

**A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF A WOMAN'S TALK:
A CASE STUDY OF AGIKUYU WOMEN SPEAKERS.**

BY

MBURU LEE NGUGI

EAST AFRICAN LIBRARY

University of NAIROBI Library



0472327 6

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
REQUIRED FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS,
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND AFRICAN LANGUAGES,
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.**

JULY, 2008

bd 339040


1005

Afr.
B
832
M38

DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work and has not been submitted for examination in any other University.

4/11/2008
.....
Date


.....
MBURU LEE NGUGI

This thesis has been submitted for examination with our approval as to University supervisors.

07-11-08
.....
Date


.....
Dr. I MWANIKI

4/11/2008
.....
Date


.....
Dr. J. H. HABWE

DEDICATION

To my loving wife,

Teresia N Ngugi

Your love and support has brought me this far.

To My Children: The Wata's and Eliud

Your support kept me going.

To all women

Without your sweet voices this universe would be prone to loneliness,

Keep on talking!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work would not have been possible without the express endeavour of some personalities.

I am appreciative to God for this provision of life, resources, insight and strength that enabled me to complete the entire M.A. degree course “For the Lord God is a Sun and Shield: the Lord bestows [present] grace and favor and [future] glory (honor, splendor and heavenly bliss)! No good thing will He withhold from those who walk uprightly. (Psa 84:11)

I acknowledge my two dedicated supervisors Dr Mwaniki and Dr Habwe for the scholarly guidance they selfishly offered. Dr. Mwaniki guided me in the theoretical framework while my research problem was born in Dr. Schroeder’s lectures. I am especially grateful to Dr Habwe for the help he accorded me on structuring this thesis.

I would like to register my gratitude to other scholars in the department including Prof. Okoth Okombo, Prof Lucia Omondi, Dr Jane Oduor, Dr Alfred Buregea, Dr Schroeder, Dr Jane Mutiga, Dr Marete, Mr. B Mungania. It is Dr Habwe who shaped my research problem.

Special thanks to my darling wife, Teresia for spiritual, material, and psychological support especially in tough times. I am especially grateful that you coordinated and accompanied me as I carried out the data collection process among the women surely; you sincerely and patiently bore the blunt of a stressed husband.

To my children, Lucy and Eliud, my son in law Jeff and grand daughter Terry. You are the reason I never gave up. You constantly reminded me; *Dad you have a high standard*

to set for us to break! This kept the bell ringing that I am not only a father but a student and a role model also.

Kuria my brother, you are my inspiration I do appreciate you.

I appreciate Simon Ngige Dedan my spiritual son for his prayers and genuine concern

I cannot forget my daughter Lucy Waata who patiently and keenly typed this work sometimes up to odd hours

I appreciate the support given by Deliverance church Olkeri especially in data collection

To all my classmates and colleagues especially Kamau, Zipporah, Pasomi and Audrey you made this thesis to become a reality.

Lastly I thank all those who helped me in one way or another and whose names I have not mentioned.

ABSTRACT

Woman's language is characterized by condensed force of utterance and by avoidance of strong or aggressive language; it is also associated with natural indirect speech attributes. Does this influence conversational rules in turn making our conversation unsuccessful? That is why this study is essentially a pragmatic study on woman study based specifically on the Agikuyu women speakers. It makes a pragmatic exploration on the factors that influences the women conversation. The primary aim of the study was to examine the extent to which various linguistic strategies, politeness, indirectness and non abrasive language can be used to demonstrate speakers' accountability on the Gricean Cooperation Principle.

The data was collected from women recorded interviews. The researcher was also able to interact with some women and collect some opinions on certain selected language expressions. This was done at four different localities within Ngong Division of Kajiado. The collected data was then analyzed using Grice (1975) Second Theory of Implicature. The results of the data analysis showed that politeness, indirectness and use of non abrasive language (some aspects of a woman's talk) influenced cooperation principle in the conversations.

This thesis is organized in such a way that chapter one gives a summary of the general frame work of the study. It displays the background to the study, statement of the problem, the set objectives, hypothesis and theoretical framework.

In chapter two we present literature review and methodological frameworks that have motivated the study i.e. General studies on language and gender and general study on language use.

Chapter three examines two aspects of the woman talk namely indirectness (non abrasiveness) and politeness to assess how they influence the cooperative principle.

In chapter four the study investigates three linguistic strategies of the woman's talk and relates them to the cooperative principle.

Finally, a summary of findings, recommendations and suggestions for further research are presented in chapter five.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
ABBREVIATIONS	vii
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Background to the Language Study	4
1.3 Statement of the Problem	5
1.4 Research Objectives	6
1.5 Hypothesis	7
1.6 Theoretical frame Work	7
1.7 Rationale and Significance of the Study	14
1.8 Operational Definitions of Technical Terms	17
1.9 Scope and Limitation of the Study	19
1.10 Research Methodology	19
1.10.1 Site of the study	19
1.10.2 Study population.....	20
1.10.3 Sampling techniques and sample size	20
1.10.4 Data collection procedure and data analysis	20

CHAPTER TWO	21
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	21
2.0 INTRODUCTION	21
2.1 General Studies in Language and Gender.....	21
2.2 General Studies on Language Use.....	23
2.3 Summary	26
CHAPTER THREE.....	27
3.0 INDIRECTNESS AND POLITENESS.....	27
3.1 Indirectness and Reduced Force of Utterance	27
3.1.1 Indirectness and Age	28
3.2 Sense of Politeness	30
3.2.1 Politeness and occupation	32
3.2.2 Politeness and Age	33
CHAPTER FOUR	35
4.0 LINGUISTIC STRATEGIES.....	35
4.1 Use of Hedges.....	35
4.2 Use of Repetition	40
4.3 Use of questions.....	42
4.3.1 Rhetorical Questions	42
4.3.2 Question Tags	43

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 CONCLUSION, SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATION AND SUGGESTIONS

FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 45

5.1 Conclusion 45

5.2 Summary and Recommendation 45

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research 45

GLOSSARY 47

APPENDIX I..... 51

APPENDIX II: TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS..... 53

APPENDIX III: Exchanges 1-7 54

REFERENCES 59

ABBREVIATION

A. W. T.	-	Agikuyu's Woman Talk
C.P.	-	Cooperative Principle
H	-	Hearer
M.T.	-	Men Talk
S	-	Speaker
W.T.	-	Woman Talk

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the study by giving the background; a brief introduction to our focus in this study. The chapter also gives methodology, states the research problem, hypothesis and research objectives.

1.1 Background to the study

This study concerns on conversational discourses specifically exchanges or interchanges of women talk .It attempts to describe, examine and analyze the pragmatic properties of the woman's talk on their relationship to the Cooperative Principle (C.P). It seeks to answer questions such as; Which Linguistic strategies are used in a woman's talk? How is C.P observed in these linguistic strategies? What is the nature of the woman's talk? How does it contribute to the lives of women in the society? How unique is a woman's talk? And how does it contribute to cooperative principle in a conversation?

This is done in Agikuyu woman's talk case study based on the Gricean Cooperative Principle theory (1975)

The general interest of pragmatic approach has been well illustrated by the successive writing of Deborah Tanen "That's not what I meant (1986)" AND "You don't understand (1990)" which focus on the different strategies and expectations people use when they try to talk to each other. There are a surprising number of everyday notions which can be illuminated by this kind of analysis, such as "nagging"," accusing" and be

at “cross purpose”. Thou not limiting ourselves to family arguments the same issues arise in the attempt to achieve successful communication in any setting at any level.

In this study we focus on factors that govern our choice of language in social interaction and the effects of our choice on others In theory we can say anything we like, in practice, we follow a large number of social rules (most of them unconsciously) that constrain the way we speak. There is no law that say we must not tell jokes during a funeral, but it is generally “not done” There are norms of formality and politeness that we have intuitively assimilated and we follow when talking to people who are older, of opposite sex and so on.(Crystal 1997 :120)

In this study we examine how pragmatic factors always influences our selection of sounds, grammatical constructions and vocabulary. Language differs greatly in these respects for example politeness expression such as please, thank you and sorry.

The 1990s has seen growth in the use of pragmatic perspective to analyze situations in which a conversation has not been successful and to suggest solutions (Crystal 1997:118)

An important aim of discourse analyses is to find out why conversations are not always successful misunderstanding and mutual recrimination is unfortunately fairly common Participants are often equipped with differing rules and expectations about the way in which the conversation should proceed --something that is particularly evident when people of different cultural backgrounds interact but even within a culture, different rules of interpreting may exist Crystal (1997:21,120).

Is there women’s language? This is a question posed by feminist linguists McConnell-Ginet (1988) for the last twenty years but if there is, the concern is what characterizes the use of language by women, and how particular characteristics of women’s language may

be linked to the gender relations of a given society in our say the Agikuyu. This question becomes the standard of gender 'reciprocity' i.e. to differentiate 'women' linguistically from 'men' in one speech community. Pioneering feminist linguists like Robin Lakoff (1975) suggest women's language as a product of early childhood socialization. Parents and authority figures encouraged little girls to adopt gender-specific way of speaking and of avoiding 'rough' play displays. Lakoff observes that women's language is illustrious by condensed force of utterance and by the avoidance of strong or aggressive language. The ethnographic literature shows that some communities regard indirectness as naturally a feminine speech attributes Och (1974), a description we would like to research on the Agikuyu's women talk.

