

**UNDERSTANDING POLITENESS THROUGH A SEQUENCE: THE CASE OF AN
INTERVIEW**

BY

PEACE MUCHIRI

C50/80830/2012

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND
LANGUAGES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE
MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN LINGUISTICS**

JULY 2014

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been presented for the award of any degree in any other University.

PEACE MUCHIRI

DATE

This project has been submitted for examination with my approval as the university supervisor:

DR. MALOBA WEKESA

DATE

PROF. JOHN HABWE

DATE

DEDICATION

To the Almighty God

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I give thanks to God for giving me the strength I have needed to work on this project to completion.

I am, in addition, greatly indebted to my supervisors Dr. Maloba Wekesa and Prof. John Habwe without whose invaluable help and encouragement I would not have been able to conclude this work.

I further extend my thanks to the lecturers who have seen me through unto this point: Dr. Buregeya, Mr. Mungania, Dr. Schroeder, Prof. Okombo, Prof. Omondi, Dr. Marete, Dr. Oduor and Dr. Michira. To my classmates: I couldn't have chosen a better group of people to accompany me on this journey, thank you all!

Finally, I cannot forget my parents and siblings who have been a great source of encouragement during this journey. I thank my father most especially for the moral and financial support he has provided throughout the duration of my studies. I remember also, in a special way, my sister and brother-in-law who provided a roof over my head for a year so that I would not have to undergo the inconvenience of living so far away from the university.

ABSTRACT

This project seeks to suggest the chronological order of linguist Geoffrey Leech's maxims of politeness in an excerpt of an interview session from popular local talk show Jeff Koinange Live (JKL). It proposes that through this order politeness is applied in a guided manner enabling efficient communication between speakers and receivers. Its main argument is that different discourse texts assume different ordering.

The research design is descriptive and purposive sampling was used to identify the interview session to work with. The research instrument was observation; the researcher observed the relationship between the interlocutors, obtained this as data and analyzed it.

The research tested three hypotheses including that the politeness maxims are discernible in the discourse of the interview session; the maxims map accurately how politeness is dispensed within such a session and that a clear pattern and ordering emerges in the discourse text of the interview session. Results found all three to be true. More specifically, it suggested the order of the maxims in the session to be as follows: tact, approbation, agreement, modesty, generosity and lastly sympathy. From this it went on to generalize that for interview discourse the use of tact , the ability to approbate and concord are prime while the maxim of sympathy is least dominant perhaps because it is not called for in every interview; it is very context specific.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	i
DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	9
1.2 OBJECTIVES.....	10
1.3 HYPOTHESES.....	10
1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
1.4.1 REVIEW OF THEORETICAL LITERATURE ON DISCOURSE.....	11
1.4.2 REVIEW OF LEECH’S MODEL OF POLITENESS.....	17
1.5 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS.....	20
1.6 METHODOLOGY.....	21
1.7 JUSTIFICATION OF STUDY.....	22
1.8 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	23
CHAPTER TWO: DATA PRESENTATION.....	30
2.0 INTRODUCTION.....	30
2.1 PREAMBLE.....	30
2.2 TACT.....	31
2.3 GENEROSITY.....	33
2.4 APPROBATION.....	34
2.5 MODESTY.....	37
2.6 AGREEMENT.....	39

2.7 SYMPATHY.....	41
2.8 CONCLUSION.....	44
CHAPTER THREE: DATA ANALYSIS.....	45
3.0 INTRODUCTION.....	45
3.1 TACT.....	45
3.2 GENEROSITY.....	47
3.3 APPROBATION.....	49
3.4 MODESTY.....	52
3.5 AGREEMENT.....	54
3.6 SYMPATHY.....	57
3.7 CONCLUSION.....	59
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....	61
4.0 INTRODUCTION.....	61
4.1 PREAMBLE.....	61
4.2 TACT.....	63
4.3 APPROBATION.....	66
4.4 AGREEMENT.....	69
4.5 MODESTY.....	72
4.6 GENEROSITY.....	75
4.7 SYMPATHY.....	77
4.8 CONCLUSION.....	80
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	82
5.0 INTRODUCTION.....	82
5.1 SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND REMARKS ON HYPOTHESES.....	82

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS.....84
REFERENCES.....85
APPENDIX.....87

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides basic information about the study beginning with the background to the study which contains relevant history on the research area, statement of the problem, objectives of the research, hypotheses, justification of the study and scope and limitations. It then delves into the literature review, methodology and theoretical framework of the study.

1.0 BACKGROUND

One of the earliest treatments of politeness, Brown & Levinson's (1978) take on the subject remains a seminal work in research on this phenomenon. Reissued with a long introduction in 1987, it is centered on the concept of face as put forth by Goffman (1967). Goffman's definition of face extends to the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact; a line in this context is the interactants own evaluation of the interaction and all of its participants, which includes self evaluation (Goffman 1967: 5 as cited in Bargiela-Chiappini, 2003: 1458). Brown & Levinson's definition of face then is the public self image that a person wants to claim for him or herself. Following this politeness amounts to the way in which social encounters are enacted such that own face and other's face are maintained through self-respect and considerateness. Unlike Brown & Levinson however, Goffman sees face-maintenance not as the objective of an interaction but a condition of it.

Brown & Levinson (as cited in Yule, 1996: 61 - 62) further assert that all model persons have positive and negative face. A person's positive face represents the need to be accepted by others, to be treated as a member of the same group and to know that one's wants are shared by others. Negative face is represented by the need for autonomy, to have freedom of action and not to be

imposed upon by others. Inherent in every utterance is the potential to create a threat to either the speaker's (s) or hearer's (h) positive or negative face, that is, a face threatening act (FTA) or as Goffman puts it, there is potential for embarrassment in every social encounter. In this regard, Brown & Levinson propose four strategies that can be used to save face or to mitigate a FTA; positive, negative, bald on record and off record strategies. Positive politeness forms emphasize closeness between speaker and hearer and can also be termed a solidarity strategy. This strategy can be evidenced linguistically by personal information, use of nicknames, abusive terms (especially among males) and shared dialect or slang expressions (Yule 1996: 65). It also encompasses supposing or asserting shared interest, goal or view, seeking agreement and avoiding disagreement, offering and promising, joking and the use of pronouns to stress solidarity. Negative politeness forms on the other hand can also be termed a deference strategy or 'formal politeness' and are impersonal. This strategy uses expressions that refer neither to the speaker nor the hearer. Further it emphasizes the speaker's and hearer's independence which is marked by an absence of personal claims (Yule 1996: 66). Bald on record politeness strategies do nothing to minimize the threat to the hearer's face and involve the use of both warnings and advice. Off record strategies entail avoiding responsibility for the FTA often by being indirect, using rhetorical questions, coyness, understatement and metaphor and by inviting conversational implicature.

Accordingly, there are three sociological factors to take into consideration in assessing the seriousness of a FTA or in determining the level of politeness which a speaker (s) will use to an addressee (h). These are: relative power (P) of h over s, the social distance (D) between s and h and the ranking of the imposition (R) involved in doing the FTA resulting in the formula $W \propto$

(weightiness) = $D(S, H) + P(H, S) + R \times$ for calculating the weightiness of an FTA. After such a calculation, interactants can choose which strategy to apply in managing the FTA.

Apart from stating that their theory is universally valid, Brown & Levinson also hold the view that all model persons are rational agents. Consequently, politeness is a set of rational strategies to soften the potentially unwelcome effects of face-threatening. It is, in addition, strategic conflict avoidance.

For more perspective is Yule's discussion of politeness in his book *Pragmatics* (1996) which draws, by and large, upon the work of Brown & Levinson. He starts by reminding the reader that much of what we say and a great deal of what we communicate is determined by our social relationships. A linguistic interaction is necessarily a social interaction (Yule, 1996: 59). He highlights both internal and external factors as relate to social distance and closeness as having an influence on what we say and on how we are interpreted. External factors typically involve the relative status of the participants, based on social values tied to such things as age and power while internal factors could be such things as amount of imposition and degree of friendliness which are often negotiated during an interaction. Interpretation often goes beyond what one might have intended to convey including evaluations such as 'rude' and 'inconsiderate,' or 'considerate' and 'thoughtful.' Recognizing the impact of such evaluations makes it very clear that more is being communicated than is said (Yule, 1996: 60). The investigation of that impact is normally carried out in terms of politeness.

For Yule, face means the public self image of a person referring to the emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize. Consequently, politeness

is defined as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face (Yule, 1996: 60). When one shows awareness for another's face when that other is socially distant this can be termed respect or deference. On the other hand, when one shows awareness for another's face when the other is socially close this can be termed camaraderie or solidarity. He incorporates the concept of 'face wants' which refers to the expectations people have concerning their public self-image. A FTA is the result of a speaker saying something that represents a threat to another individual's expectations regarding self-image. When a speaker says something to lessen the effect of an FTA, this is called a face saving act. He summarily defines negative face as the need to be independent and positive face as the need to be connected. A face-saving act oriented to a person's negative face will tend to show deference, emphasize the importance of the other's time or concerns and at times go to the extent of including an apology for the imposition or interruption and is called negative politeness. A face saving act oriented towards a person's positive face will tend to show solidarity emphasizing that both speakers want the same thing and is called positive politeness. These lead to positive and negative politeness strategies. He also cites off-record (hints) and bald on record strategies.

Yule introduces the idea that one can use pre-sequences such as pre-requests, pre-invitations and pre-announcements to avoid risk in the process of communication. Where politeness is concerned, face is typically at risk when the self needs to accomplish something involving other most especially when the other is put in a difficult position. Pre-sequences afford a way out by providing an opportunity for the other to halt the potentially risky act, take for example (Yule, 1996: 67):

Her: Are you busy? (Pre-request)

Him: Not really. (Go ahead)

Her: Check over this memo. (Request)

Him: Okay. (Accept)

The pre-request can be responded to either with a 'go-ahead' reaction or with a 'stop' reaction (Yule, 1996: 67):

Him: Are you busy? (Pre-request)

Her: Oh, sorry. (Stop)

Pre-invitations come in the form of questions from an inviter and can similarly be responded to with a 'go ahead' or 'stop.' Pre-announcements are used by children often to check if their parents are willing to pay attention.

Brown & Levinson's account of politeness has been criticized as being overly pessimistic where continuous mutual monitoring of potential face threats robs social interaction of all elements of pleasure (Nwoye 1992 cited in Vilkki, 2006: 326). Others have characterized it as individualistic and Anglo-centric and claim that it therefore does not apply to non-western societies. Gino Eelen (2001) is not only critical of Brown & Levinson's take on politeness but also of that of other theorists influenced by their work including Gu, Lakoff, Leech, Blum Kulka, Fraser and Nolen and Ide. More particularly, he is critical of their reliance on speech act theory; they all focus too closely on the speaker at the expense of the hearer and of their assumption that all politeness is strategic. He says that these theorists reify politeness making it out to be something which both hearer and speaker can unproblematically recognize. He talks about two different

senses of politeness: politeness 1 (the common sense notion of politeness) and politeness 2 (the scientific conceptualization of politeness). It is essential to distinguish between the two and even more the relationship between both notions should be carefully monitored throughout the entire analytical process not only at the input stage. He further divides politeness 1 into two: the action related side which refers to the way politeness actually manifests itself in communicative behavior and the conceptual side which refers to common sense ideologies of politeness.

Characteristics of politeness 1 are:

- a) Evaluativity: politeness and impoliteness are linked to social values and are always evaluative in nature
- b) Argumentativity: where it is always associated with situations where there is something to lose or gain.
- c) 'Polite'-ness: where each individual considers themselves and their cultural group as polite, where only others are impolite.
- d) Normativity: politeness is the result of the pressure of social norms
- e) Modality and reflexivity: this refers to the optionality of polite interactional strategies for the actor

Politeness 2 is the theory of politeness 1 in that it is the scientific conceptualization of the social phenomena of politeness. It illustrates how politeness 1 works and also what it does for people. And while politeness 1 pertains only to the polite end of the polite-impolite continuum, politeness 2 covers the whole range of the continuum. From where he stands, Eelen opines that core politeness theories do not distinguish between politeness 1 and politeness 2 because of the normative nature of these theories. Summarily, Eelen's critique of the theoretical frameworks

encompasses that they involve a conceptual bias towards the polite end of the polite-impolite distinction, they conceptualize politeness and impoliteness as opposites and that their conceptualizations of politeness are biased towards the speaker in the interactional dyad. He goes on to note that the notion of politeness differs from culture to culture. Cultural norms reflected in speech acts differ not only from one language to another but also from one regional and social variety to another. His critique inspired by the work of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu takes full account of the hearer's position and the evaluative moment, deals with both politeness and impoliteness and provides a more dynamic bi-directional view of the social-individual relationship. Eelen can however be criticized for not proposing a clear definition of politeness and not providing a clear theoretical framework for the analysis of politeness in his work.

Another critique and alternative outlook to the Brown & Levinson model can be found in the work of Watts (2003). Watts claims that he is attempting to promote a theory that offers ways of recognizing when a linguistic utterance might be open to interlocutors as (im) polite as opposed to a model that is a blueprint for interpreting some-but-not-other linguistic expressions as politeness realizations. Watts declares that his aim is to provide the means of assessing how lay participants in ongoing verbal interaction assess social behavior that they have classified as (im) polite utterances as positive or negative. In his view speakers and addressees work together to create some form of common understanding among themselves even in cases where they may never agree. He reiterates that the goal of a theory of linguistic politeness which takes (im) politeness as its starting point should not be to explain why speakers say what they say and to predict the possible effects of utterances on addressees. It should instead explain how all the interactants engaged in an ongoing verbal interaction negotiate the development of emergent networks and evaluate their own position and the positions of others within those networks.

