

An Insight into Discourse Tact and Acts:

An Analysis of a Case Study of a Spontaneous Argumentative Conversation

Fisseha Motuma (PhD)*

Abstract

This case study tried to examine the different discourse features and acts used in an argumentative conversation. The study employed purposive sampling method to gather data, and drew on a cell phone audio-recording of a series of authentic conversation as the core source of data. The data were analyzed through interpretive analysis technique. The results of the analysis reveal that the nature of an authentic argumentative conversation appears more of interactional rather than transactional. The finding indicates how discourse articulates the ethical, ideological and family or social ties. It mirrors how the different linguistic features and speech acts performed in the process influence the nature of a conversation and how the participants engaged in the conversation tried to respect maxims of politeness, relations, manners, quality and quantity through which they were able to have safe and sound interaction. This implies that discourse is not only constructed using different levels of linguistic features and speech acts, but also it is meant to echo the beliefs, feelings, cultural perspectives and social norms and relations of participants using various forms and functions of language.

Key Words: discourse, tact, acts, spontaneous, maxims, argumentation, conversation

* Assist. Professor of ELT; Dean, Faculty of Languages and Humanities Kotebe University of Education, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Case

The participants in this conversation were two persons who have had close blood relations. The first is namely Almbanch and the other is called Ketemash. Ketemash is the aunt of Alembanch, and so Alembanch is the niece of her. Alembanch took the first turn in dialing and greeting her aunt. She was addressing a house case related to her sister, Sisay.

The participants gradually led to a sort of argumentation on the case as they moved deeper into the core of their dialogue. The conversation totally restricted to the house case about which they were arguing. The house was originally belonged to a person called Asnake, who is the brother of Ketemash and the uncle of Alembanch.

Asnake, who was assumed to be the owner of the house died some years ago. He did not have wife and children. He bought the house, but he did not legalize his ownershipness of the house. When he died, Sisay, Asnake's elder brother, Amene's daughter, was allowed to live in the house until the family formally legalize their right to inherit the house. In addition, it seems that Sisay was promised that she would buy the house when the legalization process was succeeded. However, it sounds that this promise was distracted and the case of the house was apparently going on in an unexpected way.

Consequently, the two participants (Almbanch and Ketemash) were arguing about who should have the right to own the house. In addition, they argued about the fact that Ketemash and her other two brothers (Tadesse and Ermiyas) were assigned as a legal representative of the family to complete the legal process to inherit or take over their brother's property.

Unfortunately, it appears that Ketemash diverted the case of the house and attempted to legalize herself as the only owner of the house. She even tended to deny Asnake's ownershipness of the house. In other words, it would appear that Ketemash betrayed all others in the process of legalizing the family's right to share the properties of their departed brother.

1.2. The Research Questions

The central questions targeted to be answered in this case study are:

- 1) *What kinds of discourse acts do the participants employ to influence each other's opinions or ideas?*
- 2) *What types of linguistic features are being exploited in the identified discourse?*
- 3) *How are social status and life ideologies reflected in the course of interaction?*

- 5) *What are the cyclically exploited maxims of conversation?*
- 6) *Why and how are the identified maxims used in the conversation?*
- 7) *What discourse strategies are employed to maintain the continuity of interaction?*

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This case study basically tried to investigate the different discourse acts, linguistic features and maxims of conversation being exercised by participants engaged in a likely conversation. Through this, the paper tried to identify and analyze how participants influence each other, what approaches do participants employ to maintain interaction and how do participants readjust their utterances as an act of challenging or confirming other's utterances in the process. It also tried to give attention to how social status, power, life ideology and cultural values are essentially characterized in the course of interaction.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The case study could contribute to our understanding of how the different discourse strategies employed in a conversation influence the kind of speech acts or linguistic features to be used in the forthcoming utterance. Even more to the point, the analysis in this paper could help us appreciate how participants engaged in an argumentative conversation try to persuade each other, how do they account each other's discourse acts and how do they try to readjust their verbal reactions or acts to build their ideas upon the other to maintain conformity of contextual understanding.

A further point is that as the participants engaged in the conversation became unconscious of the recording of their voice, their speech assumed to be actual and spontaneous in many respects. In other words, studying a naturally occurring conversation could help to understand the nature and characteristics of spontaneous argumentative conversation and features of verbal behaviours. So, the data gathered in such context could give us better insight into what communicative activities and actions do people exploit and perform with their utterances in the real life context instead of depending on fictional depictions of talk (Sacks 1992, as quoted by Wooffitt 2005).

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Discourse, in the sense of Coupland and Gwyn (2003), is an explanatory concept which entertains various view points. Discourse is taken as a (verbal or written) text in which ...' *social and cultural life is invested with meaning and value.*' (P. 1). It serves as a predisposing mechanism through which different levels of meanings, socio-cultural and ideological perspectives are being processed.