Gal (1991; 1995) observes that 'Being a woman or a man is an issue, among other things, of talking similar to one. Subjects produce their own linguistic behavior and critic the conduct of other's, in the light of the gendered meanings attached by the culture to particular ways of talking. .Number of documented texts reflects that women are different from men regardless of their culture. They are socially different and so is their language [Trudgill 1974] it is because the society lays down different social roles for each sex and thus has an expectation of differing behavioral patterns

Women's friendship is characterized by intimacy, mutual self disclosure and a focus on, Johnson and Aries(1989a)Weedon(1987) puts it" that language is the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity is constructed". Conversations with each another is fundamental to friendship and particularly gives pleasure. The primary goal of talk between women friends is construction and maintenance of close and equal social relationship.

This study therefore focuses on women's talk that is analyzing it, basing it on Grice co-operative principles. It has been based on study population of; women that is young women [below 25years of age], middle age [between 30 to 50years] and old women [above 60years]. The study therefore aims at eliciting data to provide proof or disproof of researcher's statement of problem. This kind of analysis has not been carried out before despite the fact that Gricean co-operative principle has been acknowledged universally. Thus the study aims in testing specifically how the co-operative principle operates on an African cultural setting.

1.2 Background to the language of study

The language under study is Gikuyu, a Bantu language of the E category, characterized by concordial agreement. It is language group 50 number 51(Guthrie 1967). The language falls under the Niger – Congo sub family of languages (Guthrie 1967).

In 1999 census in Kenya, it was estimated to be spoken by about 5.3million citizens [2000, march 1, Daily nation.

The people who speak the language are called Agikuyu and mostly live in Central and Rift valley provinces of Kenya. His grouping is based on geographical, economical, political and linguistic factors.

According to Mutahi (1977:14) the Gikuyu language has seven dialects; namely:

- Ki-Embu spoken in Embu district
- Ki-Mbeere spoken in Mbeere and part of Kirinya district
- Gi-Gicugu spoken in Kirinyaga
- Ki-Ndia spoken in Kirinyaga
- Ki-Mathira spoken in Nyeri

- The northern dialect spoken in Nyeri and Murang'a
- The Southern dialect spoken in Kiambu.

The Southern dialect is also known as Gi- kabete, while the northern dialect is also known as Ki- metumi (Mutahi 1977).

1.3 Statement of the problem

Study on women has attracted a lot of attention over the years. In the beginning of 1970s and 1980s the idea that women and men speak differently started to capture the attention among linguists, psychologists and communication researchers (Crawford, 1995). Every possible source of linguistic variation in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and syntax was regarded as a possible locus of sex difference (Wodak 1997). Most of the available literature reveals a concentration point of view on the study of language of women on sociolinguistic studies ,semantics properties and so on Stockwell(2002)records that a study done by Lauren Buckland had it that women tended to produce words that referred to their immediate concrete surroundings(table, chair, carpet, badge, laundry, basket, e.t.c (Coates (1993) notes that men are more verbose than women, though it is women who chatter in stereotyping mythology, women use evaluative adjectives (nice, beautiful, rather bizarre) in general than men. These studies have resulted from a change in view expressed by a cross-section of disciplines about the approaches that have been treating language as an abstract system of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics in total disregarding of situations in which it occurred. Ever since 1960s there has been a increase of studies on aspects of language use.

There has been a reappearance of studies that combine diverse approaches and methods to the predicament of language use. Some of the disciplines concerned are; sociolinguistics, ethnography, of speaking, text analysis and discourse analysis. Discourse analysis has had its main drive from sociology and linguistics. Pragmatics has been influenced by philosophy and linguistics, whereas ethnography of speaking has been subjective by anthropology and sociolinguistics by linguistics and sociology.

Thus this study differs from sociolinguistics approaches which are mainly correlational. Sociolinguistics approaches are based on what is said where and by whom. They lack greater motivation for why something is happening and an in depth understanding of meaning as it is exemplified in texts of discourse. This study therefore emphasized the use of language and situation in which it occurred. Since very little has been done on pragmatics analyzes of women's talk, this study therefore attempts to describe how Gricean pragmatics attempts to analyze politeness ,indirectness and use of non abrasive language and examine the extent to which various linguistic strategies have been used to demonstrate speakers accountability of the Gricean cooperative principle. This we look specifically basing our study on agikuyu's women conversations.

1.4 Research objectives

This study is guided by the following objectives:

1. To examine to what extent is indirectness and reduced force of utterance (non-abrasive language) influence the Gricean cooperative principles in Agikuyu's woman talk.

2. To examine to what extent various linguistic strategies (hedges, repetitions and questions) demonstrates speaker's deviation from the Gricean Cooperative Principles in the Agikuyu's woman talk.
3. To explore how the aspect of politeness could satisfactorily explain deviations from Cooperative Principles in Agikuyu's woman talk.

1.5 Research hypothesis

1. The use of indirectness and non abrasive language in the Agikuyu's woman talk violates the Gricean cooperative principles.
2. The use of various linguistic strategies (hedges, repetitions and questions) in the Agikuyu's woman talk leads to contravention of the Gricean cooperative principles
3. Use of politeness in the Agikuyu's woman talks leads to breaching the Gricean Cooperative Principle.

1.6 Theoretical Framework.

In this study we adopt Grice Theory of cooperative Principle (C.P) (1975) a pragmatic approach to discourse.

Pragmatics has it that communication is intentional and the communicator objective is to express his intentions to the hearer. For interpretation to be effective there is need of context. Grice was the first person to put intention and meaning together. He continued to observe that, to utilize context in our communication is part of normal communication. He draws on logic and comes up with a few principles to guide this way of communication He further observes that if interlocutors do not share context (cultural world knowledge) then they have to be explicit but if they do, then they can be implicit

i.e. one can deduce as a hearer out of context what the speaker is saying. Paul Grice referred to the later as conversational implicature theory. This theory of conversational implicature is referred to as C.P (Grice 1991).He defines it as:

An imperative to make contribution such as required; at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. (Grice 1991:26)

Grice suggests that the speaker and the audience share common information. The speaker's message delivered also means more than the surface semantic sense(Leech 1987).This shared information is the basis of the inferences(Gibbs1987).Grice explains that there appears to be a conversational constrain which directs peoples use of language in a cooperative way. This he calls the cooperative principle (CP) Leech (1983).

The most interesting fact about this theory is that this regulative system is non constitutive and can be flouted for a number of reasons in diverse situations such as culture, prior knowledge and rules of interpretation Searle (1983). Thus, the audience can tell when maxim is flouted for whichever reasons but as long as other maxims are held one can still be said to be operating within the cooperative principle.

This theory of implicature is guided by **four** maxims that form the C.P.This study is intended to explore the extent to which these maxims are either obeyed or violated, consequently enhancing or undermining the woman's talk conversation.

These maxims are:

Maxim of quantity

Make your contribution as informative as required for the current purpose of the exchange.

Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Maxim of quality

Try to make your contributions on what is true; specifically

Do not say what you believe to be false.

Do not say that which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Relevance

Make your contribution relevant

Maxim of Manner.

Be perspicuous and specifically;

Avoid obscurity.

Grice suggests that there is a set of over-arching assumptions guiding the conduct of conversation. This arises from a basic rational consideration and can be formulated as guidelines for efficient and effective use of language in conversation to further co-operative ends. This led to the identification of the four maxims which fondly express a general C.P.

The maxim of quantity is concerned with the amount of information from any conversation exchange. It requires one to make his contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchange and not to make it either more or less informative than required. Consider for instance the radio announcement. ' *It is your life; protect it.* ' This may lack enough contextual aspect to relate to the fight against aids and thus by entailment (semantic logic) a call to desist from unsafe sex. It therefore violates the maxim of quantity. It portrays that to reduce an oral narrative to simple proverb obscure the intended message, and thence violating the maxim of quantity.

The second maxim is that of quality. In a sense it underlies all the other maxims in that it assumes that what we are saying is that which we believe to be true. Lying is thus a violation of this maxim. Some violations of this maxim nevertheless do enhance co-operation for example; *I have told you a million times” to cater for this*. There is need to distinguish between apparent violation like the one above and real violations which could involve understatement like: *aids is a flu*, which definitely it is not!

The third maxim is that of relation sometimes referred to as max- of violence. It directs us to organize our utterances in such a way as to ensure its relevance to conversational exchange. For instance, there was a TV commercial with the words *“before you open your heart open your eyes.”* Literally this did not communicate much since one’s eyes were already open. The meaning was to be drawn from some deeper level provided for by context.

The fourth maxim is that of manner and it obliges us to organize our utterances in an orderly manner. This means providing information in a way the listener can assimilate it. It is this orderliness that is lost when people are upset or frustrated, yet the violation of this maxim is one of the ways in which strength of feeling is communicated. In other words, without the underlying C.P we would not be able to register deviations.