Like Eelen, he draws from Bourdieu's work especially from the notion of habitus – a state of being; demeanor - noting that: participants enter verbal interaction in a specific social situation with a knowledge gained from previous experiences about what forms of social behavior are appropriate and inappropriate to that type of situation. Their knowledge is constructed through their own personal history and the way it has been linked in the past with objectified social structures.

Watts also distinguishes between politeness 1 and politeness 2 and between polite and politic behavior. Politic behavior is that linguistic behavior which is perceived to be appropriate to the social constraints of the ongoing interaction, that is, as non-salient. Linguistic behavior which is perceived to be beyond what is expectable, that is, salient behavior can be called polite or impolite depending on whether the behavior itself tends toward the negative or positive end of the spectrum of politeness.

Taking all the above into account, the principal point of reference for the present study is Leech's (1983) model of politeness. This model is founded on interpersonal rhetoric and like Brown & Levinson's views politeness as conflict avoidance. It improves upon the work of Robin Lakoff (1973) who formulated a politeness principle – be polite: don't impose, give options, make others feel good - as an addition to the Gricean maxims of quantity, quality, relations and manner. At the heart of Leech's theory is this selfsame politeness principle (PP) albeit differently stated: minimize (other things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs and maximize (other things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs. It comprises six sub-maxims namely; tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy. He goes on to note that not all of the maxims and sub-maxims are equally important (Leech, 1983: 133). He suggests that tact for example may be a more powerful constraint on conversational behavior than generosity as is

approbation more than modesty. Also, within each maxim it seems that the greater importance of the first sub-maxim over the second implies that negative politeness is a more weighty consideration than positive politeness. Otherwise put, the order in which these maxims should be placed is not solid.

The PP is complementary to Grice's co-operative principle (CP) to the extent that while the CP can explain how indirect language is interpreted in a specific way, it cannot explain why people are often indirect. Further, Keenan (as cited in Leech, 1983: 80) argues that the maxims of the CP are not universal to language where there are linguistic communities to which not all of them apply. Additionally, no claim has been made that the CP applies in an identical manner to all societies and it is in effect one of the goals of socio-pragmatics to find out how different societies operate maxims in different ways, for example by giving politeness a higher rating than cooperation in certain situations or by giving precedence to one maxim of the PP rather than another (Leech, 1983: 80).

1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT

This research suggests a chronology of application to the six maxims of politeness as suggested by Leech (1983). In this chronology, as this research will attempt to prove, politeness is applied in a guided manner through the maxims enabling efficient communication between speakers and receivers whilst at the least cost benefit possible. Whereas the research is aware that there is no universality in how these maxims are ordered in different discourses, the proposition for this dissertation is that different discourse texts assume different ordering. To prove the assertion that there is order in these maxims, the research will use as data, the discourse from a popular TV talk

show. The research will argue that such a discourse text given its uniqueness provides a fertile ground to prove the assertion about the chronology of the maxims

1.2 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this research are to:

- a.** Identify the maxims of politeness as posited by Leech in the discourse of a television interview session
- b.** Illustrate how each one of the maxims are mapped in the discourse of an interview session
- c.** Suggest the chronological order in which these maxims appear to occur

1.3 HYPOTHESES

This research hypothesizes that;

- a.** Politeness maxims as posited by Leech are discernible in the discourse of a television interview session
- b.** These maxims map accurately how politeness is dispensed within such a session
- c.** A clear pattern and ordering of these maxims emerges in the discourse text of a television interview session

1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW

This section consists of two parts. The first foregrounds, in brief, the area of discourse and discourse analysis by defining it and then reviews some of the work done on it as found at the University of Nairobi's Jomo Kenyatta Memorial Library (JKML). The second underscores the descriptive development of Leech's model of politeness.

1.4.1 REVIEW OF THEORETICAL LITERATURE ON DISCOURSE

A survey of the expansive literature on politeness shows, in recent times, a move away from Brown & Levinson's (1987) positive-negative divide to a more relational and dynamic paradigm that includes discourse analysis in its wake. Perhaps the most straightforward definition of discourse is 'language above the sentence' (Cameron, 2001:10). Derived from formalist assumptions, this characterization sees language as a 'system of systems,' where each system has its own characteristic forms of structure or organization. The sound system of a language (its phonology), for example, does not have the same kinds of units, or the same rules for combining them, as the grammatical system of that language. As one's units get larger (words are larger than sounds and sentences are larger than words), one metaphorically moves 'up' from one level of organization to the next (Cameron, 2001:10). If we embrace this view, that is, that discourse analysis concerns itself with 'language above the sentence,' this would translate to looking for patterns (structure, organization) in units which are larger, more extended than one sentence. This definition however runs into problems where it suggests that single sentences and texts have a similar kind of organization and that the difference is one of scale. Also, a text can be smaller than a sentence as proposed by Widdowson (1995). And in differentiating between discourse analysis and syntax (the study of sentence structure), the former is distinct because it is

concerned with what and how language communicates when it is used purposefully in particular instances and contexts, and how the phenomena we find in 'real language' can be explained with reference to the communicative purposes of the text or the interaction (Cameron, 2001: 13). A more encompassing definition for discourse analysis in this light is 'language in use,' and this definition corresponds to a functionalist view of discourse (an interest in what language is used to do and the view of language primarily as a societal phenomenon). Still, Schiffrin (1994) proposes a third definition for the term discourse: discourse is utterances. Here one should note the use of the term utterances as opposed to sentences effectively meaning that discourse arises not as a collection of decontextualized units of language structure but as a collection of inherently contextualized units of language use (Schiffrin, 1994:35). Like 'language above the sentence' this definition is problematic at the point of the definition of utterances as realizations of sentences.

Brown and Yule (1983) state that discourse analysis cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs. In effect, while some linguists may concentrate on determining the formal properties of a language, the discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for (Brown and Yule, 1983: 1).

Trappes-Lomax (2008) notes that discourse analysts do what people in their everyday experience of language do instinctively and largely unconsciously, that is, notice patternings of language in use and the circumstances (participants, situations, purposes, outcomes) with which these are typically associated. More particularly, the discourse analyst's contribution is to do the noticing consciously, deliberately, systematically, and, as far as possible, objectively and to produce accounts (descriptions, interpretations, explanations) of what their investigations have revealed.

He goes on to give a broad definition of discourse analysis as the study of language viewed communicatively and/or of communication viewed linguistically. Detailed definitions range from reference to concepts of language in use, language above or beyond the sentence, language as meaning in interaction, and language in situational and cultural context (Trappes-Lomax, 2008: 134). As highlighted earlier linguists will, depending on their particular convictions and affiliations (functionalism, structuralism, social interactionism...), tend to emphasize one, or some, rather than others in this list. All are, nevertheless, necessary for a full understanding of what discourse is and how it works. Trappes-Lomax relays the following set of definitions in the style of a dictionary entry for 'discourse' (2008: 136):

- The linguistic, cognitive and social processes whereby meanings are expressed and intentions interpreted in human interaction;
- The historically and culturally embedded sets of conventions which constitute and regulate such processes;
- A particular event in which such processes are instantiated;
- The product of such an event, especially in the form of visible text, whether originally spoken and subsequently transcribed or originally written.

Barton (2004) defines discourse analysis as a method for analyzing the ways that specific features of language contribute to the interpretation of texts in their various contexts. On a broad level, it is the study of the ways that language is organized in texts and contexts; discourse analysis can investigate features of language as small and as specific as aspects of sentence

structure or it can investigate features of texts and contexts as large and diffuse as genres and sociocultural world views (Barton, 2004: 57).

And now having a better understanding of what discourse analysis entails, it must be said that there are many versions of this research method that are available. A main division can be made between those approaches that comprise detailed analysis of texts and those that do not. This study leans towards the first; it will undertake a detailed analysis of the transcript of spoken interaction housed in an interview session. The source discipline that will guide this endeavor is pragmatics.

Within JKML, *A discourse analysis of the structure of KBC TV broadcast discussion programmes* by Lucy Karanja (1993) forms the first work related to the present study that will be reviewed. Karanja undertook to examine the exchange patterns observable in Kenya Broadcasting Corporation Television discussion programmes as well as the salient patterns of language use. Using the approach to discourse analysis termed conversation analysis (CA); her research paid special attention to local organization especially the turn taking and adjacency pair system. She, in addition, looked at the part played by non-verbal communication, jokes, figurative language and the effect of code mixing and code switching in communication. She found that the overhearing audience is a major determining factor of both the organization and the language used in these programmes. The topic, the participant and the institutionalized context of the discussion programmes were seen as important variables being interrelated and overlapping in their influence. Her study singled out the adjacency pair as the basic structural unit of exchange in these discussion programmes.

Karanja's work evidently differs from our study given it focused on discourse structure using the CA approach to discourse analysis. The present study will focus on the discourse itself - utterances produced by the interlocutors - and not the structure of such discourse.

Another study is one done by Lydiah Kimani (1993). It is titled: *A discourse analysis of the talk of the mentally retarded – A case study of Jacaranda Special School*. Like Karanja, Kimani was concerned primarily with the structure of discourse although in the talk of the mentally retarded. She specifically examined discourse structure features and the surface level features in sentences with the aim of identifying recurrent patterns of discourse organization of the mentally retarded. She found that while the mentally retarded have notions of structure to organize their conversations, these notions are realized in deviant forms due to such mental retardation. These deviant forms are an approximation of the norm. In the analysis of discourse features, she uncovered two specific dimensions of discourse organization that have a prominent role: the simplicity-complexity dimension and the variety of particular structures used in the discourse of the mentally retarded. This points to the fact that the mentally retarded have inadequacies in organizing complex structures and cannot adequately apply conventional norms of interaction nor use discourse that requires creativity. They have an inadequate knowledge of content hence cannot be fully involved in comprehensive and meaningful conversation.

Kimani's work is different from the current research because while it worked with actual utterances (talk), it deals with the special case of mental retardation which is nowhere near the scope of our study.

Mbugua (1997) in his work *Kenyan Newspaper Discourse: An investigation in typology and ideology* subjected samples of three sub-varieties of newspaper language (news-reporting,

editorials and news analysis) to a stylistic and then a discourse analysis. His aim was to provide a descriptively adequate account of newspaper language and subject the same to a critical discourse analysis (CDA) to explicate the ideological underpinnings present in newspaper language. On investigating the sub-varieties using the critical linguistics model, he concluded that the 'uniform' registers of newspaper language revealed functional differences, especially imbalances of power among discourse participants, perspectives etc. He demonstrated the various unequal relations of power inherent in the generic basis of the sub-varieties of particular newspapers in relation to specific topics and to the institution of the media itself.

The current research is divergent from Mbugua's where his deals with print media and uses the CDA approach to discourse analysis. This study deals with broadcast media and demonstrates the role of politeness maxims in guiding conversation as opposed looking at discourse as an instrument of power.

Another study to take into account is *Discourse Analysis of Swahili Political Speeches* by Habwe (1999). Habwe specifically focused on the problems of cohesion, coherence and pragmatic meaning in selected texts of Swahili political speeches using an eclectic approach comprising Cohesion approach by Halliday and Hasan (1976), Topic Framework Approach by Brown and Yule (1983) and the Implicature approach by Paul Grice (1975). He was able to conclude that cohesion is indeed a surface manifestation of semantic relationships that point to deeper coherence in Swahili political speeches, that code-switching is a concomitant feature of Kenyan political rally speeches, that meaning is largely implied and that topic is the strongest coherence principle, being used by speakers to achieve relevance and by the audience to interpret what is relevant and what is not relevant.

Work in a similar vein is that of John Bosco Kingati (2002) which concerned itself with the language employed in Catholic homilies in Nairobi as called *Discourse Analysis of Swahili Homilies*. Kingati focused on cohesion, performative quality and pragmatic meaning in selected texts of Swahili homilies using an eclectic approach comprising of the cohesion approach by Halliday and Hasan (1976), speech act theory by Austin and Searle and the implicature approach by Grice (1975). He found that homilies deal with metaphysical concepts and through metaphor; these concepts are brought into the realm of the empirical world. They are interpreted into the daily lives of the listeners in a congregation. He also postulated that persuasion is a key concern of homilies because as data revealed one of the homilist's main aims is to convert a people's attitudes, and make them adopt another therefore the need for persuasion.

The work of Habwe (1999) and Kingati (2002) differs from the present study firstly because it takes an eclectic approach towards the research to be undertaken. Secondly, the former is within the domain of politics and the latter religion while the present study works with the domain of journalism. Lastly, Habwe and Kingati seem to zero in on the role of cohesion in discourse; the present study attempts to prove that a chronological order will manifest itself in the discourse text of an interview session.

1.4.2 REVIEW OF LEECH'S MODEL OF POLITENESS

In this section, the descriptive development of Leech's (1983) theory is discussed.

Work done by Lakoff 1973 and Leech 1983 falls under the approach to politeness labeled the conversational maxim view. Lakoff's theory (1973) of politeness extends Grice's cooperative principle (1967, 1975) by way of adding a politeness principle. Her basic premise is that people follow a particular set of rules during interaction which prevent such an interaction from

breaking down. She puts Grice's maxims under the umbrella maxim: be clear (maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relations, maxim of manner) and then adds her own maxim: be polite which hosts three conditions – don't impose, give options and make others feel good. These conditions can also be referred to as the maxim of formality or distance, the maxim of hesitancy or deference and the maxim of equality or camaraderie (Johnstone 2008 as cited in Theories of Politeness n.d.). Lakoff proposes that granted the three maxims cannot all be maximized at the same time interactants must work toward finding a balance between them. Impolite behavior results when the balance of these maxims is thrown off. For Lakoff, politeness is universal.

In addressing the shortcomings of Lakoff's work Leech (1983) reworked the politeness principle (PP) dividing it into six interpersonal maxims of tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy which are captured in relation to the illocutionary acts with which they occur.

