

SPEECH ACTS FEATURES OF KIMUTHAMBI UTTERANCES USED FOR PERSUASION

Humphrey Kirimi Ileri

Chuka University, Kenya

Peter Kinyua Muriungi

Chuka University, Kenya

Zachary Waita Njogu

Chuka University, Kenya

Colomba Kaburi Muriungi

Chuka University, Kenya

Abstract

Persuasion is inherent in everyday communication and is very important in relationships, leadership, peace building and success in virtually every area of livelihood. The objective of this study is to describe the speech acts features of Kimuthambi utterances used for persuasion. The study is guided by the relevance theory by Sperber and Wilson and Searle's speech act theory. It utilizes qualitative and quantitative research designs and is carried out in Muthambi Division, Tharaka Nithi County, Kenya. The population includes all the Kimuthambi communicative events. The researcher purposively sampled ten real life communicative events conducted in Kimuthambi which involved fourteen speakers. Data was collected using a digital audio recorder and an observation schedule. The recorder captured conversations in Kimuthambi in the selected communicative events and the observation

schedule was used to record the contextual information. The researcher transcribed utterances from the data collected that utilizes strategies used for persuasion. The transcribed utterances are one hundred and thirty six. Then guided by the communicative principle of relevance, the researcher identifies and discusses eighty four utterances used for persuasion in Kimuthambi. The study establishes that the speech acts features of Kimuthambi utterances used for persuasion are mainly directives. This study enhances the analysis of Kimuthambi as a language variety and adds to the existing knowledge on pragmatic analysis of persuasion in various languages of the world. In addition it enriches knowledge on the tenets of the relevance theory and adds to the analysis of speech acts of languages spoken in the world. Thus it contributes to crosslinguistic studies from the perspective of a unique cultural orientation.

Key words: Persuasion, Kimuthambi, Pragmatics, Speech acts, Relevance

Introduction

Persuasion is an act or process of presenting arguments to move, motivate, or change your audience (Covino & Jolliffe, 1995). Persuasion is a very important aspect in communication and it is required in every community's communicative events to achieve particular ends. Persuasion also has bearing on cohesion and integration among individuals, communities and nations. Language is a strong tool for persuasion. Studies have been carried out on the speech acts of various languages of the world but Kimuthambi has not been studied on this perspective. Every linguistic variety is unique and culture dependent and therefore warrants a holistic analysis. Given the central role of persuasion in society, this study provides an analysis of the speech acts of utterances used for persuasion in Kimuthambi and thus contributes to cross linguistic studies in persuasion and speech acts.

Kimuthambi is an SVO Kenyan Bantu language spoken by people of Muthambi Division, Tharaka-Nithi County in Kenya who are believed to be part of the Meru people. Debates abound on whether Kimuthambi, Kitharaka, Kimwimbi and Gichuka are dialects of Kimeru language. Fadiman (1976) suggests that before the colonial occupation, the name 'Ameru' referred only to five of the present nine subdivisions of the Meru people, namely: Igembe, Tigania, Imenti, Mituini and Igoji. He further asserts that only when the British colonialists came did they chose to include Tharaka, Mwimbi, Muthambi and Chuka.

Ndwiga (2008) argues that Kimuthambi, Kitharaka, Kimwimbi and Gichuka have no connection with the Meru people and claims that Gichuka is a language on its own. Kindiki (2008) also studies Kitharaka as a distinct linguistic variety. This study treats Kimuthambi as a distinct language variety because other than the cited authorities who have treated the various geographical dialects of Kimeru as distinct, Kimuthambi is spoken by people of a unique culture which has a bearing on the pragmatics of a language. This study analyzes the speech acts features of Kimuthambi utterances used for persuasion; an area of linguistic study that other scholars have not focused on.

Speech acts as an area of study fall under pragmatics. Many scholars define pragmatics as the study of meaning in context. Such scholars include Levinson (1983) and Adegbija (1999) who advance the idea that utterances can only be properly interpreted within the social cultural situation in which they are made. Pragmatics as a field of study as theorized by Austine (1962), Searle (1975), Grice (1975) and Sperber and Wilson (2002) encompass elements like intention, presupposition, inference, implicature, speech act, context and

relevance. These scholars posit that language use is of crucial importance and they draw attention to the fact that the occasion of an utterance is important and that the specific context of such an occasion must be fully understood before the meaning of an utterance can be fully grasped. They disagree with structural linguists who posit that the meaning of an utterance is solely determined by its structure (surface arrangement of words). Though this study mainly focuses on the speech acts, other elements of pragmatics are utilized through the relevance theory to determine the utterances used for persuasion in Kimuthambi.

In the context of this research work, pragmatics is the study and analysis of language use, meaning encoding and decoding, utterance understanding and interpretation in particular communicative situations. Specifically communication in various communicative events in Kimuthambi, which takes cognizance of the message being passed, the speaker's intention, the object being referred to in the speech and also the relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of the speech is considered. This study is based on pragmatic principles; it utilizes the occasion of utterances and contexts to identify utterances used for persuasion.

Various studies on pragmatic analysis have been undertaken. Among them are Omoniyi (2012) who endeavored to identify the speech acts features of President Umaru Yar'Adua's Victory and Inaugural Speeches, and Ubong (2012) who investigates the first inaugural addresses of two presidents: Nigeria's Goodluck Ebele Jonathan of 2011 and America's Barack Obama's of 2009. Omoniyi (2012) finds that President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua used assertives more than other speech acts in his speech while Ubong (2012) discovers that the two presidents mainly utilized assertives and commissives to speak to the nation. This study investigates the speech acts in Kimuthambi utterances used for persuasion. Kimuthambi context differs in that while the speeches of the two presidents were written involving some level of deliberate control, the Kimuthambi context involved utterances collected in natural settings like chiefs' barazas and wedding dowry negotiations.

Previous studies on Kimuthambi include Ileri (2011) who establishes that there are several misinterpretations in English-Kimuthambi Church sermons and that the verb and the verb phrase are the most frequently misinterpreted categories, and Mutegi (2012) who discovers that majority of Kimuthambi folktales portray women negatively. Studies done on the sister language varieties are mainly in the areas of syntax and sociolinguistics. Muriungi (2008) establishes that the ordering of the affixes in the extended projection of the verb phrase in Kitharaka and the ordering of modifiers in the extended projection of the noun phrase fall

under the same generalization while Mwembu (2012) investigates how loan words from Kiswahili and English are nativised in Kitharaka language and discovers that Kitharaka accommodates neologisms through phonological processes to modify itself. Kindiki (2008) shows that; in an on-going Kiitharaka discourse, any new information that is added has some contextual effect in a particular context

Mutegi (2014) establishes that the strategies of Gichuka wh formation include full wh movement, partial, intermediate and wh in situ while Ndwiga (2008) examines the empty categories in the syntax of Gichuka and puts government-binding theory to task in order to test its explanatory potential as a theory of human language. Mbaka (2013) finds out that Gichuka conforms to the framework of the universal grammar while Kinyua (2010) investigates how the universality of Chomsky's universal grammar model applies on the Kimwimbi verb group. None of the studies on sister languages looks at the strategies of persuasion hence the need to carry out this study. The objectives of this study are to identify utterances used for persuasion in Kimuthambi and to analyze the speech acts features of Kimuthambi utterances used for persuasion.

