp: Yaami okumondokhana nende bavel yiye

Int.: Inyala okhuna eshindu shidi okumondokhana nende current issues.

Ata kwingala okhumanya kuni alolanga ariena Free primary education.

Khe mierere loo khumanga . . . . . Niwatiwa kwa musukulini

Omunywire: Okenya okhuna independent nohe silekhala ingo
do lake avana uave?

Resp: Khwisie awenawe ndololanga endi Vulimundu ave netifile

Sichila okhunywa okhumanya kalekholetka Musambwa.

Int.: Nee omunye awasakunili valova awashere vali independent, kha

Omunywire valova, ola khola orie.

Resp: Naliola ari nzakulate imo ndelekhalu.

Int.: Name: Doreen?

Resp: Kenya yambotele ari Nhala ingo ne yambu Vivundu Liko

Kenyu

Int.: Nee. Noli omukhama wa soma uvere nende edigiri . . . . .

Resp: Nendi nende edigiri nde yama ta?

Int.: Sichila omunywire alakhutelela ari holenganya etiisiendi

tsevelile Laxini nawe olenganya etiisiendi tsi tisito

Resp: Omunye Shonyala okhunywa avasaka hawe wanyala okhumulile

ne valuchwe okhunywa avatshina vai Valakwetsanga Vulu Shindu.

Kho avenawe nde yama ta. Nanyala eshindu Sesi mbali
embhe ne simane.

Int.: Haya ilwaye lia khavini Livere ombu b esoseti Selalumikanga.

Nkola nwana musiimi nali hende akhahana avanyigi, Laki

Khu mwana; mukhana Italalumikanga sana Sichila Shina?

Resp: Khwisie ndololanga endi Sichila akhahana avanyigi

Vaalumanga . . . . . Sichila Hukha avundu Kenya Oteshe.

Sesa ina hukha aveshizwe ngumu Laxini kwa Lwa omwam

Omunywire Vapeka Vani Kwa alakhula omukhuna omulala.

Int.: Sichila lifefikiso ingo kama Peter anyala Kitaka ingo

Musihlo soa tano name wibe soa mbi. Valakwetsa
Namyete awalimana: mwa'yanza omukutwa nivolewa katote Shunyenya tatu.


Inter: Laumini awandu vaverenu vaveneri.

Resp: Sasa mihwayo muva vasiyan' Varivolenga vasiyan' Aja. Khandi vasiyan' vavili kivalemyanga omukhama, Sasa vose Valakwaka ovwe... 

Inter: Haya nee kulekwa undi live; ombu awalikana Shunyenya vasiyan' avaluny' fomwe. Vemyanga vasiyan' Varivolenga ephwo.


Resp: Nda alyosala akatanga avatanga avamangi; Shimu, vaveri nende. "Ebi endingi.

Inter: Nee kulekwa tsino Shicula Sihina avatanga Nayo' na. Omukhama okhunyela ebiro ina ya wana ne, vemyanga biro yene yi, kuthi luka omu' ana omu' ana omumangi kina; Yaani Khudolo Khuti Dorine aleje...

Resp: Sasa omulikiana avukulanga curi kana vari omu'masa uma waminda omushere una ovulai ata esie alominda ovulai Sasa alalola curi nali omuniza uma omumasa uma, ala waminda ovulai!

Inter: Makhuva kane muto kawetanga Suga eladii nendo mami Avashere vacivoleo avasiyan' ake avashere lako vafualonga Avatcha. Sasa avasiyan' watokwamanya, avatanga sikula avasakuluka vuvula. Na avashere uma vuvula avunia avasu'ma uma (sasa) Sasa ne valonda omu' ana omuni ' enichi.
Inter. Kuvode Khuri avasakulu Valolanga vani avana avachiya nivo mukwe re avachisi vaye re lavo vani omwana mukwana ni mukwesi sasa no uma? Ayi nee doreen uvere nende lie kuvuda.

Resp.: "Einzala onyala ochumyola avasakulu vanesikwa. Mulzi ne inge tzedala io. Sasa avachechere ong'lore o vacapola ch'umwezi esti'ukumia ne avachere niwanda vani Silvula. Sasa chumya kulavekukhara tichilwa omwakuliku alabala cwi ndamwa omuekwa umwa lova omvaka...

Inter.: Avasakulu Vandi Vavere vende avachere vandi chumya eyo. Sasa avachere vavo wapavuma ne elumyola hukukulhara. Ngee avachere navo vavere vende avachere.

Resp.: "Vyi omwekwe onyala wa onga lango wa Vavere vavula. Mani avakulowe avana einzala ma'ni omwembu civa wutale omwanga...".

Inter.: Kho ong'lore nt'ukita cikupia. Olamysa omu'uli umu' (uma) vende, avachere, Haya niwanda khuru labe tundzi ni kishida Sina'ta. Avana avachere cikupia vanawanda na ts'umwania swino.


Inter.: Ne avevuli navo

Resp.: Khu'vu venuli na mukwva le binguvo

Resp.: Inter.: Mupulanga etisendi.

Resp.: Khu'vu zaka la'ini omwemwe. 1 avevuli Shivenyanga ta.