Tact Maxim (in impositives (or directives) and commissives):

- a) Minimize cost to other
- b) Maximize benefit to other

Generosity Maxim (in impositives (or directives) and commissives):

- a) Minimize benefit to self
- b) Maximize cost to self

Approbation Maxim (in expressives and assertive):

- a) Minimize dispraise of other
- b) Maximize praise of other

Modesty Maxim (in expressives and assertive):

- a) Minimize praise of self
- b) Maximize dispraise of self

Agreement Maxim (in assertives):

- a) Minimize disagreement between self and other

- b) Maximize agreement between self and other

Sympathy Maxim (in assertives):

- a) Minimize antipathy between self and other
- b) Maximize sympathy between self and other

He also establishes five scales used to determine how the maxims should be used and balanced: the cost benefit scale, the optionality scale, the indirectness scale, the authority scale and the social distance scale. He notes that not all the maxims and sub-maxims are equally important, tact for example appears to be a more powerful constraint on conversational behavior than generosity and approbation than modesty, a reflection that perhaps attests to the stance that politeness is focused more strongly on other than on self (Leech, 1983:133). Even more is that within each maxim, sub-maxim (b) seems to be less important than sub-maxim (a), illustrating the more general law that negative politeness is a more weighty consideration than positive politeness (Leech, 1983: 133).

The conversation-maxim conceptualization of politeness has been subject to criticism in as far as it does not deal with the question of what politeness actually is because the co-operative principle (CP) is too vague to be operative (Dimitrova-Galaczi, 2005:6). Lakoff's model is not explicit in giving any clues as to how the three conditions of politeness are to be understood and how interlocutors decide on a certain strategy taking away its explanatory power. Leech's model has been attacked for getting into too much detail and thus failing to portray the general picture (Van De Walle, 1993 as cited in Dimitrova-Galaczi, 2005:6). It has been thought to be too theoretical, rigid and removed from linguistic reality to be able to account for actual language

usage. Perhaps, the most notable criticism is that there is no set way of restricting the number of maxims that account for politeness.

In spite of such criticism Lakoff and Leech's work is cited as being highly relevant for cross-cultural comparisons given their explanatory power in the field of cross-cultural differences in the perception and use of politeness strategies. The identification of maxims can moreover underscore crucial aspects of ethos. Thomas (1995 as cited in Dimitrova-Galaczi, 2005:7) suggests that the maxims can be viewed as sociopsychological constraints which influence to a different degree the pragmatic choices made by speakers. In this view, some of the constraints may have universal application, others cultural and others individual.

1.5 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This study is geared towards suggesting the order of Leech's six maxims in an interview session from talk show Jeff Koinange Live (JKL). It is therefore limited to the broadcast interview genre of media discourse; other genres are out of the scope of this study. On JKL, host Jeff Koinange interviews key newsmakers and other guests from different sectors in the country whether politicians, actors and actresses, musicians, people living with disabilities among others keeping viewers updated on what is happening as well as entertaining them. It airs every Wednesday and Thursday at 7.45 pm on local channel Kenya Television Network (KTN).

No more than ten minutes of the chosen interview session will be used for the study given time constraints and the fact that it will be focused on microelements (the six maxims) which can be easily identified in the discourse text.

The study is limited in as far as any interview session is host controlled and therefore biased towards such a host's preferences and perspectives. This may significantly influence how the host employs the maxims discrediting the impartiality or objectivity of data.

The timeline of the show presents another limitation in as far as what is current at the time the show is aired may not be the same as what is ongoing today. It is restricted to the events and occurrences taking place at that time.

The target audience is also a restriction where the show can be said to target educated people and is therefore partial to the priorities of these.

1.6 METHODOLOGY

The research design is descriptive; it describes the patterning of Leech's six maxims in a ten minute excerpt of an interview session from JKL. The decision to use JKL is motivated by the fact that it is a well respected program and it features interviewees from varied sectors in the country and is therefore truly representative of talk show discourse.

The interview session used was chosen by way of purposive sampling. The researcher purposefully selected an interview session which carried within it the six maxims. This effectively eliminated those sessions which did not exhibit these maxims, saving on time. Important to note, is that a total of ten interview sessions were reviewed before purposefully selecting the used session. The results of purposeful sampling are usually more accurate than those achieved with other types of sampling.

The research instrument was observation. The researcher observed the relationship between the interlocutors, obtained this as data and analyzed it. She interpreted the patterning of the six maxims using her experience, background knowledge and library research.

The data was obtained by downloading the selected interview session from Kenya Television Network's website on the internet. The selected ten minutes of dialogue was then be transcribed for the purposes of analysis. Analysis involved examining every utterance for evidence of tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy as guided by Leech's (1983) theory.

Data was presented in the form of extracts from the transcribed data. These extracts were presented sequentially so as to illustrate the presence of tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy.

1.7 JUSTIFICATION OF STUDY

From available research, no study has been undertaken to put forward an order or patterning of Leech's politeness maxims in the broadcast (television) interview genre. The decision to focus on the genre of broadcast interviews is therefore motivated by the fact that linguistic politeness is relatively under investigated in this setting (as seen in the literature review) and by the importance of mass media as a social institution. This genre is also unique to the extent that it has a wide and varied audience which means that the interviewer and the interviewee must be strategic in the way they ask and respond to questions and is thus a rich hub for this study.

As aforementioned the decision to use JKL is motivated by the fact that it is a well loved program and it features interviewees from different sectors in the country making for an appropriate subject of study in terms of diversity.

1.8 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study adopts Leech's (1983) model of politeness as its theoretical framework. Its main tenets and principles are discussed below.

Leech's (1983) model of politeness is founded on interpersonal rhetoric and views politeness as conflict avoidance. Moreover his approach can be termed a neo-gricean approach to politeness in that it is based on the assumption of a number of principles (Clark, 2013: 357). At the heart of it all is what he calls the politeness principle (PP) which states: minimize (other things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs and maximize (other things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs. It comprises six sub-maxims namely; tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy. They are captured in relation to the illocutionary acts (note that assertives may also be called representatives and directives may also be called impositives, declaratives do not involve politeness) in which they occur as follows:

Tact Maxim (in impositives (or directives) and commissives):

- a) Minimize cost to other b) Maximize benefit to other

Generosity Maxim (in impositives (or directives) and commissives):

- a) Minimize benefit to self b) Maximize cost to self

Approbation Maxim (in expressives and assertives):

- a) Minimize dispraise of other b) Maximize praise of other

Modesty Maxim (in expressives and assertives):

- a) Minimize praise of self b) Maximize dispraise of self

Agreement Maxim (in assertives):

- a) Minimize disagreement between self and other
- b) Maximize agreement between self and other

Sympathy Maxim (in assertives):

- a) Minimize antipathy between self and other
- b) Maximize sympathy between self and other

The first four maxims go in pairs as they deal with the bipolar scales of cost-benefit and praise-dispraise. The remaining two maxims deal with the unipolar scales of agreement and sympathy. And while there are various connecting links between the scales, each maxim is distinct in that it refers to an evaluative scale which is distinct from the scales referred to by the others (Leech, 1983: 132). Summarily, the scales according to which the maxims are measured are:

1. The 'cost/benefit' scale – estimates how the action is assessed by the speaker to be costly or beneficial either to the speaker or to the addressee
2. The 'optionality' scale – describes the degree to which the action is realized as the choice of the addressee.
3. The 'indirectness' scale – describes the length of the inference involved in the action
4. The 'authority' scale – measures the degree of distance with respect to the power or authority that one participant has over another

5. The 'social distance' scale – describes the degree of solidarity between the interlocutors

The illocutionary acts expressed in brackets tie back to the speech act theory which tells that on any occasion the action performed by producing an utterance consists of three related acts: a locutionary act, an illocutionary act and a perlocutionary act (Yule, 1996: 48). A locutionary act is the basic act of utterance; the production of a meaningful linguistic expression. An illocutionary act refers to the function or purpose of the utterance and is performed via the communicative force of an utterance. A perlocutionary act is the intended effect of the utterance. Illocutionary acts with which we are chiefly concerned can be categorized in terms of four illocutionary functions in accordance with how they relate to the social goal of establishing and maintaining comity (Leech, 1983: 104):

- i) Competitive – here the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal, take for example
ordering, asking, demanding, begging
- ii) Convivial – here the illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal, take for example
offering, inviting, greeting, thanking and congratulating
- iii) Collaborative – here the illocutionary goal is indifferent to the social goal take for example when asserting, reporting, announcing, instructing
- iv) Conflictive – here the illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal take for example
when threatening, accusing, cursing, reprimanding

The competitive and convivial illocutionary functions are the two most associated with politeness. Negative politeness manifests in the competitive illocutionary function creating the need to lessen the discord implicit in the competition between what a speaker wants to achieve and what is 'good manners.' Positive politeness manifests itself in the convivial illocutionary function. Leech's definition of negative politeness consists in minimizing the impoliteness of impolite illocutions and his definition of positive politeness consists in maximizing the politeness of polite illocutions. The collaborative and conflictive illocutionary functions are not relevant to politeness and represent written discourse and offensive language respectively.

A different classification of illocutionary acts that is more suited to what we have in brackets is undertaken by Searle (as cited in Leech 1983: 105). He divides them into:

- i) Assertives – these commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition such as
in
stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming and reporting. In as far as politeness is concerned assertives tend to be neutral and belong to the collaborative category mentioned above. Exceptions include boasting which is for the most part considered impolite.
- ii) Directives – have as their intention to produce some effect through action by the
hearer as
in ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, and recommending. They primarily fall under the competitive category in the classification mentioned above which hosts

negative politeness. Some directives such as invitations can however be intrinsically polite. An alternate term – impositives – can be used for directives.

iii) Commissives – these commit a speaker - to a greater or lesser degree – to some future action as in promising, vowing and offering. These are often convivial in the categorization undertaken above and are performed in the interests of someone other than the speaker.

iv) Expressives – these have the function of expressing the speaker’s psychological attitude

towards a state of affairs which the illocution presupposes as in thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising and condoling among others. They are also convivial and resultantly intrinsically polite. Exceptions include blaming and accusing which are impolite.

v) Declarations – these are illocutions whose ‘successful performance... brings about the

correspondence between the propositional content and reality.’ Yule (1996: 53) says they are those kinds of speech acts which change the world via their utterance. They include resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, excommunicating, appointing, sentencing and the speaker has to have a special institutional role, in a specific context in order to perform this type of illocution. The speaker could be a priest, judge or referee for example. Declarations do not involve politeness granted they are institutional rather than personal acts.

Noteworthy is that politeness is essentially asymmetrical given what is polite with respect to a hearer (h) or to a third party will be impolite to a speaker (s), and vice versa. The maxims of politeness explain such asymmetries and their consequences in terms of indirectness.

The PP is complementary to Grice's co-operative principle (CP). To further elaborate, Grice's conversational implicature refers to the way in which we usually understand what others are saying even when they do not express their intentions in a straightforward manner. His cooperative principle (CP) helps to explain how people correctly interpret what others are implying by universal conventions in human interaction namely: the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relevance and the maxim of manner.

a) Maxim of Quality:

Try to make your contribution one that is true

- i. Do not say what you believe to be false
- ii. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

b) Maxim of Quantity:

- i. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
- ii. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required

c) Maxim of Relevance:

Make your contributions relevant

d) Maxim of Manner:

Be perspicuous:

- i. Avoid obscurity
- ii. Avoid ambiguity
- iii. Be brief
- iv. Be orderly

The above principles aid in explaining how hearers interpret speakers' intentions (Tsuda 1993: 64). Leech informs that we need the CP to account for the relation between sense and force; force being the intention of a speaker's utterance and sense being the contextual meaning of a speaker's utterance. However, the CP cannot explain the relation between sense and force in non-declarative sentences; nor does it give any answers to why people sometimes flout one or more of the maxims, take for example by being indirect (Leech 1983: 80). The PP helps explain why people in some situations flout Grice's maxims.

CHAPTER TWO: DATA PRESENTATION

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to identify the maxims of politeness as set forth by Leech in the first ten minutes of the discourse text of JKL interview session - Being Gay in Kenya: Biology or Lifestyle? Leech lists these maxims as: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy. The characteristics of each maxim are highlighted in brief and then the extract in which they appear is presented – providing context and succinct analysis - with the precise phrase(s), clause(s) or sentence(s) that carry the maxim italicized. For each maxim, two examples of occurrence are given.

2.1 PREAMBLE

For a holistic understanding of this chapter, it is essential to note that Leech's maxims are captured in relation to the illocutionary acts in which they occur. Searle's categories of illocutionary acts to which he principally refers include assertives, directives (impositives), commissives, expressives and declarations. He however cautions that some cases are not covered by these acts and that as far as Searle's categories go, negative politeness belongs pre-eminently

to the directive class while positive politeness is found pre-eminently in the commissive and expressive classes (Leech, 1983: 107). Also important to bring to the fore is that each maxim is accompanied by a sub-maxim - placed in square brackets – which is of lesser importance. The maxims are observed ‘up to a certain point’ as opposed to being absolute rules and speakers may adhere to more than one maxim at the same time.

2.2 TACT

Tact is characterized by sensitivity in dealing with others or by a keen sense of what to do or say in order to maintain good relations with others and avoid offense. The tact maxim is found in directives or impositives (asking, ordering, commanding, requesting, advising and recommending) and in commissives (promising, vowing and offering). Directives and commissives refer in their propositional content X, to some action to be performed, respectively by the hearer or the speaker. This action may be called A, and may be evaluated in terms of what s assumes to be its cost or benefit to the speaker or the hearer (Leech, 1983:107). The tact maxim states as follows:

- a) Minimize cost to other [(b) Maximize benefit to other]

The context of this first example of tact extends to host Jeff Koinange making an off the cuff remark, just as the program begins, about church leaders who have refused to be guests on the show. This can perhaps be attributed to the subject of the show – homosexuality – which can be controversial.