Literature Review

Omoniyi (2012) endeavored to identify the speech acts features of President Umaru Yar'Adua's Victory and Inaugural Speeches. Hence, the study focused on the pragmatic functions of locution (the utterance), illocutionary (the force behind an utterance) and perlocutionary (the effect of an utterance on the hearer) acts of the speeches. This was done with a view to determine the global pattern of pragmatic moves of the selected political speeches. The data were drawn from the Victory speech and Inaugural Speech and analyzed following the Speech Act theory of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). The findings show that the Overall Relative Frequency Percentages (ORFPs) for the selected speeches of Umaru Musa Yar'Adua were: assertive-30%, directive-17%, expressive-8%, verdictive-20%, commissives-15%, and declarative-10%. These ORFPs results show that Umaru Musa Yar'Adua relied more on sentences that performed assertive acts than other speech acts. The current study attempts to establish the speech acts features of Kimuthambi utterances used for persuasion.

Working within the Speech act theory, Ubong (2012) investigates the first inaugural addresses of two presidents: Nigeria's Goodluck Ebele Jonathan (2011) and America's Barrack Obama's (2009). The study considers the illocutionary forces in the speeches as well

as the face threatening and face saving acts respectively, with the aim of identifying the similarities and differences in the speeches. Ubong (2012) found out that the speeches are relatively alike and that the presidents utilized mainly 'assertives' and 'commissives' to speak to the nation. 'Assertives' served to emphasize the presidents' messages and 'commissives' were mainly used to thank the electorates for electing them. This study seeks to analyse Kimuthambi utterances used for persuasion into various classes of illocutionary acts.

Kindiki (2008) supports the claim made in Sperber and Wilson's (2002) Relevance Theory. He finds that; in an on-going Kiitharaka discourse, any new information that is added has some contextual effect in a particular context. Thus, when a Kiitharaka hearer perceives the contextual effect of an attitude marker in an utterance, he/she does not only find it necessary for 'relevance' but also sufficient enough for clarifying the speaker's attitude. This study establishes that within the same communicative event it is possible for the hearer, after perceiving the contextual effects of an utterance, to determine with the utterances used for persuasion.

This study does an analysis of language use, meaning encoding and decoding, utterance understanding and interpretation in particular communicative situation (specifically communication in various events in Kimuthambi). It especially takes cognizance of the message being passed, the speaker's intention, the object being referred to in the speeches and also the relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of the speeches.

Theoretical Frame Work

This study is guided by Sperber and Wilson's (2002) relevance theory and Searle's (1975) speech act theory.

Relevance Theory

According to Sperber and Wilson (2002) as well as Sperber and Wilson (1995) most utterances are potentially ambiguous in more than one way. Thus, Sperber and Wilson (2002) state that "An utterance makes manifest a variety of assumptions the hearer attends to as many of these as seem relevant to him" (p.96). They further claim that the hearer mostly infers (deduces) the speaker's meaning by considering what is and what isn't relevant to the current conversation.

Sperber and Wilson (2002) advance that in an ongoing discourse; any new information that is added has some contextual effect. They suggest that when the hearer perceives the contextual effect of new information in an utterance he or she will not only strive to interpret its

‘relevance’ but also to find out in which way it can be used to clarify the speaker’s meaning. During this communicative information exchange, any contribution by the speaker either ‘increases’ or ‘weakens’ the strength of the hearer’s assumptions; deletes them altogether, or, adds new beliefs. However, information that merely duplicates available information or has no connection to the already existing information is not perceived as being relevant (Sperber & Wilson, 2002).

This study utilizes this theory to determine the Kimuthambi utterances that are used to persuade. This is by the expectation that speakers are able to produce utterances with the intention of persuading their targets. Speakers are able to do this because they expect the hearers to pick the most relevant meaning from their expressions informed by the input and the context of utterance.

Guided by the communicative principle of relevance, that a speaker may be able to produce a stimulus which is likely to attract the audience attention, to prompt the retrieval of certain contextual assumptions and to point them towards an intended conclusion, the researcher was able to identify the expressions that Kimuthambi speakers use to persuade their targets. This is because speakers are able to predict and manipulate their audience’s mental states assured that the audience will tend pick the most relevant stimuli in their environment and process them so as to maximise their relevance.

Searle’s Speech Act Theory

John R. Searle’s Theory centres on speech act as postulated by Austin (1962) who asserts that a locution constitutes ‘saying’, an illocution constitutes the force of an utterance while perlocution is the effect of the locution on the hearer. Searle (1975) developed a speech act theory as a theory of the constitutive rules for performing illocutionary acts. Searle posits that “speaking a language is engaging in a rule governed form of behaviour.

Searle (1975) argues that the speech act is the basic unit of communication; the speech acts are intentional behaviours, and that speaking a language is performing speech acts according to rules. Searle believes that, the illocutionary act is the totality of the speech act while the consequences or effects the illocutionary act has, is the perlocutionary act. He also distinguishes the simple act of uttering words “utterance acts” which Austin calls “phatic acts” from “propositional acts” which refer and predicate.

Searle therefore believes and postulates that the study of certain conventional conditions for illocutionary acts together with the study of the correct taxonomy constitutes the core of speech act theory. Based on these essential conventional conditions, Searle (1975) proposes taxonomy of illocutionary acts into five (5) mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive classes as follows,

Assertives: Speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. The speaker fits his words to the world which incorporates his belief. Examples include assertion, claim, description, hypothesis, conclusion, report, suggestion, prediction, as well as making statement of facts. For example, the ship will be docking at five o'clock. In uttering the above statement, the speaker believes that the ship will dock at that stipulated time.

Directives: Speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action. The speaker tries to get the hearer to act in such a way as to fulfil what is represented by the content of the proposition. Examples include questioning, commanding, requesting, pleading, advising and inviting.

Commissive: Speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action. The speaker becomes committed to act in the way represented by the propositional content. Examples include promising, threatening, offering, guaranteeing, vowing, warning, betting and challenging.

Declaratives: Speech acts that change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration. The speaker performs an action just representing himself /herself as performing that action. Examples include baptizing, passing sentence, arresting and marrying.

Expressives: Speech acts that express the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition. The speaker expresses the sincerity and condition of the illocutionary act. Examples include apologizing, congratulating, thanking, appreciating, complaining, condoling, greeting and scolding.

This study utilizes Seale's (1975)'s five classes of taxonomy of illocutionary acts to establish illocutions in Kimuthambi utterances (Locutions) used for persuasion. Kimuthambi utterances are the locutions (the data that will be collected), the perlocution is persuasion while Illocutionary act, being the force of an utterance, is one of the main concern of this study. That is to find out the illocutions of persuasion in Kimuthambi.