Within this respect, Leeuwen (2008) has highlighted that many people think that the central function of language is to communicate information. However, language addresses many

more things in the course of interaction. It serves as a medium through which people reflect their social status, life philosophy, beliefs and identities. It is perhaps, the most powerful instrument in portraying human affiliation with culture, social groups and institutions.

It follows that discourse analysis could operate as a means through which we can understand, analyze and interpret how people communicate their opinions, intentions and life philosophies. What is more, the analysis helps us to gain an insight into how do people entertain their socio-cultural values, ideologies, beliefs and status in the process of communication, and how language operates to serve such diverse values and meanings in the course of interaction (Brown & Yule 1983; Leeuwen 2008; Grundy1995).

In the views of Coupland & Gwyn (2003) and Slumberous (2003), one of the core focuses of discourse analysis within a given socio-cultural context is to divulge how discourse acts, as used in talk, text and other communicative practices, reflect the ideological, moral and social positions through interactions. People use different discourse strategies like linguistic, pragmatic features and verbal behaviours to communicate different levels of messages that they want to get across. And to understand this, one technique is to conduct discourse analysis.

In much the same way, Wooffitt (2005) has made clear that discourse analysis is often used as methodological approaches to the study of verbal conversation or written text. It adds to our understanding of what is communicated, why, and how the substance of the conversation or text is being communicated within a specific social context. In other words, discourse analysis values the diverse role language plays in our everyday life (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002; McCarthy 1991).

Significantly, Wooffitt (2005) has had the view that one of the most efficient methodological approaches to analyze and interpret conversation or verbal interaction is using conversational analysis. This enables us to scrutinize the different types of meanings- that is, the meaning stated or implied within a specific conversation, and the various linguistic and pragmatic acts performed in the process of addressing the meanings.

More typically, Wooffitt raises the question of: *What is the best way to understand the values communicated in everyday communicative activities?* He has claimed that conversational analysis provides'*the most sophisticated and robust account of language in action.*' (p. 2). Conversational analysis serves as a tool of understanding how people try to communicate their intention, social status, life ideology, beliefs and their perspectives about a case at hand within a particular social context (Douglas 2001; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002). Contextually, Paul (1999) and Wooffitt (2005) have made clear that conversational analysis could enable us to

understand how people employ speech acts as a means to delegate their thoughts and intentions.

On the other hand, Austin (1962), as cited by Adegbite and Odebunmi (2006), has formulated pragmatic theory of speech acts. In his work, he identified three types of speech acts. Accordingly, the first is called locutionary acts that refer to actually stated utterance of a speaker. And this act is described in linguistic features including phonological, grammatical and lexical terms. The other identified speech acts named as illocutionary acts that signifies the intended meaning of an utterance made by a speaker. The illocutionary acts are often characterized in terms of the language acts or functions, like argument, confirmation, elicitation, encouragement, offer, suggestion, greeting, etc.

The third speech act refers to the perlocutionary act that is describable in terms of the effect of the utterance on the listener. This is mainly about how the listener reacts, acts or responds to the verbal action of the speaker. It is whether, for example, the hearer is persuaded or not by an argument, or whether the hearer reacts verbally or nonverbally, or whether he/she remains indifferent, etc.

Within this context, one of the goal of this paper is to try to examine and analyze whether the identified speech acts are reflected or not in the recorded conversation. In addition, the paper tries to search out and analyze the kind of maxims of conversation employed, and how each maxim is being exploited and practiced.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sampling and Data Collection Methods

To specify the respondents of this research, the researcher employed purposive sampling technique in which the participants of this research were not at first informed anything about the research. So, the data was collected through audio-recording the conversation of the sample subject of the study secretly in fear of that the conversation may not maintain the natural and spontaneous features of authentic interaction. So, the participants were not by any means conscious that they were being audio-recorded in the process of their exchanges.

However, after the data were recorded on tape, there remained the task of securing the research ethics and the informants' rights. Accordingly, the researcher determined to talk to the individuals to get their permission to use the data for academic purpose. In the process, the researcher tried his best to explain the objective of the research and the reason why their conversation was audio recorded behind their knowledge. In addition, the informants were ensured that their names and private cases would never be revealed to others. Anyway, after a

long and exasperating arguments and discussions, the informants were convinced that had they told that they were being audio-recorded while they were conversing, the data would have obviously been distorted. So, the agreement was finally reached to exploit and analyze the data for academic purpose (cf Grundy 1995:161-163).

3.2 Data Analysis Techniques

This study used sample audio-recorded conversation as a source of data. The conversation was originally recorded and transcribed in Amharic. Then, for convenience of analysis, it was translated into English. It means, the case study followed the procedure of cell phone audio-recording of ordinary conversation, transcribing, translating and then, analyzing by identifying the speech acts, linguistic patterns and maxims of conversation being used in the process of interaction.