Example 1: Asking

JK: Welcome to the bench. ²⁵ By the way, I have to mention this right now. ²⁶
I invited a whole bunch of (Binyavanga laughs as he claps his hands)
church folks on this show, right, a whole bunch. ²⁷ Pastor Mbevi, Pastor
M, Father Wamugunda ... (trails off). ²⁸

BW: *Are they very busy?* ²(Koinange laughs)

JK: All of a sudden, *people are busy* (ironically). ²⁹

BW: Oh, oh good, okay (nonchalant). ³

Binyavanga creates a good excuse - busy - for the church folks' absence from the show successfully guiding the audience to the conclusion that these folks will not be present for the session. The creation of this excuse can be seen to minimize cost to these leaders and consequently grant benefit to them in that it implies that they have other important things to do.

In the following example Koinange is warming up to the query on whether Binyavanga had any homosexual experiences while in high school.

Example 2: Asking

JK: *Let me ask you an unfair question.* ⁴⁹ You went to Mang'u and you are
very proud of going to Mang'u... ⁵⁰

BW: Mang'u boys yeah. ⁴³

JK: And Changes, you went to Lenana as well. ⁵¹

BW: Yes, Yes. ⁴⁴

JK: Was there any experience there? ⁵² Was there any need to experience? ⁵³

BW: Not with me. ⁴⁵ Not with me. ⁴⁶

The key words to take into account in this Example are *unfair question*. These are the carriers of tact. By stating that his question is unreasonable, host Jeff decreases any cost to Binyavanga that may be inherent in the question posed, automatically maximizing the benefit to him.

2.3 GENEROSITY

Central to the generosity maxim is putting others before oneself. The generosity maxim, like tact, is found in directives or impositives (asking, ordering, commanding, requesting, advising and recommending) and in commissives (inviting, promising, vowing and offering). In effect, it sometimes co-occurs with the tact maxim. It states:

- a) Minimize benefit to self [(b) Maximize cost to self]

This first example of generosity is found as the talk show commences; host Koinange is introducing the program and getting ready to interview his guest.

Example 1: Inviting

JK: *Welcome to the program.* ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and this is a very important issue so sit back, better

yet lean forward let's get involved. ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle @koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga's is @binyavanga capital W, @binyavangaW. ¹⁴

The invitation 'Welcome to the program' is intrinsically generous where it is performed in the best interests of the audience, minimizing benefit to self.

The context of this second example of generosity is housed in the introduction of viewers to the program by host Jeff Koinange and takes the form of a pledge.

Example 2: Pledge

JK: Welcome to the program. ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and *this is a very important issue* so sit back, better yet lean forward *let's get involved*. ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle @koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga's is @binyavanga capital W, @binyavangaW. ¹⁴

Declaring that the issue at hand is a very important one, Koinange opens himself up to the possibility of being dismissed as a sympathizer of the gay cause and so maximizes cost to self. Not everyone believes that this issue needs the attention it is being granted, for some it is a waste of time. The pledge to *get involved* also mirrors the beliefs held by the generosity maxim. For the audience to get involved they must set aside some time away from their other activities and

engage with Jeff and Binyavanga for the duration of the program. This effectively minimizes the benefit to them and maximizes any cost available to them.

2.4 APPROBATION

Approbation can be described as approval or praise.

The approbation maxim states:

- a) Minimize dispraise of other [(b) Maximize praise of other]

It is found in expressives (thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising and condoling) and assertives (stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming and reporting). Akin to flattery, this maxim advises that if one cannot praise an individual then it is better to side step the issue or to give a minimal response through the use of euphemisms for example or by being silent.

Below, Koinange is introducing Binyavanga as his guest for the program that will follow. He lauds Binyavanga's achievements.

Example 1: Praising

JK: Welcome to the program. ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and this is a very important issue so sit back, better yet lean forward, let's get involved. ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle @koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga's is @binyavanga capital W,

@binyavangaW. ¹⁴ Now, this man is quite an accomplished author. ¹⁵
About a dozen years ago he won the Caine prize. ¹⁶ That's a very
important one in the literary world. ¹⁷ Went on to write a book called
"One Day I will Write About This Place." ¹⁸ This book has been
translated into several languages. ¹⁹ I asked him if it's a best seller, he
said, "it's doing well." ²⁰

Jeff clearly wants the audience to know about Binyavanga's success introducing him as an accomplished author and noting that he won the Caine prize. It could be thought that because homosexuality is many times viewed negatively then Koinange wouldn't think to praise his guest but the contrary is true.

The background of the text below provides information that is key to understanding how Binyavanga 'came out of the closet.' Koinange recounts that Wainaina on his 43rd birthday sends out a 'lost' chapter of his memoir to two blogs he admires.

Example 2: Boasting

JK: Yeah Yeah. ⁶⁰ So fast forward. ⁶¹ Your 43rd birthday, obviously it was
very deliberate... ⁶² You... ⁶³

BW: Yeah, yeah. ⁶⁴

JK: You put together this essay, called the lost chapter and you posted it to a
couple of blogs. ⁶⁴ Right. ⁶⁵ Which ones (points at fingers to count)? ⁶⁶

BW: There was chimurenga.co.za...uh...*Chimurenga magazine is one of our leading intellectual magazines.* ⁶⁵ *They won the Prince Claus prize for cultural freedom two years ago.* ⁶⁶ *They've been a documentor.* ⁶⁷ *They are one of the most respected publications.* ⁶⁸ I know their work well. ⁶⁹ So I posted to them asked them to put it up at midnight. ⁷⁰ *The other one was Africa is a Country which is a well known blog that covers media and so on and so forth in a very critical way.* ⁷¹

The above is a case in point where boasting is concerned. Binyavanga goes beyond just naming which blogs he posted his lost chapter to rather he extols their work typically minimizing dispraise of other and maximizing praise of other.

2.5 MODESTY

Modesty has been defined as the quality of not being too proud or confident about yourself or your abilities and even as freedom from boastfulness.

The modesty maxim is encompassed by the statement:

- a) Minimize praise of self [(b) Maximize dispraise of self]

It is also found in expressives (thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising and condoling) and assertives (stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming and reporting).

The framework of this example is the beginning of the interview with the opening question on when Binyavanga discovered he was a homosexual.

Example 1: Blaming

JK: So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)?³⁵

BW: I don't know.⁷ You don't... I don't know... it's a complicated thing because you don't eh discover, you know.⁸ At least in my case, you know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that *there's this something that makes me feel very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me feel very secretive.*⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before I went to primary school.¹⁰

In trying to reveal how he found out or in revealing what made him realize he is gay, Wainaina reminisces that it was the realization that there was something that would make him feel weak, embarrassed and secretive. This takes on the tone of blaming oneself in which praise of self takes a back seat and dispraise of self is maximized as states the modesty maxim.

Here below, Wainaina is talking about a certain head boy who got expelled from school and returns to the same school for his final year.

Example 2: Blaming

BW: That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain. ⁵⁷

JK: Sure. Sure. So so... ⁵⁹

BW: He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left). ⁵⁸ He *chomad* (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and *ji-sorted*. ⁵⁹ And I was like that's that's pride. ⁶⁰ *So I was you know, over the years you are just like, aki you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy.* ⁶¹ There was something, you know, he *bebad* something. ⁶² That was quite cool...(admiringly) ⁶³

Binyavanga calls himself a coward in light of what the expelled head boy went through as an openly gay individual because he was too afraid to come out and go through a similar experience. He can be seen to be blaming himself with hindsight and is in line with not being too proud of oneself or one's abilities minimizing praise of self and maximizing dispraise of self.

2.6 AGREEMENT

Agreement implies a situation in which people share the same opinion.

The agreement maxim promotes harmony between self and other stating:

- a) Minimize disagreement between self and other
- b) Maximize agreement between self and other

It is found in assertives (asserting, stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming and reporting). It mirrors Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies which advocate that one should seek agreement and avoid disagreement to the best of one's abilities.

In this example of agreement Wainaina is describing how he feels about women and why he is not attracted to them in the sort of way that can lead to a binding relationship.

Example 1: Asserting

BW: I... I love women. ³⁷ I love how they smell. ³⁸ I love women sensually. ³⁹

But it's those things of I like you, you like me but I don't feel like calling you tomorrow. ⁴⁰ Like you kind of forgot...

JK: *Yeah ...* ⁴⁶

BW: ...and then you are like why did I forget? ⁴¹

JK: *Yeah ...* ⁴⁷

BW: Then you feel the other person is your friend...

JK: *Right ...* ⁴⁸

BW: ...something like that. ⁴²

At each stage of Binyavanga's description of how he feels about women, Koinange voices agreement whether or not he truly concurs. This can be seen to support the overall goal of moving the narrative forward and promoting harmony between the two.

In the situation below Koinange is wondering where a head boy who Wainaina says was expelled and then returned to school for his final year and to do exams is at present. Wainaina recollects with a bit of nostalgia how the head boy carried himself through it.

Example 2: Reporting

JK: Where is he today? ⁵⁸

BW: That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain. ⁵⁷

JK: *Sure. Sure.* So so... ⁵⁹

BW: He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left). ⁵⁸ He *chomad* (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and *ji-sorted*. ⁵⁹ And I was like that's that's pride. ⁶⁰ So I was you know, over the years you are just like, *aki* you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy. ⁶¹ There was something, you know, he *bebad* something. ⁶² That was quite cool...(admiringly) ⁶³

JK: *Yeah Yeah.* ⁶⁰ So fast forward. ⁶¹ Your 43rd birthday, obviously it was very deliberate... ⁶² You... ⁶³

Koinange also urges Binyavanga on in the above extract by way of agreement despite whatever is own personal opinions or feelings may be granted it is a personal story. This is done to support the overall goal of maintaining comity between speaker and hearer.

2.7 SYMPATHY

Sympathy is found where one feels that he or she cares about and is sorry about another's trouble, grief or misfortune. The sympathy maxim accounts for compassion between self and other and is encompassed in:

- a) Minimize antipathy between self and other
- b) Maximize sympathy between self and other

It is found in assertives (asserting, stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming and reporting).

The context for this first Example of sympathy is that it is found at the beginning of the interview. It is carried by the first question host Jeff Koinange asks and opens up the floor for more.

Example 1: Suggesting

JK: *So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)?* ³⁵

BW: I don't know. ⁷ You don't... I don't know... it's a complicated thing because you don't eh discover, you know. ⁸ At least in my case, you know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that there's this something that makes me feel very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me

feel very secretive. ⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before I went to primary school. ¹⁰

Sympathy is seen in the use of the word ‘discover.’ In using this word, Koinange is approaching the subject matter of the interview with a sense of tenderness that betrays sympathy where being gay is something you stumble upon as opposed to being something you choose or learn.

Still referring to the expelled head boy, Binyavanga uses the occasion below to express his sadness at how the boy is treated.

Example 2: Reporting

JK: Everybody would what? ⁵⁴ Would spit? ⁵⁵

BW: Spit. ⁴⁹

JK: At him? ⁵⁶

BW: Of course. ⁵⁰ Even form ones; you know like look at that thing (gestures with hands), you know not like a person, yeah? ⁵¹ And I remember feeling two things at the time, I felt *haiya* me, me, me *sitaki hiyo*(gestures “refusing” with hands), those people you know... so you were like don’t even imagine, *funga hiyo* chapter... (gestures “closing” with hands) ⁵²

JK: Even though you were... ⁵⁷

BW: Ah ah... clo, clo, clo... close the chapter. ⁵³ The other thing I felt was I very very desperately wanted to say hello to him. ⁵⁴ Because I just... I was like... I feel like... like that it is not... *no human being should ever*

have to walk for nine months waiting for an exam, alone in an entire school towards the exam, where every time you come to the dining some form one throws (gestures “throwing”) githeri over you and then people jump up giggling. ⁵⁵

Binyavanga’s expression of solidarity with the expelled head boy generates sympathy between himself and the audience. His narrative of what this boy went through is filled with a sense of supportiveness and understanding. He shows that he is capable of empathy; the boy’s predicament is his.

2.8 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we set out to categorize Leech’s six politeness maxims in the discourse text of an interview session on talk show Jeff Koinange Live (JKL). All six maxims were found to be present but some were easier to identify than others. Tact and approbation were the easiest to spot, followed by agreement and modesty. Generosity and sympathy were difficult to mark. In the chapter that follows I will demonstrate how each one of the maxims is mapped within the interview session.

CHAPTER THREE: DATA ANALYSIS

3.0 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I will illustrate how each one of Leech's maxims is mapped in the interview session - *Being gay in Kenya: Biology or Lifestyle?* I will show how each of these is brought out within the session. It is important to note that politeness concerns a relationship between two participants identifiable as 'self' and 'other.' Self may be denoted by s and other by h which also includes third parties, who may or may not be present in the speech situation that is to say that the label other may thus apply not only to addressees but to people designated by third person pronouns such as the audience at home in the present study. Politeness towards an addressee is however generally more important than politeness towards a third party. For each maxim three examples of occurrence are given with the precise phrase(s), clause(s) or sentence(s) that carry the maxim italicized.

3.1 TACT

Example 1:

In the example below, Koinange's mentioning – at the beginning of the program - that he requested church leaders to be a part of it all but they declined can be seen as tactful where later

on he asks Binyavanga whether he goes to church and receives a negative response. This is to say that he is setting a precedent right from the start that these leaders are somewhat responsible for the negative perceptions people like Binyavanga have towards the church and that in effect they should have been there to represent their religion and demystify its stance on homosexuality. In this way he (self) minimizes cost to Binyavanga (other) and also maximizes benefit to Binyavanga.