Population

The target population is the larger group to which the researcher hopes to apply the findings (Frankel & Wallen, 1993). The population for this study includes all communicative events conducted in Kimuthambi.

Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

The study adopted purposive sampling technique to arrive at real life communicative events conducted in Kimuthambi that will be used in the analysis. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) observe that this is a sampling technique that allows the researcher to get cases that have the required information.

The researcher limited the study to ten real life communicative events and recorded the entire conversations that involved fourteen speakers. These included: marriage negotiation ceremonies, family meetings, chiefs barazas, political meetings, farmers consultative meetings, land buying processes and church meetings. The events generated sufficient data for the study. Though the researcher had collected data from more communicative events, analysis beyond this would have been repetitive. Kothari (2004) posits that under non-probability sampling, the researcher purposively chooses particular units for constituting a sample on the basis that the sample will be representative of the whole

Methods of Data Collection

Data was collected using a digital audio recorder and an observation schedule. The recorder captured conversations in Kimuthambi in the selected communicative events and the observation schedule was used to record the contextual information. The contextual information was used to determine which utterances were used for persuasion.

Methods of Data Analysis

This study utilizes both qualitative and quantitative methods in data analysis. The researcher transcribed all the utterances from the data collected via a voice recorder onto a guiding card. Guided by Elizabeth, Imogen, and Melanie (2013) suggestions on strategies used to persuade, the researcher picked all the utterances from the transcribed utterances that had the suggested characteristics. Guided by the communicative principle of relevance (Sperber & Wilson 2002) the researcher constructed a hypothesis about the speaker's meaning which satisfied the presumption of relevance conveyed by the Kimuthambi utterances. This aided in determining and discussing utterances are used for persuasion.

Speech Acts Features of Kimuthambi Utterances used for Persuasion

Communicative Event 1 (C1)

Communicative event one (C1), is a funds drive towards the purchase of church land. The current church hall is on public land and the church leadership has invited many guests including the county governor and the member of county assembly (MCA). This communicative event involved many utterances meant to persuade the hearers to give towards the project or to support the invited political leaders. The purpose of the persuasive discourse depended on the speaker. Consider the illocutionary acts in the utterances C1.7 to C1.9 by the M.C.

Utterance C1.7

Locution: *Uka urutire Ngai kiria ubangite*
Come and give to God what you have set aside

Illocutionary act: directive (appealing)

Utterance C1. 8

Locution: *Gwi antu bakunyaga tutuni tunini betereke benyenkwa*
There are people who give little by little awaiting pleas

Illocutionary act: Directive (appealing)

Utterance C1. 9

Locution: *Waruta wira wa Ngai umenye nourathimirwe*
When you serve God you will be blessed

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterances C.1 7 and C1.8 are direct appeals by the speaker (M.C) to the audience to contribute towards the church project whole heartedly. The perlocution is persuasion and it is achieved through the directive illocutionary act. Utterance C1.9 uses the illocutionary act (assertion) directly to achieve persuasion. Utterance C1.9 asserts the fact that giving attracts blessings from God and the intention is to bring the audience to believe this fact hence be persuaded to give (Perlocutionary act). Let's describe further utterances in the same event by the MC (C1.10 to C1.12).

Utterance C1.10

Locution: *Bamwe bagatura bakionaga antu bebarathime!*
Some will just be witnessing the blessings of others!

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C1. 11

Locution: *Kana kabukwenda tutura kamugundani gaka?*

Or you want us to stay on this small piece of land?

Illocutionary act: Directive (appealing)

Utterance C1. 12

Locution: *Tutikwenda aibu.*

We don't want shame.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C1.10 is an indirect assertion which implies that those that do not give will never be blessed; 'they will only witness the blessings of others'. This locution achieves persuasion by indirectly asserting that fact which if believed by the audience the perlocutionary act is automatically persuasion. Utterances C1.11 and C1.12 are indirect appeals to the hearers to act in a way that the members of that church will not suffer shame. Utterance C1.11 is a rhetorical question whose intention is to provoke the hearers to take a particular action: in this case to obey (be persuaded) hence avoid the consequences (remaining in that land). From the contextual data the land belonged to the public and could be repossessed any time. It was too small too. Utterance C1.12 achieves the perlocution (persuasion) by asserting the consequence of not giving. Now let's describe utterances C1.16 to C1. 18 made by the MCA.

Utterance C1. 16

Locution: *Ndiambiria na kubucokeria nkatho ni gututhura twi atongoria benu.*

Let me begin by thanking you for electing us to be your leaders.

Illocutionary act: Expressive (thanking)

Utterance C1 .17

Locution: *Bamwe benu nibanegenete ni barabara, stima na buria antu*

batikwandikwa.

Some of you have been complaining concerning poor roads, lack of electricity and unemployment.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C1. 18

Locution: *Tigani ndiburieni? Barabara ino yathondekwa kwina mbura?*

I want to ask? Can this road be repaired during the rainy season?

Illocutionary act: Assertive (saying)

Utterance C1.16 is an indirect expressive speech act that shows the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the audience. This is not just a normal thanking statement, but it is intended to have the effect of persuading the hearers that the leader is a courteous person who warrants re-election. Utterance C.17 is an indirect assertion that aims at persuading the hearers that the leader is well aware of their problems while utterance C1.18 directly asserts the reason that has led to the leaders not to honor their pre-election pledge of repairing the road. The speaker expects to persuade the audience that the delaying of the process of roads repair is deliberate and justified. Lets continue to describe utterances by the MCA (C1.19 to C1.22).

Utterance C1. 19

Locution: *Burienda twitura mithanga na kagoto ikinathi na ruuji?*

You want us supply sand and ballast then they get swept away by rain water?

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C1. 20

Locution: *Eterani gutenie tukinathondeka njira ino ibwe buru.*

Please wait for the rains to subside then we repair this road properly.

Illocutionary act: Commissive (Promising)

Utterance C1 .21

Locution: *Mwena wa stima butikamake*

Concerning electricity, do not worry

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C1. 22

Locution: *Ndimunenkere transformer inya na imwe ni yenu*

I have been allocated four transformers, and one is yours

Illocutionary act: Commissive (promising)

Utterance C1.19 is a statement to the listeners; to persuade them to be patient and wait for the rains to subside so that the roads can be done properly and effectively. Utterance C1.20 is a direct promise to the hearers and the perlocution is that they are persuaded to wait. Utterance C1. 21 is a direct assertion; that the hearers should not be alarmed because the leader is in control as regards the electrification of that area. This is to persuade the hearers to wait for the

installation patiently. Utterance C1.22 is a direct assurance to the hearers that the speaker is committed to fulfil the promise he has given. Consider C1.23 to C1.26.

Utterance C1. 23

Locution: *Bamwe bariuga ntikwandikithia antu ba guku county*
Some are claiming that I am not recommending people from this are for employment by the county government.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Stating)

Utterance C1. 24

Locution: *Mbirani onabwi. Kethwa muntu atina maratathi ri, akandikwatia*
Tell me. How can we employ people without proper qualifications?