Grice pointed out that these maxims are not always observed. He made a distinction between quietly violating and openly flouting a maxim. Violations are quiet in the sense that it is not obvious at the time of the utterance that the speaker has deliberately lied, supplied insufficient information, or been ambiguous, irrelevant or hard to understand. In Grice’s analysis, these violations might hamper communication but they do not lead to implicatures. On the other hand, what leads to an implicature is a situation where the

speaker flouts a maxim, that is, it is obvious to the hearer at the time of the utterance that the speaker has deliberately and quite openly failed to observe one or more maxims.

According to Grice, the implicature is made possible by the fact that we normally

Avoid ambiguity

Be brief

Be orderly.

These maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, cooperative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly while providing sufficient information.

Grice suggests that the sources of these maxims of conversational performance are not conventional rules that we learn like say, table manners. On the contrary they are in fact non arbitrary conventions; they describe rational means of conducting cooperative exchanges. In Grice's examination, these violations might impede communication but they do not lead to implicatures. According to Grice, the implicature is made possible by the fact that we normally assume that speakers do not really abandon the cooperative principle although in conversations they sometimes face a clash between maxims.

In actual conversations, Grice's four basic maxims of the cooperative principle are often unobserved or flouted. However, this does not mean that the C.P is abandoned. In Grice's analysis, the speaker's flouting of a maxim combined with the hearer's assumption that the speaker has not really abandoned the C.P leads to an implicature. Besides flouts necessitated by a clash between maxims, there are flouts which exploit a maxim while flouting a maxim, the speaker notably upholds another maxim in order to be cooperative in the communication.

The Gricean Cooperative principle has a number of features which apply to a varying context of use: they can conflict with one another, can be flouted though the CP is maintained (Leech 1983). He further stipulates that the maxims are not enough in accounting why people are always indirect in their expressions Leech (1983:79) He therefore includes a maxim of politeness to complete the C.P, however he does not give sufficient reasons as to why the C.P and the P.P have to be separate.

When figures of speech are used in a conversation, the deeper literary meaning is arrived at and hence the use of implicature. This could be done in three ways:

1. There could be “a clash “where the speaker deliberately fails to fulfill one maxim in order to avoid violating another. For example, *when B was asked where C was? B replied; somewhere here*. He fails to fulfill the maxim of quantity by not providing enough information of the maxim of quality if in deed B had no idea where precisely C was.

2. We have a maxim exploiting implicature, which involves violating a maxim on the literal level (what is said) so as to exploit it at a figurative level (what is meant).

3. We have maxim involving implicature where no maxim is violated but the utterance involves a maxim as a ground of interpretation. For example; *P says he is hungry and Q tells him that the kitchen is open*. This involves the maxim of relation. The implicature here is that there is food in the kitchen or that P should go and make some there.

The violation of one or a combination of these maxims contributes to rendering a string or a piece of conversation exchange ineffective. The most influential alternative to Grice’s theory is the relevance theory developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986):

We have proposed a definition of relevance and suggested what factors might be involved in assessments of degrees of relevance. We have also argued that all the Grice's maxims can be replaced by a single principle of relevance -that the speaker tries as much as possible to be in the circumstances which, when suitably elaborated, can handle the full range of data that Grice's maxims were designed to explain (Wilson and Spender 1986:38).

The two, propose that omitting the maxims and putting forward only the C.P could eliminate the multiplicity of principles in the Gricean framework. The principle of relevance, however, failed to account for implicatures in politeness and style. For example if one told a kid that it is not fast enough, the implication is that child in question is slow and the maxims of the C.P captures the politeness which the relevance principle does not. We could explain this further with another example: '*some farmers are lazy*' this differs from '*not all farmers are lazy*'. But each statement implicates the other. They convey a similar message but in a different style. Thus relevance theorists have failed to illustrate that '*not all P is S*' implicates '*some P is S*' (Davis 1998).

The view that cooperation is essential to communication is retained by neo-Gricean pragmatist such as Horn and Levinson(2000),who use reformulated versions of maxims to account for a range of generalized implicatures, which are described by Grice as carried in all normal contexts and contrasted with more drastically context-dependent particularized implicatures. In this study we therefore illustrate that the step-by-step reasoning rigor of the C.P and its maxims is worth being inspected by linguists in general and pragmaticians in particular.

1.7 Rationale and significance of the study

In many sociolinguistic studies the language used by men and women is quite different. This could be due to innate hardwiring, different processes of gendered socialization or merely men and women acting to their domain roles and expectations [Stockwell, 2002: 41]. Stockwell notes that men and women perceive spoken discourse differently and so behave differently in conversation. This study therefore seeks to analyze women's talk since most societies have stereotyped images of women negatively such as being stupid or weak [Mugo 1975]. Mugo observes that the battle for women's liberation from absurd images has to be directed to the language. A woman is thought to be subordinate to men and of low status and this has been portrayed in Gikuyu's proverbs [Ndung'u 1998].

This study uses a pragmatic and not sociolinguistic approach to discourse. This is quite adequate because our concern in this study is to analyze speaker's meaning at the level of utterances. Sociolinguistics is mainly concerned with systematic linguistic correlates of relatively fixed and stable social variables (such as region of origin, social class, ethnicity, sex, age, etc). Pragmatics on the other hand, is mainly concerned with describing the linguistic correlates of reasonably changeable features of that same individual (such as relative status, social role) and the way in which speaker exploits his social linguistic repertoire in order to realize a particular objective Thomas (1948). Thus what Gricean pragmatics suggests is that human beings work with extremely negligible assumptions with reference to one another and their behavior and that they apply those assumptions as their base from which to describe highly specific inferences about one another's anticipated meanings. This study thus is quite timely because it addresses the

problem of referential ambiguity which for ages has been assumed and consequently has resulted to breakdown of communication in various settings.

At this time of history we cannot afford to ignore women and especially the W. T since women are now found in every place of work just like their counterparts men.

This study is so vital because it would give insight on how to maintain solidarity of family set-ups. The study attempts to outline the fact that W. T is different from M. T and in this light, in case of nagging or conflict in families, men could cultivate patience as they solve these conflicts taking into account for instance women could be indirect in their speech.

Thorough compromise of this study would also stipulate the women needs as much of this is verbalized during many W. T and hence the various stick holders can be in a position to plan for various, women project which would be suitable for the school programmes which are tailored with girl child in mind as she carries out some verbal activities.

UNIVERSITY OF
EASTERN

Incase of training especially at lower grades and pre-school, where women are more suitable due to their acquaintance with small children, some of the factors discussed in this study can be taken into account to make it more suitable.

The study would also be of importance in furthering the efficiency in the ministry of women and youth more so as it would aid better organization of women groups such as Kenya Women Organization.

For the social workers, preachers and the various people that work with women, this study would prepare them to be more efficient as they plan for women's seminar,

conferences and workshops. They would best prepare on how to counsel, teach or educate the women folk.

For the judiciary sector, judges and magistrates would be better prepared to handle women as they testify or are engaged in various discourses in the court room. For instance, this would help to follow the proceedings, cultivate patience as they engage in the W. T and so on.

For the mass media especially the broadcasting sector, this study would socially and psychologically prepare the broadcasters as telephone interviews as they preparing programs engage in interaction with women in various W. T such, targeting them.

1.8 Operational definition of technical terms

In this section, we give definitions of the main technical terms used in this study. The definitions will enable the reader to follow our argument. Due to limited space we include other definitions in the glossary.

Conventional Implicature: an implication deduced from an utterance, using the c.p, e.g. a bus! = we must run. Explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in general sense) more than what is actually “said” (that is more than what is literally expressed by the conventional sense of the linguistic expressions uttered).

Thing implied by how things are

Conversational Maxim: General principles thought to underlie the efficient use of language e.g. speakers should be relevant and clear.

Cooperative Principle a tacit agreement between speakers to follow the same set of conventions (maxims) when communicating. The norms of having the speaker and the listener engage in a conversation aware of each others role in the talk

Face The public self-image of a person i.e. the emotional and social sense of the Self that everyone has and expects that every one else to recognize

Face Threatening Act Anything said that presents a threat to another person’s expectations regarding the self image.

Hedges hedges are cautious notes expressed about how an utterance is to be taken,e.g.'as far as I know, ...,I may be mistaken ,but...,I’m not sure if this is right, but...,he couldn’t live with her ,I guess

Inference An opinion or judgment made based on an utterance especially where there is no relationship between entities and words.

Politeness the means employed to show awareness of another person's face (public self-image of a person, emotional and sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize)

Presupposed; the unsaid or assumed meaning. Something the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance*

*see glossary for other definitions of terms.

1.9 Scope and limitation of the study.

This study analysis the Agikuyu's woman talk based on the Gricean cooperative principle (C.P.) The study limits itself on exploring only **three** aspects of the woman's talk:

- 1 The mode of utterance, (indirectness and non aggressiveness)
- 2 Manner of communication (politeness)
- 3 Three linguistic strategies in use .

The underlying objective is to investigate how the four aspects of a woman's talk relate to the Gricean cooperative principle. We concentrate in spoken language only as presented in various interviews carried out. It would have been great to consider recording radio exchanges, telephone conversations, organizing women seminars and workshops and then collecting the data, but due to shortage of time and resources it would not be possible.