JK: Welcome to the bench. ²⁵ By the way, *I have to mention this right now.* ²⁶
I invited a whole bunch of (Binyavanga laughs as he claps his hands)
church folks on this show, right, a whole bunch. ²⁷ *Pastor Mbevi, Pastor*
M, Father Wamugunda ... (trails off). ²⁸

BW: Are they very busy? ² (Koinange laughs)

JK: All of a sudden, people are busy (ironically). ²⁹

BW: Oh, oh good, okay (nonchalant). ³

Example 2:

Still at the beginning of the program, Binyavanga's response to the absence of religious leaders on the show is an apt example of the use of tact as a politeness mechanism. 'Are they very busy?' implies that such leaders have a lot on their plates and cannot therefore make it to the show rightfully maximizing the benefit to them as reads part b of the tact maxim. Koinange's response equally reinforces this stance with '...people are busy.' Self in this case extends to Binyavanga and Koinange while other extends to the religious leaders.

- JK: Welcome to the bench. ²⁵ By the way, I have to mention this right now. ²⁶
 I invited a whole bunch of (Binyavanga laughs as he claps his hands)
 church folks on this show, right, a whole bunch. ²⁷ Pastor Mbevi, Pastor
 M, Father Wamugunda ... (trails off). ²⁸
- BW: *Are they very busy?* ²(Koinange laughs)
- JK: All of a sudden, *people are busy* (ironically). ²⁹
- BW: Oh, oh good, okay (nonchalant). ³

Example 3:

This instance is found in the middle of the show. Koinange starts his line of questioning with the preface 'let me ask you an unfair question,' effectively giving benefit to the other in that he has already established that his question is partial. The other here is Binyavanga. With this statement he automatically puts Binyavanga to advantage, elevating him and preparing the way for a courteous response.

- JK: *Let me ask you an unfair question.* ⁴⁹ You went to Mang'u and you are
 very proud of going to Mang'u... ⁵⁰
- BW: Mang'u boys yeah. ⁴³
- JK: And Changes, you went to Lenana as well. ⁵¹
- BW: Yes, Yes. ⁴⁴
- JK: Was there any experience there? ⁵² Was there any need to experience? ⁵³
- BW: Not with me. ⁴⁵ Not with me. ⁴⁶

3.2 GENEROSITY

Example 1:

Found at the beginning of the session the invitation ‘Welcome to the program’ is extended in the best interests of the audience, minimizing benefit to self.

JK: *Welcome to the program.* ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and this is a very important issue so sit back, better yet lean forward let’s get involved. ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle @koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga’s is @binyavanga capital W, @binyavangaW. ¹⁴

Example 2:

This instance is right at the beginning of the session. Koinange reminds the audience that the issue at hand is very important, minimizing the benefit to himself as a host and maximizing the cost to himself to the extent that part of his audience may perceive it to be a non-important matter granted sexuality can be viewed as a private affair which need not be discussed publicly. The invitation to get ‘involved’ minimizes benefit to s – the audience - and maximizes cost to s because it demands that s use his or her time to engage with Binyavanga and Koinange on the show despite his or her schedule.

JK: Welcome to the program. ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and *this is a very important issue* so sit back, better yet lean forward *let’s get involved.* ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle

@koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga's is @binyavanga capital W,
@binyavangaW. ¹⁴

Example 3:

In this example found towards the end of the session, Binyavanga, 'self,' cites that he is a *resourceful* person meaning he will bear the cost of traveling to Nigeria, whatever that may be. One can thus rightfully attribute this statement to the generosity maxim because he minimizes the benefit to himself and maximizes the cost to himself as well.

JK: You will go (reiterates challengingly)? ⁶⁹

BW: We shall find a way (determined resolve). ⁸⁵

JK: Okay, so... ⁷⁰

BW: I might wear a *buibui* (laughter). ⁸⁶ I don't know we'll see. ⁸⁷

JK: Bui... bui . ⁷¹

BW: *Yeah, we are resourceful people...*(laughs) ⁸⁸

3.3 APPROBATION

Example 1:

This example is found right at the start of the session. Leech tells that the approbation maxim is exemplified in the intrinsic courtesy of congratulations (1983:132) and even calls it 'the Flattery Maxim' though he notes that the term 'flattery' is generally reserved for insincere approbation. It can also be summarized as 'avoid saying unpleasant things about others and more particularly, about h'. In this instance, host Koinange (self) lauds the work of Binyavanga maximizing praise

of other.

JK: Welcome to the program. ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and this is a very important issue so sit back, better yet lean forward, let's get involved. ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle @koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga's is @binyavanga capital W, @binyavangaW. ¹⁴ *Now, this man is quite an accomplished author.* ¹⁵ *About a dozen years ago he won the Caine prize.* ¹⁶ *That's a very important one in the literary world.* ¹⁷ Went on to write a book called "One Day I will Write About This Place." ¹⁸ *This book has been translated into several languages.* ¹⁹ *I asked him if it's a best seller, he said, "it's doing well."* ²⁰

Example 2:

This second case of approbation is found towards the centre of the interview program. Here Binyavanga admires the head boy (other) who had a tough time in the hands of other students given his sexual orientation. He approbates the boy describing him as one with dignity and as 'cool.' He further notes that the boy passed his exams and went on to join campus despite all the negativity towards him. He counts the boy's behavior as pride in the positive sense of the word.

BW: Ah ah. , clo, clo, clo... close the chapter. ⁵³ The other thing I felt was I very very desperately wanted to say hello to him. ⁵⁴ Because I just... I was like... I feel like... like that it is not... no human being should ever

have to walk for nine months waiting for an exam, alone in an entire school towards the exam, where every time you come to the dining some form one throws (gestures “throwing”) githeri over you and then people jump up giggling.⁵⁵ The third thing I remember is: *that guy had dignity man...*⁵⁶

JK: Where is he today?⁵⁸

BW: That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain.⁵⁷

JK: Sure. Sure. So so...⁵⁹

BW: *He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left).*⁵⁸ *He chomad (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and ji-sorted.*⁵⁹ *And I was like that's that's pride.*⁶⁰ So I was you know, over the years you are just like, *aki* you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy.⁶¹ There was something, you know, *he bebad* (carried) *something.*⁶² *That was quite cool...(admiringly)*⁶³

Example 3:

In this instance which also appears towards the centre of the ten minute interview extract, when Koinange asks Binyavanga which blogs he sent his essay to, Binyavanga does not just mention them; he commends their work in a fashion that is typical of the approbation maxim calling *Chimurenga magazine* a leading intellectual magazine and a most respected publication. He cites

Africa is a country as a well known blog that covers media in a critical way. The ‘other’ here comprises the blogs.

JK: You put together this essay, called the lost chapter and you posted it to a couple of blogs. ⁶⁴ Right. ⁶⁵ Which ones (points at fingers to count)? ⁶⁶

BW: There was chimurenga.co.za...uh...*Chimurenga magazine is one of our leading intellectual magazines.* ⁶⁵ *They won the Prince Claus prize for cultural freedom two years ago.* ⁶⁶ *They’ve been a documentor.* ⁶⁷ *They are one of the most respected publications.* ⁶⁸ I know their work well. ⁶⁹ So I posted to them asked them to put it up at midnight. ⁷⁰ *The other one was Africa is a Country which is a well known blog that covers media and so on and so forth in a very critical way.* ⁷

3.4 MODESTY

Example 1:

This first instance is found at the commencement of the interview. Here in recalling what he first felt upon the discovery that he might be a homosexual Binyavanga humbly notes that it was something that made him feel *weak, embarrassed* and *secretive*. He is not afraid that such language may make him seem inferior. He is, in other words, maximizing dispraise of self.

JK: So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)? ³⁵

BW: I don’t know. ⁷ You don’t... I don’t know... it’s a complicated thing because you don’t eh discover, you know. ⁸ At least in my case, you

know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that *there's this something that makes me feel very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me feel very secretive.* ⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before I went to primary school. ¹⁰

Example 2:

This illustration of modesty comes at the onset too. Binyavanga refers to himself as a weird dreamy kid in this extract; maximizing dispraise of self. He is also not ashamed to say that homosexuality can be thought of as 'dirty,' minimizing praise of self and maximizing dispraise of self once again.

BW: I knew there was something very different from me...

JK: Why? Did you play with dolls? Did you play with...

BW: (Interjects) No! ¹⁵ I never really liked dolls. ¹⁶ I liked drawing girls (gestures drawing with hand). ¹⁷ I played with my sister a lot. ¹⁸ I played with my brother a lot. ¹⁹ I didn't like football but I was not a girly person... eh... not really. ²⁰ *But I was kinda weird dreamy kid.* ²¹ But what would just happen is once in a while just from that age and.... you just meet somebody usually grown up or something like that and you have these very dangerous feelings. ²² You know they are dangerous, you don't know what they are. ²³ And it takes a long time to start to understand what that thing is. ²⁴ It's only now when you learn, usually, you know, for

someone who was so innocent like me, it's in the urinal in boarding school (draws in the air with fingers) and you see, so and so is a homosexual and (writes in the air with fingers) *you see very dirty pictures and you assume that's a very dirty thing.* ²⁵ *You don't know what it is.* ²⁶ *So it takes a long time.* ²⁷

Example 3:

Binyavanga alludes, in this instance which is in the middle of the interview excerpt in consideration, to a head boy who got expelled from school for getting involved in things to do with homosexuality and then came back to the same school to sit for exams. The other students are disgusted by him but he carries himself, according to Binyavanga, extremely well, passes his exams and goes on to join campus. In thinking back to that time and to that boy, he sees himself as a coward because he is not as brave and bold.

BW: That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain. ⁵⁷

JK: Sure. Sure. So so... ⁵⁹

BW: He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left). ⁵⁸ He *chomad* (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and *ji-sorted*. ⁵⁹ And I was like that's that's pride. ⁶⁰ *So I was you know, over the years you are just like, aki you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy.* ⁶¹ There was

something, you know, he *bebad* something. ⁶² That was quite cool...(admiringly) ⁶³

3.5 AGREEMENT

Example 1:

This illustration is found at the beginning of the interview excerpt used. Koinange's emphatic and irony filled agreement that 'people are busy' is a reinforcement of Binyavanga's negative attitude towards the Christian religion; shows support for such an attitude.

JK: Welcome to the bench. ²⁵ By the way, I have to mention this right now. ²⁶

I invited a whole bunch of (Binyavanga laughs as he claps his hands) church folks on this show, right, a whole bunch. ²⁷ Pastor Mbevi, Pastor M, Father Wamugunda ...(trails off). ²⁸

BW: *Are they very busy?* ²(Koinange laughs)

JK: *All of a sudden, people are busy* (ironically). ²⁹

BW: Oh, oh good, okay (nonchalant). ³

Example 2:

This example of agreement is also found just after the beginning of the interview excerpt used. Wainaina (other) tries to explain to Koinange (self) that while he loves women such affection does not lead to anything beyond mere mutual appreciation between himself and women. At each point of explanation Koinange urges him on in agreement until he finishes. Whether he really understands or agrees with Wainaina is questionable and one can thus claim, in this regard,

that he (Koinange) flouts the Gricean maxim of quality - do not say what you believe to be false.

BW: I... I love women. ³⁷ I love how they smell. ³⁸ I love women sensually. ³⁹

But it's those things of I like you, you like me but I don't feel like calling you tomorrow. ⁴⁰ Like you kind of forgot...

JK: *Yeah ...* ⁴⁶

BW: ...and then you are like why did I forget? ⁴¹

JK: *Yeah ...* ⁴⁷

BW: Then you feel the other person is your friend...

JK: *Right ...* ⁴⁸

BW: ...something like that. ⁴²

Example 3:

Agreement is also present in the above extract – found in the middle area of the interview excerpt - where Wainaina (other) is talking about the head boy who got expelled from school and then came back to the same school to do exams. Koinange's (self) responses to references of the boy show accord and support Wainaina's narration of the event as it took place.

JK: Where is he today? ⁵⁸

BW: That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain. ⁵⁷

JK: *Sure. Sure. So so...* ⁵⁹

BW: He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left). ⁵⁸ He *chomad* (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and *ji-sorted*. ⁵⁹ And I was like that's that's pride. ⁶⁰ So I was you know, over the years you are just like, *aki* you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy. ⁶¹ There was something, you know, he *bebad* something. ⁶² That was quite cool...(admiringly) ⁶³

JK: *Yeah Yeah*. ⁶⁰ So fast forward. ⁶¹ Your 43rd birthday, obviously it was very deliberate... ⁶² You... ⁶³

3.6 SYMPATHY

Example 1:

In this first instance seen at the start of the session, Koinange (self) choice of words tells of sympathy toward Binyavanga (other) in that he takes homosexuality to be something that you come to realize (discover) as opposed to choose. Koinange comes across as expressing sympathy for a misfortune.

JK: *So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)?* ³⁵

BW: I don't know. ⁷ You don't... I don't know... it's a complicated thing because you don't eh discover, you know. ⁸ At least in my case, you know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that there's this something that makes me feel

very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me feel very secretive. ⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before I went to primary school. ¹⁰

Example 2:

In this extract witnessed at the middle of the session, the ‘self’ is Binyavanga and the ‘other’ is the head boy who got expelled from school. Binyavanga’s words tell of empathy towards the head boy by expressing the feeling that no human being should be ostracized. One can tell that he has put himself in this head boy’s shoes and can envision himself in a similar situation and thus a shared feeling of understanding.

JK: Everybody would what? ⁵⁴ Would spit? ⁵⁵

BW: Spit. ⁴⁹

JK: At him? ⁵⁶

BW: Of course. ⁵⁰ Even form ones; you know like look at that thing (gestures with hands), you know not like a person, yeah? ⁵¹ And I remember feeling two things at the time, I felt *haiya* me, me, me *sitaki hiyo*(gestures “refusing” with hands), those people you know... so you were like don’t even imagine, *funga hiyo* chapter... (gestures “closing” with hands) ⁵²

JK: Even though you were... ⁵⁷

BW: Ah ah... clo, clo, clo... close the chapter. ⁵³ The other thing I felt was I very very desperately wanted to say hello to him. ⁵⁴ Because I just... I was like... I feel like... like that it is not... *no human being should ever*

have to walk for nine months waiting for an exam, alone in an entire school towards the exam, where every time you come to the dining some form one throws (gestures “throwing”) githeri over you and then people jump up giggling. ⁵⁵

Example 3:

In the above example found just before the end of the session, Binyavanga highlights the eccentricity of the laws on homosexuality in Nigeria and raises concern about the gay community in that country creating sympathy between himself and Koinange and the audience at home as well.