Illocutionary act: Expressive (Excusing)

Utterance C1.26

Locution: *Twikaraga ndi, tukagaira ward jionthe; indi ngacoka ngeta MCA wenu nkamwongera Kanyamu*
We allocate money to all wards but I reserve something for your MCA

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C1.23 is a direct statement that intends to show the audience that the leader is aware about some of his critics. He uses the assertive illocution to persuade the hearers that the critics are not right. Utterance C1.24 is an expressive that shows the reason as to why many people have not been employed by the county government. This is attributed to the fact that they do not meet the required qualifications yet they complain about being sidelined in employment. Utterance C1.26 is an assertive that intended to bring the audience to the fact that the governor really loves them. It is meant to persuade them to continue being loyal to the governor since he favors them, by allocating them more money than other wards in the county. Lets consider utterances C1.27 to C1.31.

Utterance C1.27

Locution: *Watho wa mbiti uugite atia?*
What does the law of the hyenas state?

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C1. 31

Locution: *Riu 2017 bukaraita wira wakwa bukinarutha buria kubaterie*

In 2017 you will evaluate my performance and act accordingly

Illocutionary act: Directive (appealing)

Utterance C1. 27 is an assertion through a common cultural saying whose intention was to position the hearers to agree with the speaker's earlier assertion. The response the audience gave 'Ndukanerigwe' 'Never fail to consider your interests' was expected by the speaker shows that he had convinced them in his earlier discourse. Utterance C1.31 is a directive speech act whose intention is to appeal to the hearers to re-elect the leader in the next general elections gauged by his performance in the present five year term.

Communicative event two (C 2)

Communicative event two (C2) is a meeting convened by an assistant chief to address the many cases of people taking loans that they couldn't repay. He is the only speaker in this event and the main purpose is to persuade the audience to be very cautious when they are borrowing loans from financial institutions. This meeting was necessiated by cases of many people in that locality being auctioned for failing to repay their loans. Consider utterances C2.2, C2.3, C2.5 and C.2 6.

Utterance C2.2

Locution: *Muntu arithi gikundini agakoba mbeca njingi aiji ati atiremwa kuria niagukama.*

Someone goes to a group, takes a loan banking on milk money

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C2.3

Locution: *Aremwa kuria akathi gikundini kingi ageukia mbeca kenda aria gikundini kiria kiambere.*

When he/she is unable to repay, s/he takes money from another group to repay the first loan.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (saying)

Utterance C2. 5

Locution: *Muntu uu atiomorerwa nyomba?*

Won't this person's property get auctioned?

Illocutionary act: Directive (advising)

Utterance C2.2 uses a direct assertive to show the credit status of the people in that sub-location. The speaker who is an assistant chief uses this illocution to persuade the hearers to avoid indiscriminate borrowing which might lead to what he says in utterance C2.5 which is an indirect speech act (directive) to advice members against irresponsible borrowing by revealing the consequences of such acts. Utterance C2.3 is a continued assertion on the dealing that some people in that area have been involved in. These dealings expose them to great risks and the speaker makes this assertion to continue persuading the hearers against such. Let's consider utterances C2.6 to C2.9.

Utterance C2. 6

Locution: *Rui antu betu menyerani butikaririeni twana bukirira*
Oh! My people spare your children great suffering

Illocutionary act: Directive (advising)

Utterance C2. 7

Locution: *Tiganani na ichecho ino rui*
Please stop this habbit

Illocutionary act: Directive (advising)

Utterance C2. 8

Locution: *O muntu nieganirwe ni kiria enakio rui.*
Let everyone be content with what they have.

Illocutionary act: Directive (advising)

Utterance C2. 9

Locution: *Tiga baria bagutonga batonge*
Let those determined to get rich do so

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Stating)

Utterance C2.6 is an advice to all concerned that they be careful not to cause their children great suffering through their careless borrowing while utterance C2.7 advises the people to stop this bad habit. Utterance C2.8 is another directive that sought to persuade the people to desist from taking loans they are not able to service. Utterance C2.9 calls the audience to agree with the assertion that some methods of trying to get rich will not actually enable them actualize that reality.

Communicative Event 3 (C3)

Communicative event 3 was basically a bonding session; the bride's parents had visited the groom's people. Most utterances were basically for emphasis because much persuasion had been done during the negotiations at the bride's home. Some utterances though implicitly had the intention of persuading. Lets look at C3. 8 to C3.10.

Utterance C3. 8

Locution: *Untu uria wa bata muno ni gikeno kia jiana ino*
The most important thing is the joy of these children

Illocutionary act: Assertive (saying)

Utterance C3. 9

Locution: *Tugerieni muno tubauthirie mauntu.*
Let's try as much as we can to lighten their burden

Illocutionary act: Directive (appealing)

Utterance C3. 10

Locution: *Na bakirathimwa, onatwi tutitigirirwa*
And we will partake of their blessing too.

Illocutionary act: Commissive (assuring)

Utterance C3.8 is an indirect assertion that calls upon all parties to do all they can to ensure that the couple that is about to wed live a happy life. Utterance C3.9 is a direct appeal to all involved to lessen the burden of the couple. Though the utterance appears to be directed to all the audience present (a face saving strategy), the message is meant for the bride to be people who are raising the bride price too high and expecting alot of money before they allow the wedding tplan to proceed. Utterance C3.10 is a direct commissive assuring the hearers that treating that couple well will lead their blessing. These three utterances are informed by the presupposition that a couple that is almost wedding in that society gets troubled by demands of all sorts from the relatives.

Communicative Event 4 (C4)

In communicative event four (C 4) the principal is attempting to persuade parents to embrace the idea of beginning a boarding wing in a school that had been day. Most parents and other stake holders express their displeasure with that direction because the day school was basically begun to help children from humble backgrounds to acquire education. The

introduction of a boarding wing could mean that the day is being phased out yet many parents may not afford the school fees charged in boarding schools. Consider utterances C4.1, C4.3 and C4.4 .

Utterance C4. 1

Locution: *Ajiari betu gwi gauntu tukwenda kubwereca*

There is something we want to explain to you, our parents.

Illocutionary act: Directive (requesting)

Utterance C4. 3

Locution: *Antongoria na atiririri cukuru batirimana, bareciririe bambiririe rwang'i rwa Kulala.(manegene kuma gi antu).*

When leadears and stakeholders met, they proposed that we start a boarding wing (glumbling).