Due to limited time frame the sample population was delimited to four categories of interviewees' i.e. church women leaders, business ladies, house wives and professionals. Thus the researcher of necessity worked with a representative sample of the women population

1.10 Methodology

This section sets out the site of the study, study population, sampling procedures and Sample size, data collection and data analysis:

1.10.1 Site of the study

This study has been carried out in Kajiado District at Ngong Division .Ngong is a cosmopolitan town though quite a number of Kikuyus live there .The study has been confined to a population that are literate.

1.10.2 Study Population.

This study is typically a case study. The study population consists of kikuyu native speakers. The accessible population is made up of women from different age groups and occupations:

- Young (below 25 years)
- Middle (between 30-50 years)
- Old (above 60 years).

Their occupations categories include: Professionals, house wives and business ladies.

1.10.3 Sampling techniques and sample size.

In this study the method used for sampling is the simple random technique

This study limited itself to kabete dialect.

1.10.4 Data collection procedure and Data analysis.

My corpus consists of a few exchanges from each age set bracket. The researcher carried out an audio recording of naturally occurring conversations between women friends, recorded in their homes, this has been supplemented by ethnographic interviews. The names of all participants and people mentioned in the conversations and interviews have been changed. The data was then transcribed and analyze.

example in most Kenyan ethnic group's; sayings, proverbs, riddles all portray a woman negatively for example when a man cries he is referred to as a woman.

Smith (1989) explains that the modern day English usage prejudices, debase, degrade and demean a woman but glorifies a man. This happens through speech, gender divisions created in the society, the relationship between language and social structure such as the notions of masculinity and feminist.

Mugo (1975) explains that among the circumcising ethnic groups such as; Luhya, Gikuyu, Maasai, Kalenjins among others, when boys are circumcised into manhood and in the process happens to weep they are usually said that they are weak, cowards, stupid and not real men, they are associated with women. He further explains that there is an English saying that goes "behind every successful man there is a woman" this statement though it looks positive it has a derogative touch. The woman success is seen in the relationship to a man and not her personal quality. Such linguistic sayings lower women to a junior status as they fortify men.

Ndung'u (1998) observes how women are portrayed in selected Gikuyu and Kiswahili proverb. They are generally portrayed pessimistically especially with view to their personalities and roles. She establishes for example that division of labor is gender based; light duties such as cooking and cleaning are carried out by women while men engage in heavy duties such as clearing fields and virgin lands. This is done on the premises that women are weaker while men are stronger sex.

Wango (1998) analysis gender marked words in the kikuyu language. He analyzes that the language is sexist bias for example a large number of general words like mundu is for a man and its not used for a woman.

2.2 General studies in language use

Language is planned differently to communicate diverse themes. The language of radio announcements differs from that of news; that of funerals from that of weddings etc.

Malinowski (1923) commenting on language for specific purposes, points out that a statement spoken in real life is never detached from the situation in which it has been uttered. Language is disheveled with learning of the young, social intercourse, the management of laws, carrying out of rival all forms of practical co-operation.

kin and Rodman (1988) notes that society, units course of linguistic evolution, invents terms and ultimately demarcates between what is to be said in polite company and what should not – thus becoming taboo. They point out that all terms at man's disposal are accessible for use but the social context determines what is to be said where and when. They postulate that "filth or the beauty of language must be in the ear of the listener or the collective ear of the society." (278) pleasant human co-existence leads to the self – imposition of these self – check:

Sapir (1988) Says that what people are told has proportionate relationship to the world they know. Whatever thing removed from their own world may be misunderstood. People form a psychological image of what they are told from what they already know but not from the speaker's point of view. An individual's imagination is directed by the possible reality in the world. For example an American – Indian tribesman has no obvious division of time, observes Sapir, as we know seasons, periods, durations and events. He therefore has no concept of being ten minutes late. Sapir (1929) proposes the theory "man lives in the world about him principally indeed exclusively, as the world presents it to him" Whorf proposes the weaker version of the theory "we are thus introduced to a new

principle of relativity, which holds that all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe (Orwell 1984). The description of the theory is about linguistic determinism while the weaker version is about linguistic relativism. According to Whorf, the term pre-disposition means relationship between language and culture is deterministic i.e. We cut nature, organize it into concepts and give importance to it because we are parties to an agreement that organizes an organization that holds throughout a speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language. Support for the strong version has been weak because it is impossible to test ones world view without using language. Support for the weaker version has been minimal and continues to be debated by researcher. Dittmer (1976) puts forward a Marxist view in regard to language and society. According to him, speech performance as well as in social behavior are in even state of interface and material living conditions are vital factors in this correlation Noting that there is a strong connection between cultures, Dittmer explains:

1. Social structure may determine or influence linguistic structure or behavior for instance education level and age. Varieties of language that speakers use reflect such matters as their regional, social, ethnic origin and sex.
2. Linguistic structure and or behavior may influence or determine social structure.
3. The influence is bi – directional: language and society may influence each other.

Halliday (1985) notes that language is a tool used to represent some situation, exchange some information or convey a message, thus words are to be forwarded by actions while these actions may be words as well. As such, given words provoke given expectations.

A language will have performed some role even when this is not met. "It is known from linguistic research that in many societies the speech of men and women differs." Language varies not only according to social class, ethnic group, sex or age but also according to social context we find ourselves in. Trudgill (1983) further notes that language varies in respect to whether it is spoken or written, the latter being more formal than the former. Different linguistic varieties are also used for different purposes. Palmer (1981) notes that the words of a language do not so much reflect world's reality but the interest of the people who speak it. He elaborates for instance that the desert dwellers have more than a dozen words for a camel. Deborah et al (1991) explains that in oral language, the point intention or significance of language the speaker's meaning is preserved in the mind of the listener as actual words, syntax and intention are ephemeral. They are rapidly exchanged for those interpreted meaning which can be preserved. In the written language the words, syntax, sentences and the artifacts of writing preserve meaning. As such mental recall becomes the precise reproduction of that artifact. Grice (1991) calls this difference conventional implicatures. Glenn (1978:245) stated "subjects make inferences until they can understand or recall the passage" the interpretation of a conversation or discourse must therefore involve more than a literal interpretation of the explicitly presented sentences. Thus it appears listeners and readers do adopt a different strategy in comprehending discourse structures. The listener pays primary attention to the theme of the story, building a coherent representation of what was meant. On the other hand, readers are able to pay closer attention to the meaning of the sentence per se, recalling more incidentals that mentioned details and being more accurate in their judgments of

what was stated in the text.

Grice first theory was on conventional implicature that was more or less an elaboration of what is commonly referred to as semantic logic. His concern of implicature brought about the very nature of things for example if one says he has bought a car, a conventional implicature is that cars are sold. This theory was heavily attacked and did not stand much ground.

2.3 Summary

In this chapter, we have looked at literature regarding language in general and the language used in women.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0.0 INTRODUCTION

This section discusses **two** major concerns of this study i.e. the extent to which the Agikuyu's woman talk which is distinguished by indirectness and reduced force of utterance (non- aggressive language) interacts with the cooperative principle (C.P) and the aspect of politeness And its relation to the C.P.The accounting of C.P phenomena as the linguistic strategies are in use is discussed in chapter four.

The social variables taken into consideration in this section include:

- ↓ Occupation
- ↓ Age

A general overview of the data collected shows that social variables have stake in the way conversation is carried out. The strategies used are to some extent determined by the social variables. We discuss the findings in relation to the above social variables.

3.1.0 Indirectness and reduced force of utterance (non- aggressive language)

Weizman (1989:73) defines indirectness as not just lack of transparency, such as with the use of unusual words or ambiguous deitic references, but as lack of transparency specifically and intentionally employed by the speaker to convey a meaning which differed, in some way, from the utterance meaning. The key notion is that of intended exploitation of a gap between the speaker's meaning and the utterance meaning. It occurs when there is a mismatch between the expressed meaning and the implied meaning. Though not all indirectness is intentional, in pragmatics we are concerned with the intentional indirectness:

- Indirectness may be used to maintain some social or communicative reasons
- The desire to make ones language more or less interesting.
- To increase the force of ones message.
- Competing goals politeness regard for face

3.1.1 Indirectness and Age.

To maintain some social and communicative goal, taking into consideration her listeners (a group of mixed age categories) who needed to be cooperated with, Mama C had to use indirect expression. According to Grice the cooperativeness of an interaction depends on shared knowledge i.e. what the speaker and the listener mutually know.

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
EAST AFRICANA COLLECTION

Mama C who is a middle aged lady narrates of her neighbor who refused her husband.

...akirega muthuri tukiuge uguo. Aregire muthuri tene muno kaana kau enako ge kindu boo.

(...she refused her husband. She refused her husband long time ago, that child she has is now in class four.)

In this expression there are two indirect messages.

- Akirega muthuri.
(Refused her husband)
- kaana kau enako gekindu boo
(That child she has is now in class four.)

The first expression, *she refused her husband*, does not only involve indirectness, but it is also a less aggressive phrase. Out of the 10 men interviewed on what expression

they gave to a woman who has stopped engaging in sex with her husband, only 10% gave the expression used here thus implicating that it was a feminine expression.

This expression's literal meaning is; she separated from her husband while as the implied meaning is; she no longer engages sexually with her husband.