BW: ... Remember that there is this conversation going on about the most insane and reprehensible laws that are going on in Nigeria today which is the worst law I have seen like in 100 years. ⁷⁸ You have to go back (throws hands to his right to signal “back”) to the Nazis before World War II to see a law that closes down public space like that. ⁷⁹ So of course that’s part of the reason I was just like... you know me I go and work with Nigerians every year, right. ⁸⁰ I’ve worked with some of the most talented writers and artistes out of Nigeria for ten years, right. ⁸¹ *So of course you have to feel not just for the gays and lesbians in Nigeria but for the writer’s community, the media community cause when you start targeting there (points to his left) that’s when you are targeting that way (points to his right).* ⁸²

JK: Do you plan to go to Nigeria this year? ⁶⁷

BW: Oh yeah. ⁸³

3.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter looked at how Leech's maxims are foregrounded taking into account 'self' and 'other.' It demonstrated how these maxims are emergent in and where they are positioned in the discourse text. The goal was to reorient the reader with these maxims by making clearer how they are portrayed in the session. In chapter four, I will show the chronological order in which these maxims appear and highlight how such an order may be used to achieve success in other interview situations.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter endeavours to suggest the chronological order in which Leech's maxims of politeness occur within the chosen interview session. It will lay out the dominance patterns of these maxims with the aim of establishing the order in which they normally occur in such discourse text remembering that the problem statement for this thesis noted that different discourse texts assume different ordering. It will then use this ordering to highlight some of the requisite skills that an interviewer should possess in order to carry out a successful interview.

4.1 PREAMBLE

Andreas Jucker in his book *News Interviews: A Pragmalinguistic Analysis* (1986) is of the view that interviews are almost entirely concerned with the interviewee's positive face. Accordingly negative face plays a very minor role granted the interviewee has consented to be publicly

questioned on a certain topic relinquishing his or her right to non-distraction. In effect he or she undertakes to respond to the questions asked whether or not he or she actually wants to answer them. And so while Leech cites that sub-maxim b of each of the maxims is of lesser importance illustrating the more general law that negative politeness is a more weighty consideration than positive politeness (Leech 1983: 133), the chosen interview session affirms Jucker's stand and leans more towards positive politeness. This takes us back to Brown & Levinson's face-saving approach towards politeness. We must however note that Andreas' is working with the news interview genre as opposed to a talk show. JKL can at the same time be said to comprise elements of a news interview as it features newsmakers of all types on a weekly basis.

According to Brown & Levinson, face, the public self image of a person, is central to politeness and they therefore define politeness as the means employed to show awareness of another person's face (Yule 1996: 60). Face can be either positive (the need to be accepted) or negative (the need for autonomy). Inherent in every utterance is the potential to create a threat to either the speaker's (s) or hearer's (h) positive or negative face, that is, a face threatening act (FTA). Four strategies can be used to mitigate a FTA: negative, positive, bald on record and off record strategies. Negative politeness takes on the form of deference emphasizing the hearer's right to freedom and is impersonal including expressions that refer to neither the speaker nor the hearer. Positive politeness forms emphasize closeness between the speaker and hearer and can be seen as a solidarity strategy. Linguistically speaking positive politeness strategies include personal information, use of nicknames, sometimes even abusive terms (particularly among males), and shared dialect or slang expressions (Yule 1996: 65). It also encompasses supposing or asserting shared interest, goal or view, seeking agreement and avoiding disagreement, offering and promising, joking and the use of pronouns to stress solidarity. Within the chosen session

Binyavanga shares personal information, both host Jeff and Binyavanga use slang expressions such as *changes* for the high school Lenana boys and *watchie* to refer to watchman, Binyavanga uses informal language in his narration calling a boy that ‘guy,’ refers to himself as ‘Binya’ and code switches quite a bit, Jeff seeks agreement and avoids disagreement and Binyavanga jokes often even saying that in light of the harsh laws against gays in Nigeria, he will visit this country dressed in a *buibui* for safety reasons.

In the following sections I discuss the dominance pattern of each maxim with the aim of suggesting the hierarchy of these maxims within the chosen session.

4.2 TACT

Jucker (1986) argues that the cost-benefit scale is restricted to negative face wants and consequently does not play any prominent role in interviews. Tact falls under this scale. He further asserts that the illocutionary acts to which tact applies - commissives and directives - are rare in news interviews. He states as an example that one seldom hears the participants of an interview invite each other to a cup of coffee as a commissive would require. Where directives are concerned, requests to pass the salt or leave the room are also unheard of in the news interview genre because the willingness of the interviewee to comply would have to be negotiated yet the willingness to answer relevant questions has already been given.

This research nevertheless found tact to be the most dominant maxim in the interview session behaving as a watermark, that is, being found at the background of most of the conversation such that even where another maxim is in operation tact is still present as part of the bigger picture. This conflicting result can be attributed to the specifics of genre, that is, talk show versus news

interview. A talk show is more likely to have commissives such as invitations and offers and directives such as asking and advising because of its informal nature.

A few examples to illustrate how tact is constantly in the background of the session include this first one where the maxim identified as salient is sympathy:

Example 1: Sympathy

While sympathy is identified as the overriding maxim here below, Koinange's question can be interpreted as tactful in that by the use of the word *discover* he makes it seem as though homosexuality is a predicament that Binyavanga has stumbled upon; it is considerate to say the least and effectively minimizes cost and maximizes benefit to other.

JK: *So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)?* ³⁵

BW: I don't know. ⁷ You don't... I don't know... it's a complicated thing because you don't eh discover, you know. ⁸ At least in my case, you know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that there's this something that makes me feel very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me feel very secretive. ⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before I went to primary school. ¹⁰

Example 2: Agreement

In this second example agreement is identified as the maxim of the extract. This agreement can however be seen to be tactful in so far as eliciting a response from the interviewee and moving the narrative forward. Whether or not Koinange truly agrees with Binyavanga's description of

the head boy as 'cool' is another matter, this agreement can thus be termed maximizing benefit to Binyavanga.

JK: Where is he today? ⁵⁸

BW: That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain. ⁵⁷

JK: *Sure. Sure.* So so... ⁵⁹

JK: He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left). ⁵⁸ He *chomad* (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and *ji-sorted*. ⁵⁹ And I was like that's that's pride. ⁶⁰ So I was you know, over the years you are just like, *aki* you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy. ⁶¹ There was something, you know, he *bebad* something. ⁶² That was quite cool...(admiringly) ⁶³

BW: *Yeah Yeah.* ⁶⁰ So fast forward. ⁶¹ Your 43rd birthday, obviously it was very deliberate... ⁶² You... ⁶³

Example 3: Generosity

Example three has generosity as its principal maxim but has tact strategically incorporated within it. In noting that the topic under discussion is a very important one host Koinange makes it beneficial (sub maxim b of the tact maxim) for the audience at home to be watching.

JK: Welcome to the program. ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and *this is a very important issue* so sit back, better yet lean forward *let's get involved*. ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle @koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga's is @binyavanga capital W, @binyavangaW. ¹⁴

Example 4: Approbation

This instance of approbation found at the beginning of the show is tactful to the extent it puts the guest, Binyavanga, on a pedestal softening his attitude towards the interview and making for rich responses.

JK: *Now, this man is quite an accomplished author.* ¹⁵ *About a dozen years ago he won the Caine prize.* ¹⁶ *That's a very important one in the literary world.* ¹⁷ Went on to write a book called "One Day I will Write About This Place." ¹⁸ *This book has been translated into several languages.* ¹⁹ *I asked him if it's a best seller, he said, "it's doing well."* ²⁰

Example 5: Modesty

Here Binyavanga's humility can be seen as comprising some tact in as far as wanting the audience to sympathize with him.

JK: So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)? ³⁵

BW: I don't know. ⁷ You don't... I don't know... it's a complicated thing because you don't eh discover, you know. ⁸ At least in my case, you know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that *there's this something that makes me feel very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me feel very secretive.* ⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before I went to primary school. ¹⁰

4.3 APPROBATION

Using the pragmatic scales once again, Andreas (1986) opines that the praise-dispraise scale under which approbation and modesty fall, is of considerable prominence in interviews. He cautions that this may not apply in the way suggested by these two maxims to the extent that both interlocutors want to avoid making evaluative comments about each other. Still, the interviewer can ask the interviewee to comment on himself or herself (Jucker 1986: 74).

In this study, approbation was found to be quite prominent, falling second in the hierarchy of maxims in the selected session. It was easy to single out being spread throughout the interview session, appearing at least four times.

It is seen right from the beginning as host Jeff Koinange introduces his guest Binyavanga Wainaina:

Example 1:

JK: *Now, this man is quite an accomplished author.* ¹⁵ *About a dozen years ago he won the Caine prize.* ¹⁶ *That's a very important one in the literary*

world. ¹⁷ Went on to write a book called “One Day I will Write About This Place.” ¹⁸ *This book has been translated into several languages.* ¹⁹ *I asked him if it’s a best seller, he said, “it’s doing well.”* ²⁰

It also emerges when Jeff points out the high schools Wainaina went to noting with apparent admiration that he attended well known, good national schools:

Example 2:

JK: ...You went to Mang’u and you are very proud of going to Mang’u

BW: Mang’u boys yeah.

JK: And *changes*, you went to Lenana as well.

BW: Yes, yes.

When Wainaina describes the head boy who got expelled and then had to return to the same school for exams, it is similarly with apparent admiration:

Example 3:

BW: *He had dignity, like his head, he won’t look this way (turns head to the right); he won’t look that way (turns head to the left).* ⁵⁸ *He chomad (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and ji-sorted.* ⁵⁹ *And I was like that’s that’s pride.* ⁶⁰ So I was you know, over the years you are just like, *aki* you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy. ⁶¹ There was

something, you know, *he bebad* (carried) *something*.⁶² *That was quite cool... (admiringly)*⁶³

Lastly when he discusses the blogs to which he posted the 'lost chapter' of his memoir he is full of praise for them:

Example 4:

JK: You put together this essay, called the lost chapter and you posted it to a couple of blogs.⁶⁴ Right.⁶⁵ Which ones (points at fingers to count)?⁶⁶

BW: There was *chimurenga.co.za*...uh...*Chimurenga magazine is one of our leading intellectual magazines*.⁶⁵ *They won the Prince Claus prize for cultural freedom two years ago*.⁶⁶ *They've been a documentor*.⁶⁷ *They are one of the most respected publications*.⁶⁸ I know their work well.⁶⁹ So I posted to them asked them to put it up at midnight.⁷⁰ *The other one was Africa is a Country which is a well known blog that covers media and so on and so forth in a very critical way*.⁷¹

4.4 AGREEMENT

The agreement maxim promotes an atmosphere of friendliness in the interview session and is the next most dominant after tact and approbation given the high presence of declaratives. On a large scale, the act of agreement can be seen in Binyavanga's giving consent to be interviewed.

Jucker accords substantial importance to the agreement maxim saying that the agreement - disagreement scale is of great necessity in news interviews. He elucidates further by noting that many questions in such interviews are formed as yes/no interrogatives and that a roughly equal proportion are formed as declaratives with a very small proportion being formed as wh-interrogatives. This means the interviewee is constantly put in situations where they have to either agree or disagree, both to the yes/no interrogatives and to the declaratives (Jucker 1986: 75).

Within the session, evidence of this maxim is primarily seen on Jeff's side of the conversation.

The following Examples are a testament:

Example 1:

In the example below, agreement is crucial because Wainaina is talking about a very sensitive issue. He is explaining how he feels about women and why he cannot sustain a relationship with them.

BW: I... I love women. ³⁷ I love how they smell. ³⁸ I love women sensually. ³⁹

But it's those things of I like you, you like me but I don't feel like calling you tomorrow. ⁴⁰ Like you kind of forgot...

JK: *Yeah ...* ⁴⁶

BW: ...and then you are like why did I forget? ⁴¹

JK: *Yeah ...* ⁴⁷

BW: Then you feel the other person is your friend...

JK: *Right ...* ⁴⁸

BW: ...something like that. ⁴²

Example 2:

In this second example, agreement is paramount in not only advancing the narrative but also in making Wainaina feel that what he is saying is worthwhile and that it resonates with host Jeff and the audience.

JK: Where is he today? ⁵⁸

BW: That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain. ⁵⁷

JK: *Sure. Sure.* So so... ⁵⁹

BW: He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left). ⁵⁸ He *chomad* (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and *ji-sorted*. ⁵⁹ And I was like that's that's pride. ⁶⁰ So I was you know, over the years you are just like, *aki* you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy. ⁶¹ There was something, you know, he *bebad* something. ⁶² That was quite cool... (admiringly) ⁶³

JK: *Yeah Yeah.* ⁶⁰ So fast forward. ⁶¹ Your 43rd birthday, obviously it was very deliberate... ⁶² You... ⁶³

Example 3:

In this extract Koinange's agreement that the church folks invited to be on the show are busy reinforces the irony of it all and searing the fact that these religious leaders are a disappointment into the minds of the audience.

JK: Welcome to the bench. ²⁵ By the way, I have to mention this right now. ²⁶

I invited a whole bunch of (Binyavanga laughs as he claps his hands)
church folks on this show, right, a whole bunch. ²⁷ Pastor Mbevi, Pastor
M, Father Wamugunda ... (trails off). ²⁸

BW: *Are they very busy?* ²(Koinange laughs)

JK: *All of a sudden, people are busy (ironically).* ²⁹

Example 4:

Here agreement is seen from Binyavanga's side of the conversation in the word *watchie*. It serves to reinforce the view that even a watchman can have an opinion on an issue such as the present one.