Illocutionary act: Directive (appealing)

Utterance C4.4

Locution: *Mpani kanya ndibwerese kaora antu betu*

Please allow me to explain step by step our people

Illocutionary act: Directive (Requesting)

Utterance C4.1 is a direct appeal to the parents to give the speaker ample time so that he can explain some important things about the school. The fact that he uses the plural [tu] [we] in this utterance implies that he is not in this alone. That it was not a person decision but a well reasoned ou decision by many stake holders. Utterance C4.3 is an explanation and an appeal to the parents on the decision that the school management had undertaken. The speaker aimed at persuading the audience but the murmuring by the audience (from the observation schedule) showed that they were not persuaded. Utterance C4.4 uses another directive to request the parents to remain calm and get the full explanation. After they calmed down, the speaker seizes the opportunity to try and persuade them as evident in utterances C4.5 to C4.7.

Utterance C4.5

Locution: *Ka mbere kwina twana twingi tukuthomera guku na tumaga kuraja muno.*

Firstly, there are students that commute from very far to come to this

school.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Saying)

Utterance C4.6

Locution: *Baingi barirarirua guku nturani.*

Many are being accommodated in the villages around.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C4.7

Locution: *Butikwona ni kaaba tubaruthire antu a kurara ?*

Don't you think we need to accommodate them?

Illocutionary act: Directive (assessing)

Utterances C4.5 and C4.6 are assertives that reveal some of the facts that led to the management's decision of beginning a boarding wing. The reasons are meant to persuade the audience. Utterance C4.7 is a directive that assesses whether the earlier locutions have achieved the persuasive effect. Utterances C4.8 to C4.11 give other reasons for the decision by the school's management to begin a boarding wing. Their speech acts features are described here.

Utterance C4.8

Locution: *Untu ungi ni wa ugitiri.*

Then we have the issue of insecurity.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (saying)

Utterance C4.9

Locution: *Kwi mwana atirimanine na amba aukite cukuru rukiri.*

One student encountered thieves as he came to school.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C4.10

Locution: *Rwangi rwa kwinukaga rutithira. Tigani kumaka.*

Worry not we will not do away with the day section.

Illocutionary act: Commissive (assuring)

Utterance C4. 11

Locution: *O murutwa akathomera kuria akenda.*

Students will choose the form they prefer.

Illocutionary act: Commissive (assuring)

Utterance C4.8 assertively introduces another reason; that is insecurity; which made the management undertake such a decision. Utterance C4. 9 assertively sites a specific case of insecurity that involved a student. These assertions that are presented as facts are meant to help the speaker persuade the audience. This perlocution was achieved because the noises that had persisted at the beginning of the principal's speech subsided and the audience nodded in agreement. Utterances C4.10 and C4.11 have locutions that utilize commissives that assure the audience that their fears have been taken into consideration. These assurances go along way into persuading the audience to agree with the speaker.

Communicative Event 5 (C5)

Communicative event five (C5) was a meeting of dairy farmers. The dairy officials had called for a meeting to explain the reason for very low payout rate. The farmers were so discouraged by the performance of their officials that some were talking of leaving that dairy for better ones. The first speaker, that is the farmers' spokes person's utterances were mainly meant to emphasize the agreed upon position- to put to task the dairy officials on the reasons for low pay out rate. The speaker did not need to persuade the farmers for the low payout was obvious and the farmers were already charged. From the context it was clear that they had other meetings, without the dairy officials. Probably it is in these meetings that much persuasion was needed to charge the members.

It is the utterances of the second speaker, a dairy official that consist of attempts to persuade. The dairy official had to work hard to convince the members that things would get better while giving credible reasons for the current state of affairs. Consider utterances C5.8 to C5.10

Utterance C5. 8

Locution: *Antu betu tumanitie kuraja muno.*
My people, we have come along way.

Illocutionary act: Expressive (gratitude).

Utterance C5. 9

Locution: *Gatutigeni Kuriganirwa na mpwi.*
Let's not forget quickly .

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C5. 10

Location: *Twambiririe dairy ino guti na ingi guku kunthe*
We began this dairy as a pace setter in this region

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Saying)

Utterance C5. 8 is an expressive that expresses the spaker's gratitude towards the hearers for the support they had rendered her in the past. It is also an assurance that the matter at hand concerned both the speaker and listeners. The illocution is intended to position the hearer to agree with the speaker; just as they have done in the past. Utterance C5.9 is a directive speech act which appeals to the hearers to recall their past encounters with the speaker hence change their minds on the current encounter too. Utterance C5.10 is an assertive that was intended to bring the audience to remember their history with the speaker hence change their minds regarding their current engagement.

Utterance C5.11

Location: *Ni uma kurari na kathina indi nitugukathiria*
There has been a problem but we are addressing it

Illocutionary act: Commissive (assuring)

Utterance C5. 12

Location: *Nitwetikaniririe tugure mashini nene na ngari ya gukamata iria. Tibu?*
We had agreed to buy coolants and a vehicle to ferry milk. Isn't it?

Illocutionary act: Directive (assessing)

Utterance C5.13

Location: *Into iu nijio iratumire mbecha inyia*
Those items affected the pay rate

Illocutionary act: Asserting (saying)

The illocution in utterance C5.11 is a commissive that assures the hearers that the problem that exists will be addressed accordingly. This is to persuade them to desist from leaving the milk buying company. Utterance C5.12 uses a directive to assess whether the members remember the success of the dairy in the past. Following that assessment, utterance C5. 13 asserts the reason for the decline of the pay rates in the previous months. These utterances are

meant to persuade the audience into staying with the dairy; assured that the situation would improve. Consider utterances C5.14 to C5.16.

Utterance C5. 14

Locution: *Riu niturikitie kuria buru.*
We have settled the payments in total.
Illocutionary act: Assertive (stating)

Utterance C5. 15

Locution: *Tueni mieri iiri yonka aki bwoneni.*
Please give us only two months and you will note the difference.
Illocutionary act: Directive (Requesting)

Utterance C5. 16

Locution: *Kana uria akwenda kuthi gikundini kingi athi.*
Or if someone wants to try another group, we let them.
Illocutionary act: Directive (Instructing)

Utterance C5.14 is an assertive that explains to the audience that the reasons that had caused the deteriorating pay rates are now sorted. Utterance C5.15 is a directive that appeals for more time to rectify the situation. Utterance C5.16 is a directive that changes tact and instructs those that are so disgruntled to the extent that they can't listen to logic could leave the group. This is an indirect way of persuading many to remain in the group. Lets now focus on utterances C5.17 and C5.18.

Utterance C5. 17

Locution: *Buria akona gutiwe akera*
The experience that person will get, he wont tell anyone.
Illocutionary act: Directive (warning)

Utterance C5. 18

Locution: *Tiga tumanirieni tukurie gikundi gietu.*
Lets encourage one another and grow our group.
Illocutionary act: Directive (Requesting)

Utterance C5.17 is a directive that seeks to persuade the audience not to leave the group. It does this by claiming that leaving the group will be extremely unhealthy for the members thus indirectly this locution promises that sticking with the group guarantees greater benefits. Utterance C5.18 has a directive speech act which is a request to the audience to accept to stick with the group.

Communicative Event 6 (C.6)

Communicative event six (C. 6) involved two groups negotiating; the bridegrooms side are asking to be allowed to proceed and plan the wedding while the brides side insist that more money for bride price should be added before that happens. This is the second meeting after thorough negotiations during the first meeting. Let us look at utterance C6.1 to C6.4.