Inter.: "Mani koo shina shivi ne koo nde' ch'umfualana etoli? Noko avevuli vukwana vari avachomo niwanda kufakala elongi valavisa.

Resp.: Vukwana vari no'fa rula etoli Olavisa la'ini avakulwa vavo Vavualanga eBingubo la'vu na vunia.

Inter.: "Kho enyre mukulang vei'kwaka ts'ina. Chumya okhumwenda..."
Resp. Vulola zuni amsani niso avana ne avakhana nayo?
Int. Atu avandu vanuwo siyena vanumva varo avasidini niso avana kwi, avandu vamakhani ningune efunda.
Resp. Khulwe nu mahali wa kuule mabuku lemo amsanina lachunja.
Int. Haya eluho lindi lvuerembyi avandu avainda nende amasanki yami avatjini vaendelela okhuna avatjini cu siso amasanki niso vaendelela okhunukho Stima efunda?
Resp. Avainda shuvakhonyanga amasanki tume.
Int. Yami vahlee efistsinzi.
Resp. Vahlee efistsinzi.
Int. Lacinini avainda vaningang'a eKuisiini yisindi hi Sana.
Int. Ichoro esimikani ingo la Khuwene yake ne?
Resp. Esimikani ingo la Khuwene ensiwa eKawa eKhisimwe group ichando omayene ichando etabu ya vanuwo vakweno ne vanumva efistsendini sivumishiranga avuluwe tume.
Int. Vahulwe efistsino?
Resp. Vahulwe efistsino re fendi fendi ne omayene avainda vanumishiranga eKhisimwe tsyare avuluwe.
Int. Khono esimikani. Kheke chane efistsendis ichando l'khono avainda vanuwo vane.
Resp. Alafu Khando avukhu lwa vuyana avukhula khunda
hungwesile. Omuhana wo mundu ushin okhute kha ni sama
lakini omanye he fesi kha musiwe wo mundu byalakhe
Inter: Haya elinde li a simi hivre kha khumunyana. Nyalu
vaaiwine omusani.
Resp. Konya omanye mnde mubere kha musamvu,
Resp. shinga kuvole kwiw omusani alakhwenyanga so nyala
okhumanya. Konya kufane ujula paka ove omanye Khulus
nunda mubere khombeste lakini avandi na vaaiwine
okhumaphasta.
Inter: Ass Chenda Khutsa kha mwele li a Sapa. Efuphuma
wembo hu masomo lwa vutere amasomo ka bule.
Resp. Mba musamungu kwa kuneza ta Nhlebeza efikho, lalo
kwa lentheng ya esimphi senele esisendi fesi futhi.
Inter: Makhuwa be siwisa maka kane? Raula ndeke kibaki wim
omulai?
Resp. Ta Khutsa siwisa avandi vuyana Raula Shumila
ni kujana.
Inter: Ass avandi naparanga endi omuwevo kwenero owen
muno muno.

SECOND RECORDING SESSION
Inter: Muhinzi we uzi fisi? Shuna?
Resp. Esisendi Khutsakhana ndalite omuhakhu othunyana
kufunyana.
Inter: Nee avana vuyana?
Resp. Ke vesi vuyala oluthuza eshida
Inter: Mani mune olalathu ari?
Resp. Koma avukhula oluthuza ekinda omanye jasa
omuhakhu alasiri shiwa omushere, safi planyelo omuhakhu
alalumanga omushere cui Shumila Shuna Shiga lakayo
nende avukhala vane?
Appendix 5: Map of Kenya and Western Province
Appendix 6: Map of Malava Constituency
Appendix 7: Observation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start time</th>
<th>Finish time</th>
<th>Notes, comments or reflections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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# Appendix 7: Observation Schedule

## General Observation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start time</th>
<th>Finish time</th>
<th>Notes, comments or reflections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First recording session</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>9:30 A.M.</td>
<td>The speech is characterised by many DMS - there are new inventions of DMS and borrowings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman 18-45 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First recording session</td>
<td>10:00 A.M.</td>
<td>10:30 A.M.</td>
<td>Less DMS observed to occur in speech as compared to Woman in this category. One DMS appears very often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man 18-45 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second recording session</td>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Woman are observed to talk more, there are more polite forms of DMS in their speech compared to Man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and Women 46-60 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second recording session</td>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>2:30 P.M.</td>
<td>The women are observed to talk more and there are more instances of DMS in their speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and Women 18-45 yrs</td>
<td>11:00 A.M.</td>
<td>11:30 A.M.</td>
<td>The speech of the respondents is characterized by many older forms of DMS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second recording session</td>
<td>12:00 P.M.</td>
<td>12:30 P.M.</td>
<td>The speech had limited instances of DMS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man 46-60 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First recording session</td>
<td>8:30 A.M.</td>
<td>9:00 A.M.</td>
<td>Very many DMS in their speech. The DMS have polite forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman 46-60 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First recording session</td>
<td>4:00 P.M.</td>
<td>4:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Many instances of DMS characterised by innovations and borrowing from Kiswahili.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and Women 18-45 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second recording session</td>
<td>4:30 P.M.</td>
<td>5:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Many instances of DMS characterised by innovations and borrowing from Kiswahili.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and Women 18-45 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>