When 12 sampled young woman and 12 sampled old ladies were asked what these expressions meant, the results were as follows:

Expression	literal	implied	young %	old %
Kurega muthuri	to refuse a man	to refuse sex	16	92
Kumiria	to remove	to end	83	8
Kugwira	to fall on	to be lucky	100	8
Guita na ndumo	to leak	bad luck	0	100

This suggests that if such terms were to be used in an environment where age is not considered a factor, the cooperation rate of interaction would be low.

George Yule (1996:3) notes that in the sense of cooperation we assume that the people that are engaged in a conversation are not trying to confuse, trick or withhold relevant information from each other. In most circumstances this kind of cooperation is only the starting point for making sense of what is being said.

The second indirect expression is the next part of Mama C statement; *that child she has is now in class four*. Its literal meaning is that the child is actually big. The

implied meaning is; that the last time the woman had sex with that man is so long ago as evidenced by the product of that union (the child).

This indirectness flouts the maxim of quantity. In order for us to get the correct interpretation we need to be given more information.

Mama J, a 68year old, talks of a dog that has stopped bearing puppies as having taken family planning pills.

Ino niyanyuire bamiri

(This one took family planning pills.)

She uses indirect message to appear interesting.

In the two instances above, the maxim of quality is flouted. We all know that the lady was still married to her husband and had not divorced him and the dog never took the pills as per se. One of the issues observed in this section is the fact that different social groups and age groups have common knowledge of terms, phrases or expressions used in indirect expressions or when less aggressive language is in use. Hence interaction cooperativeness is enhanced for hearty laughter follows the usage of these expressions as observed from our recorded conversations.

3.2.0 The Aspect of politeness.

Politeness, in an interaction, can be defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face (public self-image of a person, emotional and sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize) Yule (1996:60).

Politeness can be accomplished in situations of social distances or closeness. When one shows awareness to a person's face that he has a social distance: this is termed as respect

or deference. Walters (1979) investigated how much politeness could be squeezed out of speech act strategies alone also the perception of politeness by native and non-native speakers of English and Spanish.

Leech (1980) sees politeness as strategy used by a speaker to achieve a variety of goals, such as promoting or maintaining harmonious relations. This may include conventional and non conventional indirectness.

Much of what we say and communicate is determined by our social relationships. Some of the factors we consider as we interact are social distance and closeness (an external factor) relative status of participants based on social values tied to age and power. In English-speaking context for instance, speakers who value themselves as low status tend to mark social distance between themselves and higher status speakers by using address form such as Mr. Dr, madam etc.

From an illustration we can note that Mama C makes a reference of her husband.

...mathomaga gwiciria na *baba wa aya*.

(...they were class mates I think with *the father of these*.)

The status, age and power of Mama C's husband are reflected on her statement. She politely refers to him as the father of these. This is a common expression amongst women speakers in their conversations. This observation nevertheless raises an issue with the

C.P. It infringes the maxim of manner which states:

Avoid ambiguity.

Unless we employ more information and hence contravene the maxim on quantity our statement remains ambiguous.

In addition, we have internal factors such as degree of friendliness. This may make the social distance to change (increase or decrease) during interaction course.

Other polite terms noted as the interview was carried out were referring to parents with their children's names for instance

WA Brian

(Of Brian)

WA Kanyui,

(Of kanyui)

WA Mburu

(Of Mburu)

The same issue of ambiguity arises. The lack of clarity is – whose name are we attaching to the lady? Is it her father, son or husband? We need to be supplied with more information to disambiguate the expressions.

3.2.1. Politeness and occupation

Trudgill (1974:62) observes that language is a significant issue in group detection, group solidarity and the signaling of differences. In addition he remarks that the social environment can also be reflected on the vocabulary of the group, a reality that is noted in this study. The study considered the business ladies (salon, butchery and kerosene owners).

We note the social environment and group identification when two ladies talked about their businesses:

3.2.2 Politeness and Age.

The following is an illustration of instances where politeness was demonstrated following age difference.

When Mama C was interviewed about a man who had committed suicide she responded as follows:

Mwanake ucio ni muku tu mwite mwanake/ tondu ndarari
mutumia (mitheko) 72, 72, ona –onandiari muciare/ nandierigiriire/
mathomaga ngwiciria na baba wa aya/

(That young man is old lets call him young man because he was
unmarried (laughter) 72, 72, even even I was not born I was not
even expecting I think they were schoolmates with the father of
these/)

Mama C interprets being married as synonymous to being old. This is possibly because of the presence and the existence of children in the marriage. The case at hand involves an old man who does not qualify these specifications. Mama C thus suggests to her listeners in midst of laughter to concur with her and refer to the deceased (the old man) as a young man; this is a sign of politeness. Mama C continues to say that she would not have expected to be born when this man was born. She indirectly and politely implies that her mother was not pregnant then. As she ends her exchange she politely refers to her husband as the father of her children

The CP has been violated in a number of ways;

Firstly, the maxim of quality where the speaker says and persuades the others to say what she knows is not true.

Secondly, the maxim of manner where the speaker is ambiguous .It is not clear what 72 means. Is it the year of birth of the deceased or is it his age? And lastly, the maxim of quantity where she says she was not expecting even to be born. This is making the contribution more informative than the way it is supposed to be.

To sum it up, in this section we have discussed on how indirectness and reduced force of utterance (non- aggressive language) and the aspect of politeness interacts with the cooperative principle (C.P).We have realized that the C.P in all these instances is violated though the conversation cooperation is maintained due to the shared background knowledge. Next we look at the linguistic strategies and investigate what happens.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the third objective of the Agikuyu's woman talk, which states:

That linguistic strategy (hedging, repetition and questions) could be used to demonstrate the deviations from the Gricean cooperative principles.

The primary goal of talk between women friends is designed to construct and maintain close and equal social relationship, thus the linguistic strategies are deployed to construct and maintain connection and minimize social distance.

4.1.0 The use of Hedges.

According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, to hedge is to evade giving a direct answer to a question or promising to sustain a particular idea. Words such as *maybe*, *sort of*, *I mean* are used

Yule (1996:130) defines hedges as:

cautious notes expressed about how an utterance is to be taken.e.g.'as far as I know, ...,I may be mistaken ,I'm not sure if this is right, but...,he couldn't live with her ,I guess. Used when giving some information.

He explains further that the importance of the maxim of quality for cooperative interaction in English may be best calculated by the number of expressions we use to indicate that what we are saying may not be totally accurate."(This we investigate its validity within the A.W.T). For example:

In the conversation where Mama M is asked why women get annoyed she avoids giving direct answer and instead she gives an example of herself and uses some hedges to give examples of why she would get angry herself.

... na ndikiri na wira ndiraruta njetereire* *ringi* o kuheo **ringi* he tuundu atarinjikira

(I am unemployed I am *may be* *waiting to be given *may be** there are some small duties he will not do).

[*words used as hedges]

From this extract we can observe the following;

The speaker is cautious of the quantity maxim.

Try to make your contributions on what is true; specifically do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that which you lack adequate evidence.

The speaker uses the expressions (may be), to indicate that what she is saying may not be totally accurate. Thus she intentionally infringes the C.P.

Another example when a speaker used a hedge and as a result deviated from the C.P is When Mama C used markers tied to expectation of relevance (from the maxim of relation). Which states:

Make your contribution relevant

This was brought out in a conversation context where recent rumors were taking place.

In a case where Mama C was interviewed following a recent incident of a man who committed suicide, she used hedges as she reported on what she believed was the cause of this man's death. (a rumor)

PST: Na aciari niukuona tamangikorwo nio hihi marari na thina
na mwanake Hihi/

(Do you think the parents may be had a problem with their
son/)

Mama C: kuma tene –ri mwanake ucio nia ingiraga nyumba
akoya kindu agathii akendia

riu ngwi* ciria maturite macokanagiria no ungirora kuu kwao-ri
baba wao ni mwega muno akioneka na njira no ndungimenya uria
maragia na ciana ciake tariu* gwaku ndiui uria mwaragia na
Mburu na ndakuona na njira njiraini ukinjariria wi mwega ona
niurahe ciugo cia kunyumiriria no nyumba gwaku ndiuii uria
urutagira ukari ciana ciaku/

(for a long time the young man could have entered in the house
and stole anything and sell it and I think* they have been having a
problem and if you look at their home their father portrays like if
he is a very good man in the streets yet* you would never guess
how he interacts with his children like now I would not really*
know how you relate with Mburu and when we meet with you may
be you are the one that encourages me and yet in your house you
are so violent/

[*Words used as hedges]

Mama C brings out a hedge at the centre of a remark when she states some information and then proceeds on something quite unconnected with what she was saying. She uses the phrases “*I think and yet*” as a signal that she is drifting into a non-relevant discourse. This is again a demonstration on a speaker deviating from C.P when she deliberately used a hedge.

Hedges have a number of functions; they can be used to communicate a shade of doubt or confidence, they allow us to be inclined to other people’s feelings; they help us in the search for the right words to put across what we imply; they also aid us to stay away from playing the expert.

Let us illustrate the above functions with an example:

Hedges are used in search for right words so that we can be in a position to say what we mean and yet maintain a close relationship with our listeners.