Utterance C6.1

Locution: *Twauka butwitikiria twendelea na uiki, Kiria tutiretete tukareta twarikia Uiki.*

We've come to request that you allow us continue planning the wedding, then we will bring what remains, after the wedding.

Illocutionary act: Directive (appealing)

Utterance C6.2

Locution: *Tutiumba gwitikiria butiretete kiria kibatie niuntu mwiriga ni wiji na niu ukarekeria mwari.*

We can't just allow without a nod from the clan because it is the one that releases the bride

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Stating)

Utterance C6.3

Locution: *Iukiani kiria twaruta na gikeno bukimenyagirira aana baba batikambirie uturu wao na mathina.*

Please accept what we have gladly, being careful that these children won't begin their lives badly

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C6.4

Locution: *Tika tukurega, bwaruta ngiri mirongo ithandatu na tutinenkerete aka*

nombi. Ongerani ikinye Igana.

We are not refusing. You have only given sixty thousands. Make it at least one hundred so that we can afford to give women something.

Illocutionary act: Directive (appealing)

The speaker in utterance C6.1 uses a directive illocution to appeal to the bride's people to allow the couple continue to plan their wedding. The bride's spokes person uses an assertive in utterance C6.2 to insist that they cannot cede ground. This is to persuade not to lower the price further. Utterance C6.3 is a directive that furthers the appeal by the speaker A while utterance C6.4, speaker B (Check appendix 4), uses a directive to insist on his argument. These utterances have the intension of persuading their targets. Consider further persuasive utterances; C6.5 to C6.8.

Utterance C6.5

Locution: *Iu itioneka, ntibuenia, nonga uiki utire.*

That isn't possible, unless we postpone the wedding

Illocutionary act: Directive (Advising)

Utterance C6.6

Locution: *Tigani kwaria ugu, tibu antu baragia ugu. Bukongera jiiigana?*

That's not how to approach issues, how much will you add?

Illocutionary act: Directive (requesting)

Utterance C6.8

Locution: *Ari, kinyiani kibau, kibau gionka onakaba tukongera tukagaira antu.*

Make it twenty, twenty only. We would better make additions ourselves and distribute to the people.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Requesting)

In utterance C6.5 the speaker uses a directive to advice his hearers to be more cautious on the issue they were dealing with. Utterances C6.6 and C6.8 are directives requesting the audience to add more money. The request is based on the argument that it is not the immediate family which requires all this money but the clan. They claim that what is demanded by the clan is non-negotiable.

Communicative Event 7 (C7)

Communicative event seven is a meeting of extended family members, convened by one of them for the purpose of persuading them to begin raising funds for a member of the family who has been very sick for long. I will refer to the speaker as the convener of the meeting. Consider utterances C7.2 to C7.5.

Utterance C7.2

Locution: *Nitukwenda tumurutire gantu kanini kamutethererie.*
Let us contribute something small to help him.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C7.3

Locution: *Mbeca jiongwa ikinyite ngiri Magana manana.*
The bill adds up to eight hundred thousand.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Stating)

Utterance C7.5

Locution: *Antu betu gatutethieni umwe wa jietu riu ena thina*
Our people lets help one of us in this time of need

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C7.2 uses a directive to appeal to the audience to assist one of their own who was hospitalized to pay the medical bill. Utterance C7.3 is an assertive that quotes the amount that is required at the hospital. This assertion is an indirect way of showing that the audience need to be convinced to give good amounts of money (because of the high bill). Utterance C7.5 is a directive that further appeals for support from the audience in an endeavour to persuade them to give generously. Consider utterances C7.6 to C7.10.

Utterance C7.6

Locution: *Gutiwe utigwatwa ni thina teno.*
Anyone of us can get into such a situation.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C7.7

Locution: *Kana ingi muntu agwatwa ni untu akebanga ?*

Do we leave individuals to struggle alone?

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C7.8

Locution: *Mauntu mama guti muntu matigwata*

These things can affect any one.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Saying)

Utterance C7.9

Locution: *Omundi ni niu, ru nigweu.*

If I am affected today, remember tomorrow is your turn.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C7.10

Locution: *Omuntu arute akimenyaga untu uu ni munene.*

Let each one of us contribute with the knowledge that this is a big task.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C7.6 is a directive that indirectly appeals to the audience to contribute. The locution that, 'no one can not get sick' was to have some effect on the audience so that they can behave in a particular way. That is contribute money towards the medical bill of the one affected. Utterance C7.7 is an indirect appeal too meant to persuade the hearers. Utterance C7.8 is an assertion that indirectly states the facts that should make any person want to give generously. Utterances C7.9 and C7.10 are directives that appeal to the audience accept to pledge or contribute towards the said event. The observational data showed that the audience were persuaded and went ahead to pledge towards the medical bill.

Communicative Event 8 (C8)

Communicative event eight (C8) is a meeting between the local community and water project officials. Their main aim is to convince the local people to participate actively in the implementation of the water project. From the contextual information in this meeting, it is

clear that some people are lax on the project while others are totally opposed to it to the extent of barring the water pipes from passing through their land. After some emphasis on the need for this project, the chair begins to persuade members to get involved with the work. Consider utterances C8.3 to C8.6.

Utterance C8.3

Locution: *Ikiirani ruji ruru muno, niuntu rukabutethia*

Support this project and you will benefit

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C8.4

Locution: *Twetana kwinja mitaro ukani. Uria akenja akaruta tubeca tunini*

Ruji rukinywiwa.

When we ask people to help in digging trenches please come and you will be reducing your final fee before you can benefit.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C8.5

Locution: *Ndigwa ona kwibo batikwenda ruji rwitukira kwao. Tamaka?*

Imagine some are opposed to the pipes passing on their lands.
Imagine?

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Saying)

Utterance C8.6

Locution: *Ntonga muntu emurogi?*

Unless one is a witch.

Illocutionary act: Assertive (Saying)

Utterance C8.3 is a directive appealing to the audience to support the water project. Utterance C8.4 is another directive that seeks to convince the audience by providing the benefits they would enjoy if they support the project. Utterance C8.5 on the other hand is an assertion that gives the state of affairs in that community. Utterance C8.6 is an assertion that seeks to show how serious the state in utterance C8.5 is (that some people do not even want the pipes to

pass through their land) and so persuade members to desist from such behaviour. Let us now consider the speech acts features of utterances C8.7 to C8.9.

Utterance C8.7

Locution: *Ka ruji rukuria mugunda uriku?*
How much land will the water pipes occupy?
Illocutionary act: Commissive (Assuring)

Utterance C8.8

Locution: *Gwanca ona rwinjagirwa ndi muno. Gutibu rukugiria kurutha.*
Actually the pipes are placed quite deep underground and they can not interfere with your activities.
Illocutionary act: Commissive (Assuring)

Utterance C8.9

Locution: *Ringithwa ni nkoro bai nomenye ruji ni mwoyo.*
Get touched please and know that water is life.
Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterances C8.7 and C8.8 are commissives indirectly assuring the hearers that not much of their land will be affected by the water project. The final illocution that has the perlocutionary effect of emphasis in this communicative event is in utterance C8.9, which is a directive that directly appeals to the members of this community to fully support the water project.