BW: *Si, I was telling you.* ⁹³ Yesterday I was coming into a building coming out of an interview and the *watchie* had been trying to greet me when I went in, I was a bit nervous, so when I came out he was like, "I was watching you on the Trend. (Puts on the watchman's voice) He! *Uh.. sielewi hiyo kitu, hiyo kitu enyewe sielewi...*," and he looked at me frowned and then

he shook my hand and said (puts on the watchman's voice & demeanor),
“*Lakini mi niliona unaongea ukweli na unajua ukweli , ukweli, ukweli ni
poa...(laughs).*”⁹⁴

JK: A *watchie* (laughs).⁸²

BW: A *watchie*.⁹⁵

4.5 MODESTY

Modesty tags along being especially prominent in Binyavanga's side of the conversation. He is humble about his experiences being unafraid to put himself down when explaining himself. Jucker, as stated earlier, finds this maxim that falls under the praise-dispraise scale to be of considerable prominence in interviews. We look at some examples below:

Example 1:

In the exchange below modesty shows itself as prominent in Binyavanga's description of what he felt as a young child who had gay leanings.

JK: So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)?³⁵

BW: I don't know.⁷ You don't... I don't know... it's a complicated thing because you don't eh discover, you know.⁸ At least in my case, you know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that *there's this something that makes me feel very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me*

feel very secretive. ⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before
I went to primary school. ¹⁰

Example 2:

In this extract modesty is dominant where Binyavanga calls himself a coward in comparison to what the expelled head boy went through as an openly gay individual.

BW: That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious
but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain. ⁵⁷

JK: Sure. Sure. So so... ⁵⁹

BW: He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the
right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left). ⁵⁸ He *chomad*
(slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B
something like that, went to campus and *ji-sorted*. ⁵⁹ And I was like that's
that's pride. ⁶⁰ *So I was you know, over the years you are just like, aki you*
Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy. ⁶¹ There was
something, you know, he *bebad* something. ⁶² That was quite
cool...(admiringly) ⁶³

Example 3:

Binyavanga is modest here where he doesn't hold back from admitting that he was a weird kid
and that homosexuality is views as a dirty thing.

BW: I knew there was something very different from me...

JK: Why? Did you play with dolls? Did you play with...

BW: (Interjects) No! ¹⁵ I never really liked dolls. ¹⁶ I liked drawing girls (gestures drawing with hand). ¹⁷ I played with my sister a lot. ¹⁸ I played with my brother a lot. ¹⁹ I didn't like football but I was not a girly person... eh... not really. ²⁰ *But I was kinda weird dreamy kid.* ²¹ But what would just happen is once in a while just from that age and... you just meet somebody usually grown up or something like that and you have these very dangerous feelings. ²² You know they are dangerous, you don't know what they are. ²³ And it takes a long time to start to understand what that thing is. ²⁴ It's only now when you learn, usually, you know, for someone who was so innocent like me, it's in the urinal in boarding school (draws in the air with fingers) and you see, so and so is a homosexual and (writes in the air with fingers) *you see very dirty pictures and you assume that's a very dirty thing.* ²⁵ *You don't know what it is.* ²⁶ *So it takes a long time.* ²⁷

4.6 GENEROSITY

Generosity is not very prominent in the session and proved difficult to identify. This is perhaps a confirmation of Andreas' findings that the cost-benefit scale is restricted to negative face wants and consequently does not play any prominent role in interviews. Given the nature of their content commissives and directives are not often found in news interviews. Some examples to verify this are provided below:

Example 1:

The element of generosity in this example demonstrates politeness towards a third party namely the audience. As noted in chapter three politeness towards an addressee is generally more important than politeness towards a third party making this instance of generosity less dominant.

JK: *Welcome to the program.* ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and this is a very important issue so sit back, better yet lean forward let's get involved. ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle @koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga's is @binyavanga capital W, @binyavangaW. ¹⁴

Example 2:

In stating that homosexuality is a very important issue and that we all need to get involved, this Example of generosity likewise demonstrates politeness towards a third party (the audience) as opposed to an addressee and so makes this maxim to be less dominant overall.

JK: Welcome to the program. ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and *this is a very important issue* so sit back, better yet lean forward *let's get involved.* ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle @koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga's is @binyavanga capital W, @binyavangaW. ¹⁴

Example 3:

This example finds its generous element in the word *resourceful* such that Wainaina is willing to bear the cost of going to Nigeria. It is however neither a commissive or directive and this weighs in on its value as far as measuring the dominance of generosity.

JK: You will go (reiterates challengingly)?⁶⁹

BW: We shall find a way (determined resolve).⁸⁵

JK: Okay, so...⁷⁰

BW: I might wear a *buibui* (laughter).⁸⁶ I don't know we'll see.⁸⁷

JK: Bui... bui .⁷¹

BW: *Yeah, we are resourceful people...*(laughs)⁸⁸

4.7 SYMPATHY

Sympathy isn't present enough to be labeled overarching. In his work, Jucker notes that for the scale of sympathy-antipathy, there seems to be no evidence in news interviews. More specifically, the interactants refrain from making comments referring to their sympathy or antipathy for each other. Such comments are not made about themselves but about persons, or actions and events related to persons, that are not present (Jucker 1986: 76). We look at some examples to support this claim:

Example 1:

This example proposes that sympathy is housed in the word *discover* which suggests that homosexuality is something you stumble upon and not a choice as some would like to think. This is however a fleeting example of the presence of this maxim and not one strong enough to lend overall dominance to it.

JK: *So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)?* ³⁵

BW: I don't know. ⁷ You don't... I don't know... it's a complicated thing because you don't eh discover, you know. ⁸ At least in my case, you know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that there's this something that makes me feel very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me feel very secretive. ⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before I went to primary school. ¹⁰

Example 2:

Sympathy as demonstrated here indicates politeness towards a third party (the expelled head boy) and this weighs down on the prominence of this maxim in the session remembering that politeness towards an addressee is generally more important than politeness towards a third party.

JK: Everybody would what? ⁵⁴ Would spit? ⁵⁵

BW: Spit. ⁴⁹

JK: At him? ⁵⁶

BW: Of course. ⁵⁰ Even form ones; you know like look at that thing (gestures with hands), you know not like a person, yeah? ⁵¹ And I remember feeling two things at the time, I felt *haiya* me, me, me *sitaki hiyo*(gestures “refusing” with hands), those people you know... so you were like don’t even imagine, *funga hiyo* chapter... (gestures “closing” with hands) ⁵²

JK: Even though you were... ⁵⁷

BW: Ah ah... clo, clo, clo... close the chapter. ⁵³ The other thing I felt was I very very desperately wanted to say hello to him. ⁵⁴ Because I just... I was like... I feel like... like that it is not... *no human being should ever have to walk for nine months waiting for an exam, alone in an entire school towards the exam, where every time you come to the dining some form one throws (gestures “throwing”) githeri over you and then people jump up giggling.* ⁵⁵

Example 3:

Like example two, sympathy in this example is directed towards the audience in as far as Wainaina’s feelings that the insane laws in Nigeria are a letdown and so is empathetic towards the gays in that country. However, politeness towards an addressee is generally more important than politeness towards a third party.

BW: ... Remember that there is this conversation going on about the most insane and reprehensible laws that are going on in Nigeria today which is

the worst law I have seen like in 100 years. ⁷⁸ You have to go back (throws hands to his right to signal “back”) to the Nazis before World War II to see a law that closes down public space like that. ⁷⁹ So of course that’s part of the reason I was just like... you know me I go and work with Nigerians every year, right. ⁸⁰ I’ve worked with some of the most talented writers and artistes out of Nigeria for ten years, right. ⁸¹ *So of course you have to feel not just for the gays and lesbians in Nigeria but for the writer’s community, the media community cause when you start targeting there (points to his left) that’s when you are targeting that way (points to his right).* ⁸²

JK: Do you plan to go to Nigeria this year? ⁶⁷

BW: Oh yeah. ⁸³

4.8 CONCLUSION

This section of the study highlighted the dominance patterns reflected in the session with the aim of understanding which maxims interview discourse most employs. Taking into account these dominance patterns, it can be said that for broadcast interview discourse the skill of tact and the ability to approbate are prime. Leech (1983: 133) remarks that tact is often the more powerful constraint on conversational behavior when compared to generosity while approbation is more powerful than modesty. This further rightly reflects the more general law that politeness is focused more strongly on other than on self.

Also crucial to carrying out a successful interview is agreement. Agreement spurs the conversation on and aids the interviewer in eliciting responses. In the provided discourse text, agreement is straightforward consisting of replies such as ‘yes’ and ‘sure’ but it is important to highlight that partial agreement which suggests that part of what is said is untrue applies too.

Modesty which is the next most dominant involves humility is another essential interviewing skill. A modest interviewer is likely to have good rapport with his guest granted this is an endearing quality. A modest interviewee will likewise appeal to the interviewer making the interviewer less likely to badger him or her.

Generosity and sympathy are the least outstanding of the maxims. Perhaps this is because sympathy for instance is very content specific; not all situations call for it.

The suggested order of Leech’s maxims of politeness in the selected interview session of Jeff Koinange Live is thus: tact, approbation, agreement, modesty, generosity and sympathy.

In chapter five, I will summarize the analysis done in this chapter and chapter three and see how this measures up against the hypotheses as laid out in chapter one as well as make recommendations for further research in this area.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter comprises a brief outline about the contribution of each chapter, remarks on how the findings measured up against each hypothesis as laid out in chapter one and finally a few recommendations for further research.

5.1 SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND REMARKS ON HYPOTHESES

Chapter one of the current research aimed at introducing the key components it will employ. It provided background information, the statement of the problem which had as its proposition that different discourse texts assume different ordering (of the maxims), objectives which included identifying, illustrating and suggesting the chronological order of the maxims within the session, hypotheses, literature review which involved foregrounding the area of discourse analysis and reviewing the descriptive development of the politeness principle, scope and limitations, methodology which highlighted the study's descriptive design, justification of the study and theoretical framework.

In tandem with objective number one of the research, chapter two identified the maxims of politeness as found within the chosen interview session- Being gay in Kenya: Biology or Lifestyle? - giving two examples of occurrence for each.

Corresponding to objective number two of the study chapter three undertook to demonstrate how each of the maxims is brought out within the session using three examples for each maxim.

The crux of the research is found in chapter four which is in tandem with objective number three, that is, it suggested the chronological order of the maxims in the chosen interview session. On a

general note it found positive politeness to be most prevalent within the selected session when compared to negative politeness confirming Andreas Jucker's (1986) stance that interviews are primarily concerned with the interviewee's positive face. In terms of hierarchy, it found tact to be the most dominant maxim in the session, followed by approbation, agreement, modesty, generosity and lastly sympathy perhaps a reflection, in part, of Leech's own proposition that tact is a more powerful constraint on conversational behavior than generosity and approbation more than modesty.

In addition, this research began with some assumptions (based on the objectives of the study) about the presence and patterning of Leech's maxims of politeness in an excerpt of an interview session from popular local talk show Jeff Koinange Live (JKL). And now here at the conclusion of this study, some generalizations can be made against each hypothesis:

- Politeness maxims as posited by Leech are discernible in the discourse of a television interview session

Leech's six maxims of politeness were evident in the selected interview session – Being Gay in Kenya: Biology or Lifestyle. Some were easier to identify than others however, indicating that perhaps these are used more in the broadcast interview genre.

- These maxims map accurately how politeness is dispensed within such a session

Chapter two which undertook to illustrate how the maxims are brought out portrays precisely how politeness is distributed within the session. The generalization that can be made here is that the maxims of politeness often occur in a sequence showing how politeness disseminated in an interview.

- A clear pattern and ordering of these maxims emerges in the discourse text of a television interview session

Using dominance patterns, the research establishes a clear order of the maxims in the discourse text and goes on to propose that this order can be applied by other interviewers for a successful interview.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

This study focused on the application of the politeness principle in the broadcast interview genre (television) only. Consequently, the first recommendation of the researcher is to explore the application of this principle in other journalistic genres such as radio interviews and news programs.

The second recommendation extends to interviewers who can use the established order of the maxims in their work so as to replicate the success of JKL.

This research used only one ten minute interview session because of the practicality of analyzing microelements (the six maxims) in such a session. The final recommendation in this regard involves using more interview sessions for broader perspective.

REFERENCES

- Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2003). Face and politeness: new (insights) for old (concepts). *Journal of pragmatics*, 35, 1453-1469.
- Barton, E. (2004) Linguistic Discourse Analysis: How the Language in Texts Works. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior, *What writing does and how it does it: an introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices* (pp. 57-82). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Dimitrova-Galaczi, E. (2005). Issues in the definition and conceptualization of politeness. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, 2, 1-20.
- Habwe, J. H. (1999). *Discourse Analysis of Swahili Political Speeches*. Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.
- Hamza, A. Sheffield Hallam working papers: Linguistic politeness and context (Review of the book *A critique of politeness theories* by G. Eelen). Retrieved from extra.shu.ac.uk/wpw/politeness/reviews.htm
- Jucker, A. (1986). *News Interviews: A Pragmalinguistic Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Karanja, L. (1993). *A Discourse Analysis of the Structure of KBC TV Broadcast Discussion Programmes*. Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.