The interviewer asked mama B what she thought about house girls. As she answered this question she really expressed her emotions .She is struggled for the right words to use to describe the conduct of the house girl before the interviewer as she wanted to maintain social distance.

Mama B: Mundu niekaga kiundu ma no uka menya nduguthii umuguthite nakio uthiu ukugera uu- *yani ugerere thii umurire thii ukari uria nyina wa Brian oka nanii ndigacoka gwika uguo tondo ungithii tariu* –ri ndanakorwo hindi ingi –ukuona mundu areka kiundu makucundi na ni mbere ya ageni ngaigua ta ngukua no ngamenya atiriri (mitheko)no ngamenya atiriri tondu ndikwenda kumu-embaraci (mitheko) ndiroria marithii –ri ndiroria marithii-ri you* know ni human niwagiriire

kumenyerera kinya kinya kinya kumenyerera kinya ngoro yao ukona
mundu ma eka kiundu kiu ona mwana wa nathari ndangika noukona*
atiriri wacha tuu wacha nivumilie ugakiaria riu na ageni mathii hwai-ini
muikarie thi mutugo ucio nyonire ma unanauna nona ma ui ndugekire
guku ringi niwanyita*/

(someone can surely do a crazy thing/but you make a decision I will not
confront her on the spot you will approach it indirectly underground and
may be* the bitterness that she see with mama Brian she will decide I will
never repeat this again you see* someone deliberately does something
crazy even in front of visitors that makes me feel like I am going to die but
then I realize (laughter)I realize because I do not want to embarrass her
(laughter) I am longing when shall the visitors depart when shall they
depart you know* is human it is important to take care of her soul you
see* someone does something crazy even a nursery kid cannot do such but
you say* let me ignore it let me be patient until the guests go home you
continue entertaining your guests but after they leave in the evening sit her
down and tell her that conduct that I surely saw you do don't ever repeat it
here again/

The above example demonstrates that as hedges are in use the C.P of manner is violated
which states:

Be perspicuous and specifically; Avoid obscurity

Thus we can make an observation that when hedges are used in conversations the speakers usually deviate from the C.P.

We can now turn to the next linguistic strategy and observe how it reacts to the C.P.

4.2.0 The use of Repetition.

Repetition is the fact of doing or saying the same thing many times .It is a linguistic strategy employed in discourses. This is a very common feature in a woman's talk. It is mostly used in affirming the group voice. Repetition can be realized at different levels i.e. at word, phrase and clause levels. It involves grammar and meaning as well as vocabulary repetition which functions primarily to signal solidarity in conversation .This implies that we are saying the same thing and using the same linguistic pattern as each other:

The following except is an illustration of instances where we encountered repetition.

Mama B: Andu aingi matingigutunya/ matingigutunya/ Mari
atumia we hi Mari atumia ii Mari atumia we /

(Lots of people cannot rob you /they cannot rob you /when they are
women no when they are women hii when they are women you /

When repetition strategy is used in this exchange, the C.P is infringed .The maxim of quantity for instance which states:

Try to make your contributions on what is true; specifically do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that which you lack adequate evidence

From the information given it is inaccurate to state that most people cannot rob you for this would depend on the context.

The maxim of manner is also violated there is lack of order and clarity in this statement. In consequence therefore we note an infringement of the C.P.

Another illustration on repetition strategy is noted when Mama M commented on men's anger;

PST: Athuri o niwonaga ta makoragwo na thina ucio / ringi wa kurakara kinya makinye handu menyurage /onandiri ndaigua muthuri wiyuragite. Kana marakara mekaga atia?

(Do you think men are faced by this challenge /of becoming very offended to a point of committing suicide? Or when they get annoyed what do they do?)

Mama M. Athuri o nimirakaraga athuri ringi nimirakaraga nandungimenya kana nimuraka-nimurakaru/ ringi agakira na undu agakira na undu agakira na undu / riu nowona undu ucio / no hihi no ahiuhe gwika undu muru tondu mutumia arakara no ariaria no arinegena hihi nake muthuri niguki-

(Men indeed get angry men at times get angry and you may not discern that he is - angry / at times he may hold a grudge hold a grudge hold a grudge / now do you understands /and may be he may be quick at doing something evil / when a woman gets

annoyed she cannot keep quiet she has to open up but for a man
may be he keeps quiet-/

Just like the first illustration the maxim of manner is violated the expressions 'get angry and hold a grudge' are over used and this leads to lack of order resulting to obscurity.

This again is a demonstration of violation of the C.P.

Finally we turn to the other linguistic strategy under scrutiny in our study i.e. use of questions.

4.3.0 The use of questions.

The use of questioning technique is a very popular linguistic strategy. This technique has a number of functions:

- It raises and upholds conversation e.g. it draws speakers to a conversation and keep it going
- it assists us to verify whether we are still in harmony with each other and so ask for help when we are stuck
- questions are used to request or signal friends to come in and chip in
- We also use them in contentious conversations to introduce our differing points of view without obviously disagreeing with each other.

There are two categories of questions that are analyzed in this section i.e.

- Rhetorical questions
- Question tags.

4.3.1 Rhetorical questions:

These are questions that are used to illustrate general truths, they assert the group's world view and check that consensus still exists .Oxford advanced learner's dictionary

(2000:1010) defines them as questions asked only to make a statement or to produce an effect rather than to get an answer

The following exchange is an expression from Mama B on how she started her business. She expresses her frustration when she could not figure out where to get customers. She uses rhetorical questions to do so.

Mama B: Gugikia kiuria Ngai atiriri/ thubu uyu
kimenyithie/ ngwikira kibao unyuwo watuhu ii? (Mitheko)
kana nikii?
(when the morning came I asked God ; this soup now tell
me do I put a sign post so that people may come and drink
it free of charge?(laughter) or what is it?

When the speaker used rhetorical questions she maintained cooperation with her listeners though she infringed the C.P of Quantity which states that:

Make your contribution as informative as required for the current purpose of the exchange. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

She gives information which is not necessary at the current point of exchange. A similar observation is noted when a question tag is used.

4.3.2 Question tags –

(Oxford advanced learner's dictionary 2000:995) defines question tags as phrases that are added to the end of a statement in order to turn it into a question or check that the statement is correct. They are used to check what has been taken for granted on what has been said. The above illustration has been concluded with a question tag.

Kana nikii

(What is it?)

As said earlier, the maxim of Quantity has been violated; the contribution at this point is less informative than it needs to be.

In summary in this section we have observed that the C.P is violated when some of the linguistic strategies mostly used in women conversations namely hedging, repetition and questioning as in use.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0.0 CONCLUSION, SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

5.1 Conclusion

The results of the data analysis showed that politeness, indirectness and use of non abrasive language (some aspects of a woman's talk) influenced cooperation principle in the conversations.

5.2 Summary and Recommendation

The study was mainly pragmatic analysis of politeness, indirectness (non abrasive language use) and linguistic strategies used in the Agikuyu woman's talk. Our main concern was to investigate how these pragmatic aspects influence the Gricean cooperative principle. In view of the data sampled in this study and from the results of the analysis, we noted that the cooperative principle is not always observed sometimes it is quietly violated for instance when the speaker has deliberately lied, supplied insufficient information, or been ambiguous, irrelevant or hard to understand. e.g. when an old man who was unmarried is referred to as a young man. On the other hand, when a speaker flouts a maxim, that is, it is obvious to the hearer at the time of the utterance that the speaker has deliberately and quite openly failed to observe one or more maxims, an implicature is arrived at e.g. when a speaker referred to a dog that had taken family planning pills.

During the study we noted that some hearers could not infer the implicated messages where indirectness and non abrasive language was used. This confirms our hypothesis that indirectness and use of non abrasive language are not always adequate in communicating. The study also reviewed that aspects of politeness though may seem attractive when in use may create ambiguity and lack of clarity to the hearers. This confirms our hypothesis that use of politeness in the Agikuyu's woman talk leads to breaching of the Gricean Cooperative Principle. Further findings from the analysis of our data, revealed that the use of linguistic strategies influences the C.P This confirms our hypothesis that the use of various linguistic strategies (hedges, repetitions and questions) in the Agikuyu's woman talk leads to contravention of the Gricean cooperative principles

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research.

This study concentrated mainly on data collected through interviewing small groups of women. I would recommend that in future researchers would collect data from seminars/workshops, television /radio f.m stations, telephone exchanges, family unit exchanges to name a few.

Research should be done to include many more social variables like social class, education level, other occupations and place of residence.

GLOSSARY

Ambiguous: Having an obscure or double meaning equivocal indistinct inconclusive, vague, undefined, confusing, unreliable.

Commissives: the speaker is committed in varying degree to a certain course of action e.g. gurantee, pledge, promise, swear, vow. What is said involves the speaker being bound to some future action

Communication: Flow of information from source to recipient

Communicative competence: a person's awareness of the rules governing the appropriate use of language in social situations.

Competence: Native speaker's knowledge of their language Unconscious knowledge of the system of grammatical rules in a language.

Constative: Word(s) that only pass information, an utterance that is a descriptive statement, analyzable into truth values.