Communicative Event 9 (C9)

Communicative event nine is a haggling process between a buyer and a seller. The buyer hopes to buy a piece of land as cheaply as possible while the seller does all he can to sell the piece as much as possible. They negotiate at the site and with them are witnesses who do not talk. After the speaker emphatically states the facts about the land, the buyer begins to bargain aggressively. Consider utterances C9.5 to C9.8.

Utterance C9.5

Locution: *Mugunda ti muthuku indi milioni ni nyingi muno, iukia ngiri Magana Mathandatu.*

The land isn't bad but a million is too much. Take six hundred thousands.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing).

Utterance C9.6

Locution: *Aiii, tibu migunda ikuma ugu, gokwenda kumbinyiria atia.*

Ooh no! That is not the current price of land; unless you want to exploit me.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Assessing)

Utterance C9.7

Locution: *Ndutarutira bai tiga kumiria oaria wambiririe, gotikumanya twibamwe?*

Adjust for me abit please; don't you know we are one people?

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C9.8

Locution: *Ruta Magana manana turikanie indi na utikarie kairi.*

Make it eight hundred then and don't bargain further.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C9.5 is a directive appealing to the seller to reduce the price earlier stated in utterance C9.4. Utterance C9.6 is a directive too but uttered by the seller to resist the haggling of the buyer. The aim is to persuade the buyer to buy at the price stated. Utterance C9.7 is another directive by the buyer still appealing to the seller to cede more ground and sell the land at a lower price. The seller does not give in and uses a directive yet again in utterance C9.8 appealing to the buyer to increase the amount of money for that particular piece of land. Let us now focus on utterances C9.9 to C9.11.

Utterance C9.9

Locution: *Kandute mugwanja bai na nkoro imwe*

Let me pay seven hundred sincerely

Illocutionary act: Directive (Requesting)

Utterance C9.10

- Locution: *Gweu riu kobangite kundiria, Nkurengerete Magana mairi ririkana!*
It seems you are not mindful of my welfare. Remember I have already reduced two hundred thousands!
- Illocutionary act: Assertive (Stating)

Utterance C9. 11

- Locution: *Muriwa ni mwene atithiraga.*
You will not run broke by supporting your people.
- Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C9.9 is a directive whereby the buyer requests the seller to accept the price he is offering. In utterance C9.10 the seller uses an assertive to show the buyer that his offer is very bad in an endeavour to persuade him not to lower it further. In utterance C9.11 the buyer uses a directive and going by the latter utterances the seller got persuaded to sell him the land at the price he had suggested.

Communicative Event 10 (C10)

Communicative event ten is a wedding planning committee. The members of the committee had pledged to give various amounts of money at the beginning of the committee's sittings but very few have honored their promises. The wedding day is at hand and the monies fall below the target by far. The chair of the committee uses this speech to persuade members to expedite their giving. Consider utterances C10.2 to C10.5.

Utterance C10.2

- Locution: *Rui antu betu twiumieni turutaruteni mbecha ino.*
Please our people; let us put more effort and contribute more money.
- Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C10. 3

- Locution: *Kana kabutikwenda antu baba bagurana?*
Do we really want this wedding to succeed?
- Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C10.4

Locution: *Onatwi gatwatethirwe, tigani tutethenagieni bai.*
We were helped too, let us keep helping each other

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C10.5

Locution: *Kana ingi tubere beukie runi baturugire uiiki bacoke kuthina?*
Do we ask them to get a loan to finance the wedding then they are left to suffer?

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C10.2 is a directive, appealing to the committee members to give generously to assist the couple that is planning their wedding. Utterance C10.3 is a directive that continues with the same appeal. Utterances C10.4 and C10.5 are also directives in which the speakers are appealing to achieve persuasion. Finally on the speech acts features of Kimuthanbi utterances used for persuasion, let us consider utterances C10.6 and C10.7.

Utterance C10.6

Locution: *Tukendelea ugu tutikinyia mbeca itutethia.*
If we continue giving at this rate, we can't help the situation.

Illocutionary act: Directive (Assessing)

Utterance C10.7

Locution: *Gatugeni omuntu auke na kiria etwirire mucemanioni uu ungi. Tibu?*
Lets agree to bring with us the amount we pledged ourselves in the following Meeting. Agreed?

Illocutionary act: Directive (Appealing)

Utterance C10.6 is a directive that helps the hearers to assess their performance in the giving and hence be persuaded to improve. Utterance C10.7 is the final directive which passionately appeals to all the committee members to heed to the need and respond as per the agreement during the following meeting. Table 4 is a summary of Speech Acts features of Kimuthambi utterances used for persuasion

Table 4

Summary of Speech Acts Features of Kimuthambi Utterances used for Persuasion

Speech Act	Frequency	Percentage
Directives	46	54.76 %
Assertives	27	32.14 %
Commissives	08	9.53 %
Expressives	03	3.57 %
Declaratives	00	0 %
Total	84	100 %

As illustrated in table 4, persuasion in Kimuthambi is mainly through directives. That is Speech acts that are to cause the audience to take a particular action. For instance requests, commands and advice. Out of the eighty four (84) utterances that were used for persuasion, forty six (46) were directives accounting for 54. 76 % of the total utterances. To persuade therefore speakers gave requests, advice, instructions and sometimes commands.

The second most frequent speech acts for persuasion are the assertives. These were inherent in twenty seven out of eighty four utterances which accounted for 32.14 % of the total utterances. Commissives accounted for 9.53 %, Expressives 3. 35 and declaratives 0 %. From the data collected therefore, there were no utterances used for persuasion in Kimuthambi that were declaratives.

The low tally of utterances that are commissives and expressives could be attributed to the fact that it is not usual for persuasion to take the nature of promising, threatening and warning in the case of commissives, and thanking, complaining and scolding in the case of expressive. There were no declaratives in the utterances probably because declaratives are found in performatives which are in the realm of activities which are controlled like actual wedding or naming ceremonies which were not sampled. Even if such events were included in this study the performatives which would generate declaratives would still not be relevant for this study because they are not used to persuade; they just perform an action, like baptize or wed.

Omoniyi (2012) endeavored to identify the speech acts features of President Umaru Yar'Adua's Victory and Inaugural Speeches. The findings showed that the Overall Relative Frequency Percentages (ORFPs) for the selected speeches of Umaru Musa Yar'Adua were: assertive-30%, directive-17%, expressive-8%, verdictive-20%, commissive-15%, and declarative-10%. These ORFPs results showed that Umaru Musa Yar'Adua relied more on sentences that performed assertive acts than other speech acts. Omoniyi (2012) found that Umaru Musa Yar'Adua used the sentences that were verdictive and directive to assert his authority and exercise his power as the President. Sentences that were expressive had the least ORFP; hence, it was observed that the President exploited less of sentences which were meant for indicating the sincerity of his intentions.