- Kimani, L.M. (1993). *A Discourse Analysis of the Talk of the Mentally Retarded: A Case Study of Jacaranda Special School*. Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.
- Kingati, J.B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis of Swahili Homilies*. Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Mbugua, P.G. (1997). *Kenyan Newspaper Discourse: An Investigation in Typology and Ideology*. Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Theories of Politeness. (n.d.). In *linguistics.usask.ca*. Retrieved February 20, 2014, from <http://linguistics.usask.ca/Ling347/webp/politeness2/index.html>
- Trappes-Lomax, H. (2008) Discourse Analysis. In A. Davies & C. Elder, *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 133 -164). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Tsuda, S. (1993). Indirectness in Discourse: What Does It Do in Conversation? *International Journal of Intercultural Communication Studies*, 3, 63-70.
- Vilkki, L. (2006). Politeness, face and facework: Current issues. *SKY journal of linguistics*, 19, 322-332.
- Watts, R. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX - BEING GAY IN KENYA: BIOLOGY OR LIFESTYLE?

Being Gay in Kenya: Biology or Lifestyle? was aired on local television channel Kenya Television Network (KTN) on the 5th of February 2014 at 7.45 pm. The following is a transcription of the first ten minutes of the session as used by this research. It captures talk show host Jeff Koinange interviewing well known Kenyan author Binyavanga Wainaina following his ‘coming out of the closet’ announcing his sexual orientation (gay) on his 43rd birthday via an essay called ‘the lost chapter’ (I am a homosexual, mum) of his memoir. He posts this ‘lost chapter’ on two blogs Chimurenga.co.za and Africa is a Country to stimulate and stir up conversation about gays in Africa.

Jeff Koinange (JK)	Binyavanga Wainaina (BW)
<p>It is Jeff Koinange Live. ¹ Tonight we are gonna put politics aside for a little while and talk about what we call social issues. ² One in particular. ³ Imagine your son or daughter waking up and telling you that they are gay, in Kenya, in the 21st century. ⁴ Wow! ⁵ It happened a few weeks ago and we are gonna talk to the man who’s become the poster child for gayness, in Kenya and possibly Africa. ⁶ His name is Binyavanga Wainaina. ⁷ It is time to ask the hard questions. ⁸ Oh yes, sit back. ⁹ It is time for Jeff Koinange Live. ¹⁰</p> <p>(Background music: theme song)</p> <p>Welcome to the program. ¹¹ We are live at the pool side of the Intercontinental Hotel and this is a very important issue so sit back, better yet lean forward, let’s get involved. ¹² Tweet us. ¹³ My twitter handle</p>	<p>Hello. ¹</p>

<p>@koinangejeff hash tag JKL, Binyavanga’s is @binyavanga capital W, @binyavangaW. ¹⁴ Now, this man is quite an accomplished author. ¹⁵ About a dozen years ago he won the Caine prize. ¹⁶ That’s a very important one in the literary world. ¹⁷ Went on to write a book called “One Day I will Write About This Place.” ¹⁸ This book has been translated into several languages. ¹⁹ I asked him if it’s a best seller, he said, “it’s doing well.” ²⁰ On his birthday, a couple of weeks ago, he turned 43 and released something called the Lost Chapter. ²¹ Basically that was his coming out. ²² Telling the world, he is gay. ²³ Binyavanga Wainaina, my brother. ²⁴</p>	
<p>Welcome to the bench. ²⁵ By the way, I have to mention this right now. ²⁶ I invited a whole bunch of (Binyavanga laughs as he claps his hands) church folks on this show, right, a whole bunch. ²⁷ Pastor Mbevi, Pastor M, Father Wamugunda ... (trails off). ²⁸</p>	<p>Are they very busy? ²(Koinange laughs)</p>
<p>All of a sudden, people are busy (ironically). ²⁹</p>	<p>Oh, oh good, okay (nonchalant). ³</p>
<p>But you know who agreed (pleased)? ³⁰ Couple of hours ago, I called Val... Valentine Njoroge. ³¹ She said... She’s here. ³² She’s here. ³³</p>	<p>Oh good. Welcome Valentine (laughs). ⁴</p>
<p>Good to see you, my brother. ³⁴</p>	<p>You know Jeff, I always thought my voice was deeper than yours (Koinange laughs), so this is very distressing (Koinange laughs). ⁵ I’m going to be trying to pull a bass now (gestures at his throat with fingers; Koinange laughs). ⁶</p>

<p>So when did you discover you were gay, Binyavanga (pointedly)?³⁵</p>	<p>I don't know.⁷ You don't... I don't know... it's a complicated thing because you don't eh discover, you know.⁸ At least in my case, you know, because human beings are very complicated people and so what I knew is... I knew very early that there's this something that makes me feel very weak and also makes me feel very embarrassed and also makes me feel very secretive.⁹ But you know this was maybe; certainly it was before I went to primary school.¹⁰</p>
--	--

<p>Before?³⁶</p>	<p>Before, before.¹¹</p>
<p>So we are talking four or five years old (gestures side to side with whole hand).³⁷</p>	<p>Five.¹² Probably not four but five for certain (gestures with hand).¹³</p>
<p>You knew you were gay (fist forward determinedly)?³⁸</p>	<p>I knew that there was something very different from me...¹⁴</p>
<p>Why?³⁹ Did you play with dolls (interestedly)?⁴⁰ Did you play with...?⁴¹</p>	<p>(Interjects) No!¹⁵ I never really liked dolls.¹⁶ I liked drawing girls (gestures drawing with hand).¹⁷ I played with my sister a lot.¹⁸ I played with my brother a lot.¹⁹ I didn't like football but I was not a girly person... eh... not really.²⁰ But I was kinda weird dreamy kid.²¹ But what would just happen is once in a while just from that age and... you just meet somebody usually grown up or something like that and you have these very dangerous feelings.²² You know they are dangerous, you don't know what they are.²³ And it takes a long time to start to understand what that thing is.²⁴ It's only now when you learn, usually, you know, for someone who was so innocent like me,</p>

	<p>it's in the urinal in boarding school (draws in the air with fingers) and you see, so and so is a homosexual and (writes in the air with fingers) you see very dirty pictures and you assume that's a very dirty thing. ²⁵ You don't know what it is. ²⁶ So it takes a long time. ²⁷ But you see me I'm a kid who is curious. ²⁸ And even though I wasn't... I've always been a shy person and I have never been sexually curious. ²⁹ I didn't do anything about it until I was in my thirties. ³⁰ I wasn't... I was curious to read and learn. ³¹ And I did. ³²</p>
<p>Did you just mention? ⁴² Your first sexual experience was in your thirties (leans forward)? ⁴³</p>	<p>Yup. ³³</p>
<p>In your thirties (surprised)? ⁴⁴</p>	<p>With...With a man. ³⁴</p>
<p>With a man (clarifying/ emphasizing). ⁴⁵</p>	<p>I had maybe three as it was in my short story, with women, one successful one. ³⁵ I love women. ³⁶ I... I love women. ³⁷ I love how they smell. ³⁸ I love women sensually. ³⁹ But it's those things of I like you, you like me but I don't feel like calling you tomorrow. ⁴⁰ Like you kind of forgot...</p>
<p>Yeah ... ⁴⁶</p>	<p>...and then you are like why did I forget? ⁴¹</p>
<p>Yeah ... ⁴⁷</p>	<p>Then you feel the other person is your friend...</p>
<p>Right ... ⁴⁸</p>	<p>...something like that. ⁴²</p>
<p>Let me ask you an unfair question. ⁴⁹ You went to Mang'u and you are very proud of going to</p>	<p>Mang'u boys yeah. ⁴³</p>

Mang'u... ⁵⁰	
And Changes, you went to Lenana as well. ⁵¹	Yes, Yes. ⁴⁴
Was there any experience there? ⁵² Was there any need to experience? ⁵³	Not with me. ⁴⁵ Not with me. ⁴⁶ I was too shy and curious and... I mean there were incidents that you heard of, right. ⁴⁷ Which I mean already for me that something had happened in Njoro boys which I had been there for one year and let us just say I was... things had happened in the school and a head boy got expelled, it's in my book , head boy got expelled, it was just .. and then he was... came back to the school and everybody just used to spit when he walks, you know for like a year... ⁴⁸
Everybody would what? ⁵⁴ Would spit? ⁵⁵	Spit. ⁴⁹
At him? ⁵⁶	Of course. ⁵⁰ Even form ones; you know like look at that thing (gestures with hands), you know not like a person, yeah? ⁵¹ And I remember feeling two things at the time, I felt haiya me, me, me sitaki hiyo(gestures "refusing" with hands), those people you know... so you were like don't even imagine, funga hiyo chapter... (gestures "closing" with hands) ⁵²
Even though you were... ⁵⁷	Ah ah. , clo, clo, clo... close the chapter. ⁵³ The other thing I felt was I very very desperately wanted to say hello to him. ⁵⁴ Because I just... I was like... I feel like... like that it is not... no human being should

	<p>ever have to walk for nine months waiting for an exam, alone in an entire school towards the exam, where every time you come to the dining some form one throws (gestures “throwing”) githeri over you and then people jump up giggling.⁵⁵ The third thing I remember is: that guy had dignity man...⁵⁶</p>
<p>Where is he today?⁵⁸</p>	<p>That guy... lets... we don't talk about it but I don't know and I'm curious but you know those are not things you want to share in a public domain.⁵⁷</p>
<p>Sure. Sure. So so...⁵⁹</p>	<p>He had dignity, like his head, he won't look this way (turns head to the right); he won't look that way (turns head to the left).⁵⁸ He chomad (slides hands up and down as he claps) his sixteen points A, A, B something like that, went to campus and ji-sorted.⁵⁹ And I was like that's that's pride.⁶⁰ So I was you know, over the years you are just like, aki you Binya you are a coward, you know, remember that guy.⁶¹ There was something, you know, he bebad something.⁶² That was quite cool...(admiringly)⁶³</p>
<p>Yeah Yeah.⁶⁰ So fast forward.⁶¹ Your 43rd birthday, obviously it was very deliberate...⁶² You...⁶³</p>	<p>Yeah, yeah.⁶⁴</p>
<p>You put together this essay, called the lost chapter and you posted it to a couple of blogs.⁶⁴ Right.⁶⁵ Which ones (points at fingers to count)?⁶⁶</p>	<p>There was Chimurenga.co.za...uh...Chimurenga</p>

magazine is one of our leading intellectual magazines.⁶⁵ They won the Prince Claus prize for cultural freedom two years ago.⁶⁶ They've been a documentor.⁶⁷ They are one of the most respected publications.⁶⁸ I know their work well.⁶⁹ So I posted to them asked them to put it up at midnight.⁷⁰ The other one was Africa is a Country which is a well known blog that covers media and so on and so forth in a very critical way.⁷¹ So I asked them to put it up.⁷² I really wanted to provoke a conversation about Africans so I didn't want to go....⁷³ I could have easily published this in the New Yorker, right.⁷⁴ I could easily have published this in the New York Times actually.⁷⁵ Um, I knew that.⁷⁶ I knew that right from the very beginning but I wanted 48 hours for a breaking (gestures circularly with hands) conversation to start to happen with people around the internet.⁷⁷ Remember that there is this conversation going on about the most insane and reprehensible laws that are going on in Nigeria today which is the worst law I have seen like in 100 years.⁷⁸ You have to go back (throws hands to his right to signal "back") to the Nazis before World War II to see a law that closes down public space like that.⁷⁹ So of course that's

	part of the reason I was just like... you know me I go and work with Nigerians every year, right. ⁸⁰ I've worked with some of the most talented writers and artistes out of Nigeria for ten years, right. ⁸¹ So of course you have to feel not just for the gays and lesbians in Nigeria but for the writer's community, the media community cause when you start targeting there (points to his left) that's when you are targeting that way (points to his right). ⁸²
Do you plan to go to Nigeria this year? ⁶⁷	Oh yeah. ⁸³
You will go (challengingly)? ⁶⁸	We shall find a way (determined resolve). ⁸⁴
You will go (reiterates challengingly)? ⁶⁹	We shall find a way (determined resolve). ⁸⁵
Okay, so... ⁷⁰	I might wear a buibui (laughter). ⁸⁶ I don't know we'll see. ⁸⁷
Bui... bui . ⁷¹	Yeah, we are resourceful people...(laughs) ⁸⁸
So, you send this out and the storm that followed. ⁷² Were you surprised? ⁷³	No, of course not. ⁸⁹
You weren't. ⁷⁴	I was waiting for the storm. ⁹⁰
Are you weathering the storm? ⁷⁵ Do you like the response? ⁷⁶	Yes, yes. ⁹¹
You do. ⁷⁷ You can handle this heat? ⁷⁸	Yeah. ⁹²
And have people approached you since? ⁷⁹ You know, in the streets they say, you know because	Si, I was telling you. ⁹³ Yesterday I was

<p>obviously you are out, you've done a couple of shows.⁸⁰ Have people approached you?⁸¹</p>	<p>coming into a building coming out of an interview and the <i>watchie</i> had been trying to greet me when I went in, I was a bit nervous, so when I came out he was like, "I was watching you on the Trend. (Puts on the watchman's voice) He! <i>Uh.. sielewi hiyo kitu, hiyo kitu enyewe sielewi...</i>," and he looked at me frowned and then he shook my hand and said (puts on the watchman's voice & demeanor), "<i>Lakini mi niliona unaongea ukweli na unajua ukweli, ukweli, ukweli ni poa...</i>(laughs)."⁹⁴</p>
<p>A <i>watchie</i> (laughs).⁸²</p>	<p>A <i>watchie</i>.⁹⁵</p>
<p>Any negative reactions upfront, face to face?⁸³</p>	<p>Nope. Not one.⁹⁶</p>
<p>What does that say about us Kenyans?⁸⁴ Because, look, on social media they will say anything they want, hiding behind a name, you know a pseudonym.⁸⁵ Face to face?⁸⁶</p>	<p>Face to face, none.⁹⁷ People have come and po...I'm just... you know, I don't... in my facebook for example, I've generally not applied that policy where if someone politically disagrees with me, I block them...uh... and so even my facebook friend profile is not like people like me kind of...you see what I am saying.⁹⁸ So it's just been interesting watching who comes in to wade in and make lots of noises and then because you like a good intellectual conversation, people have a response, so if you want to wade in...⁹⁹</p>