Context: The sounds, words or phrases, immediately preceding or following the sound word or phrase under consideration. The situational environment with which words are uttered

Conventional Implicature: Thing implied by how things are

Conversation: An in formal talk involving a small group of people or only two; the activity of talking in this way for example a telephone conversation.

Conversational Analysis: a method of studying the structure of conversations using the techniques of ethomethodology.

Conversational Implicature: What is implied by the words uttered?

Conversational Maxim: General principles thought to underlie the efficient use of language e.g. speakers should be relevant and clear.

Cooperative Principle: (c.p) a tacit agreement between speakers to follow the same set of conventions (maxims) when communicating. The norms of having the speaker and the listener engage in a conversation aware of each others role in the talk

Declaration: the speaker alters the external status or condition of an object or situation solely by making the utter, e.g. I resign. I baptize, you are fired, and war is hereby declared.

Declarative: grammatical constructive used in expressing a statement (e.g. the dog barked) what is said requires indicating changes in the immediate world

Directives: The speaker tries to get the hearer to do something e.g. ask, challenge, and command, insist and request. What is said involves the listener to do or not to do something e.g. sit down (a command)

Discourse: any form of written or oral communication or composition, written text or spoken words usually larger than sentence

Ethno methodology: the detailed study of techniques used during linguistics interactions.

Euphemism: use of less offending words in the place of those that are seen to be obscene

Expressive: the speaker expresses an attitude about a state, an affair, e.g. apologies, deplore, congratulate, thank, welcome. It is a **purpose** of conveying or stating an idea.

What is said involves expressing a psychological state

Felicity Conditions: criteria that must be satisfied if a speech act is to achieve its purpose, conditions that must be fulfilled first before the speaker can go to a task besides passing the message

Figure of Speech: a metaphor or a simile often used instead of a term.

Flout: To show that you have no respect for a law, openly not obeying it

Illocution: what assign is intended to mean devoid of the interpretation by the recipient(s)

Illocutionary: a speech act involving a per formative verb (baptize, promise, request e.g.), the force behind an illocution

Implicature: an implication deduced from an utterance, using the c.p, e.g. a bus! = we must run. Explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in general sense) more than what is actually "said" (that is more than what is literally expressed by the conventional sense of the linguistic expressions uttered.

Locution: In general, a synonym of phrase, utterance, expression e.t.c. Specifically an expression of some idiomatic or structural peculiarity. A speech act making a meaningful utterance.

Pejoration: the semantic shift undergone by certain words and involving and producing a lowering in meaning.

Per formative: denotes an utterance that effects an action by being spoken or written (e.g.

I bet, I apologize)

Perlocutionary: a speech that achieves a particular effect on a listener (e.g. frightens persuades)

Pragmatics: the branch of linguistics that deals with language in use

Representatives: the speaker is committed in varying degrees, to the truth of a proposition, e.g. affirm, believe, conclude, deny and report. a particular effect the speaker's utterance has on the listener, who may feel amused, persuaded, warned e.t.c.

Semantics: relating to meaning or sense

Semiotics: analysis of language along three dimensions with regard to the use of language i.e. from pragmatic point of view, then with regard to meanings of linguistics signs from semantics point of view and with regard to the relations between signs without reference to their meanings from syntactic point of view.

Speech: verbal expression of thoughts –the faculty of uttering articulate sounds compared to parole –the oral medium of transmission for a language (spoken language).

Speech Acts: an utterance defined in terms of intentions of the speaker and effect it has on the listener.

Syntax: the grammatical arrangement of words showing

**UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
EAST AFRICANA COLLECTION**

7. An equal sign at the end of one's speaker's utterance and at the start of the next utterance indicates the absence of discernable gap, e.g.:

--
A: they were unable to defeat =them

B: =good people/

--

8. Double round parentheses indicate that there is doubt about the the accuracy of the transcription:

What's that ((mean)) brethren/

9. Where material is impossible to make out, it is represented as ((xx)), e.g.

She is ((xx))-she's not/

10. Angled brackets give clarifatory information about underlined material, e.g.:

Why doesn't that man-straighten up/ <smiling>

11. Capital letters are used for words/syllables uttered with emphasis:

She can MAKE it/

12. The symbol % encloses words or phrases that are spoken very quietly, e.g.:

%it can't it can't %

13. The symbol .hh indicates that the speaker takes a sharp intake of breath:

.hh will leave you now/

14. The symbol [...] indicates the material has been omitted, e.g.:

Ken [...] says there is a stranger near the door/

Appendix: 2

PST: Tondū muturire ini ni kuri maundu maingi tokaragwo namo ri? ringi
nikuri uhoru wa mucii ngwenda unjire uhoru wa itura riri ria geri ri
wonaga atia uhoru wa micii?-andu.

mama :C kana gwi thayu ,miingi ikoragwo na thayu no amwe ni kwi hinyereria
guikara micii iyo itari na thayu ingi itakoragwo na thayu tariu ri thina
ukoraragwo wi ki? Tuge amwe ri nikuhinyiririka ni mbecha andu maturaga
maharanaga ni mbecha riu okoro nita nyumba gwakwa ri gutiri cukari
turetanirira tutire na mawi – mawira yani muthee ndaimete – wira nanii
ndithiete wira na niturenda cuka – cukari okorwo ni mwana toucio nirenda
kibao gia –gia tukoni catandi nikiagire tukahanaga githemba kiu.

Appendix: 3

Reketuke haha iguru nihari mwanake ureitire witagwo kinuthia niumue? Phibian.

Mama: C Nindimue onagutuika tiugwo muno

PST: Mwathomaga Hindi imwe cukuru kana hihi are mbere.

Mama: C mwanake ucio nimukuru tumwite mwanake tondu ndari mutumia
(laughter) 72, 72 onandiare muciare nandieregiriire mathomaga ngwiciria
ngweciria na baba wa aya.

PST: Nikiukuona ta mwanake ni orana na karamu thinirie.

Mama : C turari na mami wao ira aranjiraga ndanamanya kiria mwanake
ucio arekire onagutuika ni athiete gwi cicita yake akamwera ni
muruaru mutwe ni arariagwo ni mutwe nguiciria oka amera-I
matioire ikinya akiona ta atigwirwo.

PST: na aciari niokuona ta mangikorwo ni hihi marari na thina na mwanake
hihi.

Mama: C kuma tene ri mwanake ucio ni atigiraga nyumba akoya kindu agathii
kwendia riu ngwiciria maturite maakanagiria no ungirora kuu kwao ri
baba wao mwega muno akioneka na jira no ndungimenya uria maragia na
ciana ciake tariu gwaku ndiui uria maragia na mburu na ndakuona na
njira I – njiraini, uki njariria no nyuma gwaku ndiu ii uria urutagira ukari
ciana ciaku.

Appendix: 4

- PST: tondu ndirindaigua mutumia wiyuragite iturai no anake, niuwe nii ndironaga ni hinya mwanake akiyuraga anga atumia nio mangikiyuraga.
- Mama: M atumia nimirakaraga nimirakaraga makiria nimacokaga makarikiriaonarua tondu tariu ndina ciana ri ndinginya ikinya kwiuragatonde ni ngwiciria ni ndakiyuraga ciana nacio ndatigira u? Ugacuka ugecira mthuri ucio ni ugucoka ahikanie. Ciana ciaku ikurerwo atia na ikurerwo nu? riu niundu cio ringi niturakaraga no ukomiri- ukona umiririe tu niundu wa ringi ciana uguo riu maundu ta macicio/
- PST : Okey na muno muno atumia marakaragio nikii? Atumia (laughter) atumia marakaraga narua muno tondu tariu niwona riu ndihaha na ndikiri na wira ndiraruta njeteraire, ringi okuheo ringi hetuundu ataririnjira no nginya ndikinyererwo ringi nigweka atia- nikurakar a tondu niwe njirigiriire okorwo ni muthuri niwe njirigiriire niwe ngwitia kira ki- naringi ndekuhota riu niwoana kuri ukunge ukarakara naringi nigutare ii no niturakaraga tugacoka tugakena onarua.

Appendix: 5

PST: Athuri o nimuonaga ta makoragwo nathina ucio ringi wa kurakara kinya makinya handu meyurage ona ndirindaigua muthuri wiyuragite – kana marakara mekaga atia?

Mama: B Athuri o ni marakaraga, athuri ringi nimakiraga na ndumenye kana nimuraka – nimurakaru ringi agakira na unduagakira haundu agakira na undu. Riu niwona ucio no hihi noahiuhe gwika undu muru tondu mutumia arakara no ariaria no arinegena hihi nake muthuri ni guki-/

Appendix: 6

Mama: M Ekire niguo ona ithimo ici tuthomaga cia makanitha no irehaga thina agithoma gia akurino kiu onanii ndathomete akirega muthuri tuge uguo. Aregire muthuri tene muno kaana kau niko gatumire matugane (akihikania)

PST: na riu muthuri akihikania akiigua nia nogio niwe

Mama: M Guku ona ndokaga muno ona angiuka etanagira hau ngiti –ini indo ckarutwo agoka gwa cucu kana agathii

PST: okey riu nyina wa uria ongiona atia kanitha ucio wa cayuni kanitha ucio wa iremba (laughter)

Mama: M nii ninyonete mutu- tata witu akiamba akihonoka kiu ari wa gathoreki akihonoka betheli muthuri agethii akiuma betheli niwagua niatiga muthuri akihonoka giki kia hwaiti kirembe gitarutagwo ningi akiuma agiuka guku (laughter) hindi iria ya haha yari na mwaki biu mokaga geri maguru agoka ringi agaikara thiku ithatu nia riganirwo nigwake.