The differences in the findings between Omoniyi's study and this study could be due to the different contexts. President Umaru Yar'Adua was giving a speech after winning an election and therefore he had to assert and declare more that the speakers in the Kimuthambi context whose main task was to persuade their audiences.

Summary

Communicative events in Kimuthambi involve many utterances used for persuasion. Out of a total of one hundred thirty six (136) utterances collected from the communicative events, eighty four (84) are used for persuasion which account for (61.76 %).

Persuasion in Kimuthambi is mainly through the use of directives. Out of the eighty four utterances that were used for persuasion, forty six were directives accounting for 54.76 % of the total utterances.

The second most frequent speech acts for persuasion are the assertives. These were inherent in twenty seven out of eighty four utterances which accounted for 32.14 % of the total utterances.

Conclusion

Speech acts features of persuasion are mainly directives and assertives.

Suggestion for Further Studies

Persuasion is dependent on culture and culture is highly embedded in a language. This study recommends studies that compare speech acts features of utterances used for persuasion between languages of different cultures.

References:

- Adegbija, E. (1999). *A Speech Act Analysis of Consumer Advertisements*. (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis). Indiana University: Bloomington.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bach, K., & Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Breaden, B. (1996). *Speaking to Persuade*. New York: Hartcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987): *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burkley, E. & Anderson, D. (2008). Using the Science of Persuasion in the Courtroom. *The Jury Expert*. September 2008: 1-5.
- Chakorn, O. (2006). Persuasive and politeness strategies in cross-cultural letters of request in the Thai business context. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication. Asian Business Discourse*, 16 (1).
- Cooper, M. & Nothstine, W. (1996). *Power Persuasion: Moving an Ancient Art into the Media Age*. Greenwood, IN: Educational Video Group.
- Covino, W. A., & Jolliffe, D. A. (1995). *Rhetoric: Concepts, definitions, boundaries*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dlugan, A. (2012). *Six minutes speaking and presentation skills*. London: CUP.
- Elizabeth, E., Imogen, B., Melanie, N. (2013) *VCE Year 12 English Skills*. London:

CUP.

Fadman, J. (1976). *The Pre-colonial Meru*. Ohio: Ohio University Centre for International Studies.

Tang, X. (2009). Investigating pragmatic transfer in persuasion strategies used by native and non-native speakers of English. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics*. 9 (1), 92-105.

Gachara, M. (2005). *A Pragmatic Analysis of the Language Used to Campaign Against HIV/AIDS: A Case of Kikuyu Speakers*. (Unpublished thesis). Kenyatta University: Nairobi.

Green, G. (1989). *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grice, H. (1989). *Studies in the Ways of Words*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press.

Grice, H. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Academic Press Publications.

Grundy, P. (1995). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gqwede, E. (2005). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Persuasion in Isixossa*. (Unpublished M.A Thesis). University of Stellenbosch.

Hardin, K. (2001). *Pragmatics of Persuasive Discourse in Spanish Television Advertising*. SIL International and the University of Texas at Arlington: Dallas.

Harnish, R. (1994). *Basic Topics in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Wheatsheaf.

Hornby, A., Cowie, A. & Lewis, J. (2005). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of*

Current English. London: Oxford University Press.

- Indarno, R. (2009). A pragmatic Analysis of Slangs; The Titles of English Church Lyrics (Unpublished B.Ed. Research). University of Surakarta, Muhammadiyah.
- Ileri, H. (2011). *Misinterpretations in English-Kimuthambi Church Sermons: A Case of Pentecostal Churches in Muthambi Division*. (Unpublished M.A Thesis). Chuka University: Chuka.
- Kindiki, S. (2008). Pragmatic Functions of Attitude Markers in Kiitharaka. (Unpublished M.A thesis). University of Kwazulu-Natal. Durban.
- Kinyua, A. (2010). A descriptive Analysis of the Verb Group in the Kimwimbi Dialect of Kimeru Language, Eastern Kenya. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis) Chuka University, Kenya.
- Koike, D. (1992). *Language and Social Relationship in Brazilian Portuguese: The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Kothari, C. (2004). *Research Methodology*; New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*, London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lingzh, Z. (2010). Study of pragmatic transfer in persuasion strategies by Chinese Learners of English. *The South East Asian Journal of English Language Studies*. 16 (2), 93-114.
- Mbaka, H. (2013). The Phrase Structure of Gichuka Language. (Unpublished M.A Thesis), Chuka University, Chuka.

Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mugenda A. & Mugenda O (2003) *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: ACTS press.

Muriungi, P. (2005). Phrasal Movement inside Bantu Verbs: Deriving Affix Scope and Order in Kitharaka. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). University of Tromso, Norway.

Mutegi, A. (2012). Taswira ya Mwanamke Katika Ngano za Wamuthambi. (Unpublished M.A Thesis). Chuka University, Chuka-Kenya.

Mutegi, M (2014). Strategies of Wh-question formation in Gichuka. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Chuka University, Kenya.

Mwembu, K. (2012). Uasilishaji wa Maneno ya Kigeni katika Lahaja ya Kitharaka. (Unpublished M.A Thesis). Chuka University, Chuka-Kenya.

Ndwiga, S. (2008). *A Syntactic Examination of Empty Categories in the Syntax of Gichuka*. (Unpublished M.A thesis). University of Nairobi.

O'keefe, D. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and Research, 2nd edn*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Olukoya, B. (2010). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Slangs Used for Female Students in University of Ilorin*. An (Unpublished B.A. Research). Work, Department of English, Faculty of Arts University of Ilorin, Ilorin.

Rank, H. (1988). *Persuasion Analysis: A companion to Composition*. Park Forest, IL: Counter Propaganda Press.

Scheidel, T. (1967). *Persuasive Speaking*. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

- Scott, M., & Murray, M. (2012). *Communication in Business*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Searle, J. (1975). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*; 2nd Edition. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2002) *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford. Blackwell.
- Stiff, B & Mongeau, P. (2003). *Persuasive Communication*, 2nd ed. New York: Guilford Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Omoniyi, M. (2012) *A Pragmatic Analysis of Victory and Inaugural Speeches of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua*. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria
- Ubong, E. (2012). Pragmatic analysis of President Goodluck Jonathan's and President Barack Obama's inaugural addresses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*.2, (12), 261- 278.
- Udofot, I. (1998). *English Semantics*. Uyo: Scholars Press (Nig.) Ltd.
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Pragmatics as a Theory of Linguistic Adaptation, Working Document*. Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association.
- Verschueren, J. (2003) *Understanding pragmatics (2nd ed.)*. India: Replica Press.
- http://www.researchgate.net/publication/267860635_A_Pragmatic_Analysis_of_Victory_and_Inaugural_Speeches_of_President_Umaru_Musa_YarAdua