PST: iino zayuni kana iria ya kiria

Mama :M Aca ino ya thinji nii ndaiguaga makiuga kwa mutheru ndiracokire
kumenyaati ni guku ndimenyaga niku haya agoka agaikara thiku ithatu
Atari ainuka niwaigua ena muthuri niwe urugaga muthuri niwe wikaga
maundu mothe na ena ciana ciana ri tuigana uu tugikirio tukubiatwa hwaiti
nimakahurirwo tukahana redi riui ukona mundu ucio ethamba athii
gutwara ndumiriri mucii wake githi ndwa haragana muthenya mugima
ndaroneka na riria oneka gukire andu riu akanitha muthuri niwona ndari
handu onagerwo aikaraga ahana teteki- ndiu ni wocimeni athiaga utuku
niwona ndari hindi makonana na mutumia uyu haya riu ingutware naiku-
ru mugunda athii kuu nihindi ehiririe araigua eguku ati arehete ndumiriri
ni uraimajini aimite nakuru agoka Ngong muthuri eguku wira riu ona
ithomo icio turathoma ri niiratuma andu mariganirwo ni micii yao
tugekirira kanitha muno riu niwona nake andu aria me mucii ni mararigwo
ni uhonokio uriku no okorwo ndukwamba kuhonoka gwaku nyumba ri
niwona riu ona wathii nakuu njaa hatiri na wira .

Appendix: 7

Mama: B Gugikia ngiuria, Ngai! Atiri thubu uyu ri, ni kimenyithia ngwikira unyuo, wa tuhu ii, (laughter) kana ni kii?

Mama: B andu aingi andu aingi mari atumia we hi mari atumia ii mari atumia we.arume nioru na mbia hau ninguga uguo.

Mundu nieka kiundu ma no ukamenya nduguthii umuguthite nakio uthio ukugera uu yani ugerere thii, umurire thii nie kumenya ukari uria nyina wa brian okananii ndigacokagwika uguo tondu ungithii tariuri ndanakorwo hindi ingi-ukona mundu areka kiundu makucundi na ni mbere ya ageni ngaigua ta ngukua no ngamenya atiriri (laughter) no ngamenya atiriri tondu ndikwenda kumuembaras (laughter) ndiroria marithii ri ndiroria marithii ri you know ni human niwe gakumenyerera kumenyerera kinya kinya kumenyerera kinya ngoro yao ukona mundu ma eka ki undu kiundu kiu ona mwana wa nathari ndangika no okona atiriri wacha tu wacha nivumilie ugakiaria riu na ageni mathii hwai-ni muikarie thii mutugo ucio nyonire ma una nona no na ma ui ndugekire guku ringi niwanyita.

REFERENCES:

- Ariel, M (1990) *Accessing Noun-phrase Antecedents*. London: Routledge.
- Bolinger, D. (1997) *meaning and form* London: Longman
- Cameron, D (1986) *Feminism and Linguistic theory*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Chomsky, N (1965) *aspects of the theory of syntax* New York: Press.
- Coates, J (1989) *Women, men and language of sex . A sociolinguistics account differences in language*. London: Longman.
- Coates, J (1992) (second edition) *Women, men and language*. London: Longman
- Crawford, M (1995) *Talking difference on gender and language*. London: sage publications limited
- Creedon, J.P (1993) *Women in mass communication*. London: sage publications limited
- Crystal .D,(1996) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* 2nd Ed.Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Davis W (1998) *implicature, intention, convention and principle in the failure of Grecian theory* Cambridge CUP.
- Fromkin R Rodman, V (1997)6th edition. *An introduction to language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart.
- Fowler R (1985) Power in T.V Dijk(Ed) *Handbook of Discourse Alysis*.London: Academic Press. Vol 4pp.27-42.
- Gachara M Mwangi (2005) a pragmatic analysis of the language use to campaign against HIV and Aids: a case study of Gikuyu speakers in

Nairobi and Nyeri unpublished thesis. Gal, Susan (1991) *between speech and silence: the problematic of research on language and gender*, in Michaela di Leonardo (Ed), *Gender at the crossroads of knowledge*, Berkeley, C.A: University of California Press.

Gal, Susan (1995) '*Language, gender and power: an anthropological review*', in K. Hall and M. Bucholtz (Ed), *gender Articulated: Language and socially constructed self*. London: Routledge.

Gibbs, W.R (1987) Mutual knowledge and Conversational Inferences. In Mey Jacob et al (Eds) *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol II no 2 October pp 561-588

Givon, T (1989) *mind, code and context: Essays in Pragmatics*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gleason, (1978) *The English language Rhetoric*: New Jersey: Pentice Hale

Graddol, D and Swan, J (1989) *Gender Voices*. Britain: Blackwell

Green, G (1989) *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*.

Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grice P (1991) *Studies in the way of words* (Harvard University Press.

Grice, P (1995) 'Logic and conversation' in P.Cole and J Morgan (Eds)

Syntax and Semantics 3. New York: Academic press, pp41-58.

Guthrie, M (1967) *classification of Bantu language*. London: Dawson's of Pall Mall.

Halliday, M (1985) *an introduction to functional Grammar*. London:

Arnold

- Hudson, (1995) *word meaning*: London Routledge.
- Katz J (1978) *semantic theory*.newyork: Harper Collins.
- Kramarae, C (1980) *Feminists Dictionary*. Boston Pandora.
- Lakoff, Robin (1975) *Language and Woman's Place*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Lak Off, G (1975) *Language and women's place*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Wodak, R (1997) *sage Gender and discourse: Londonpublications limited*
- Leech (1983) *Pragmatics* London: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson S (1983) *pragmatics*. Cambridge CUP.
- Mandillah K.L (2006) *Gender perspectives in the language of advertising print and electronic media in Kenya*. Unpublished thesis, Kenyatta University.
- Maninowski, B (1923) *the meaning of meaning. A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism*.newyork: Harcourt, Brace and world.
- Sapir E (1929) *the status of linguistic science*. New York: Harcourt Brace. HarcourtBrace.jovanoric.
- Mbilinyi, M (1994) '*Research methodologies in gender issues.*' In Meena, *R education. Gender in South Africa: Conceptual and theoretical issues*. Harare: SARIPS.
- Morris C (1968) *college English*: New York: Harcourt brace and world.

Mugo M.G (1975) *The role of women in the struggle for freedom. The participation of women in Kenya society*. Nairobi: KLB

Mutahi K (1977) Sound change and the classification of the dialects of southern mt.Kenya unpublished PhD thesis uon.

Ndung'u C.M (1998) images of women in Africa oral literature: a case study of Gikuyu and Swahili proverbs unpublished thesis, Kenyatta university.

Ndung'u C.M (1998) images of women in Africa oral literature: a case study of Gikuyu and Swahili proverbs unpublished thesis, Kenyatta university.

Ochs, Elihor (1974) *'Norm-makers, norm-breakers: uses of speech by women in a Malagasy community*, in Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer (Eds), *Exploration in the Ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oduol J.A (1990) sexist ideology in dholuo. Some linguistic Guidance unpublished paper.

Orwell, G (1984) *Language* New York: Harcourt

Palmer F (1981) *semantics second Edition* Cambridge University Press

Pei, Mario(2003) *A Dictionary of Linguistics*: Newyork:USA

Pleck, J (1975) *Man to man: Is brotherhood possible?* In N.Glazer-Malbin(Ed) *old famil, New family*.Newyork: VanNostrand.

Prince, E (1978) *on the function of one 'this' and this really weird 'one,'* presented at the I. S. A summer meeting, Urbana, I. L. Smith, P.M (1989) *Language, the sexes and society*. New York: Basil Blackwell limited.

Spender, D (1985) *Man made Language*. London Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sperber P and Wilson D (1986) *communication and cognition*. Cambridge MA, Harvard University press.

The Oxford Dictionary and Thesaurus, (1994) Oxford University Press: Oxford, Melbourne.

Thomas, J (1995) *Meaning in interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*: London, Longman Group Limited.

Thompson A (1989) *the grammar and pragmatics of context dependence in Discourse*. London: Lancaster University PhD thesis

Trudgill, P (1974) *Sociolinguistics. An introduction to language and society*. Harmond Snorth: Pe Books limited.

Uchs,E, and Schieffelin,B.(1992) *Acquiring Conversational Competence* London: Rout ledge

Wango, J.M (1998) *language, Education and Gender*. Unpublished paper, University of Nairobi.

Wango G.M (1998) *language and Gender. A case study in social semiotics of the lexicon of the Gikuyu language unpublished thesis*, Kenyatta University.

Webber, B (1979) *A formal Approach to Discourse Anaphora* New York and London:

Weizman, E (1989) *Requestive hints*. In Blum-kulka S, House J, Kasper G (ed) *Cross-cultural pragmatics; requests and apologies*. Ablex, Norwood, New Jersey.

Yule, G (1995) *Pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press.