PRESENTATION, RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4:1 Presentation of Data

As being pointed out earlier, the data for this study was gathered through cell phone audio-recording. The participants were communicating in Amharic (one of the Ethiopian languages) and their exchanges took about twelve minutes. So, for reasons of convenience, the recorded sample conversation was first transcribed into Amharic and then translated into English. In the conversation, 'A' represents Alembanch and 'K' stands for Ketemash.

A: Hello? Are you Ketemash?

K: Yes.

A: I'm Alembanch; thanks to Him, you get to the holiday safely.

K: Thanks, you too get to the holiday, Alembanch.

A: Are you all right?

K: Thanks to God.... Are you in Nazareth?

A: I'm not; I'm in Addis Ababa.

K: Are you all right?

A: I'm all right, thanks to God... something. Hmm... Tadesse and others came lately....

K: Ihi

A: They said something. Ketemash wants to buy the house.

K: Right.

A: Is it true?

K: Yes, it's true.

A: How come!?

K: Say why?

A: Ihi

K: It has reason.

A: What is the reason behind; let you tell me.

K: Before this time, we said it was Asnake's...it means when we asked money to accomplish the case at that time, Sisay refused to give money saying she didn't have money. She claimed that we had the money to handle the case without help.

A: Ihi

K: In that case; she, too, knows the way to be used.

A: Ihi

K: I went on. That was failed. Eventually, the required people came.

A: Ihi

K: When the people came, nobody asked the case and what happened then. I told everyone about the actual situation though she did not ask me anything about the case.

A: Ihi

K: Now, after I have gone through all these and I have exhaustively tried...

A: Ihi

K: That is, I have sacrificed myself...

A: So, is it for what you have gone through that you want to buy now?

K: Yes.

A: Oh! I'm very sorry, Ketemash!

K: There is nothing you're to be sorry about.

● *(Both 'A' and 'K' begin chatting together- no one listens.)*

A: Let me tell you something.

K: Ihi

A: We are your children though you didn't give birth to each of us. The children who 'Amiiyee' (Amene, who was Alembanch's and Sisay's father and Ketemash's elder brother) gave birth to...

K: Ihi

A: are your children; aren't?

● *(Both 'A' and 'K' began chatting together- no one was listening.)*

A: Let me finish! I'll listen to yours. Just listen to me.

K: There's something I want to tell you...ehu..I request you in the name of Lord.

A: Wait.

K: Ihi

A: It means nothing; you'll tell me.

K: Alright.

A: We mean, your children. Amiiyee's children are your children.

K: Yes, yes.

A: Though he is not alive, he replaced us for you.

K: Right.

A: Before, when we were in poverty, no one remembered us.

K: Today, you...

A: Wait, let me finish. Please, in the names of your mother, let me finish.

K: Not to say that; you...

A: Wait, I beg you in the name of your mother, let me finish. A person does not only support others just by giving money.

K: Ihi

A: Saying where are you; how are you, be strong,..... couldn't this be something great? We didn't get that from any one of you. Now, we are being here. Today, you yourself get us in touch; we become closer to each other. Moreover, you yourself pushed up Sisay to live in this house. Did she request you to let her live in the house? You confirmed her saying you would buy no problem and so on. Even, I heard that you said I would never think of Asnake's house; whenever I thought of this house, I remembered my brother and I was in tears.

K: In fact, this is a big lie!

A: Okay, let it be.

K: Personally, instead of blaming me saying I said that, I would gather the people in position when I said that.

A: Okay.

K: Let it be uncovered whether or not I said this in the presence of all others.

A: Ihi...hmm...

K: I want to say what I said in the presence of others.

A: How? How?.... Yet, how was she allowed to live in this house? Did she request you?

K: No.

A: Ihi

K: I asked "Gash" (used to show respect to an elder person) Solomon and others about this. They told me that they discussed the case with Sisay and agreed that she would live in the house. I asked others to phone to "Gash" Solomon and made what they agreed upon clear.

A: Ihi

K: He said they didn't give her the promise that she would buy the house.

A: Ihi

K: At that time in point the house did not belong to Asnake.

A: Ihi

K: Nothing was clear about it.

A: Ihi

K: They told her that let's, first, be clear about it, but did not tell her saying you would buy.

A: Ihi

K: Now, I myself...

A: Ihi

K:asked what they discussed.

A: Alright.

K: They did not raise this issue to me.

A: Alright.

K: At that time, yet, she said I wouldn't give you money unless I bout the house.

A: Alright.

K: The money I spent on it....

A: Okay.

K: I know how much it is.

A: No matter how much you spent, you will be compensated. She...

K: Why was it repaid for me? If I didn't succeed, you would ignore me.

A: What?

K: If I didn't succeed, you all would ignore me.

A: What.... What did you say?

K: If I didn't succeed, weren't others laughing at me?

A: If you lost the money, what is the matter, you did it for your brother's children.

● *(Both began chatting together- no one was listening.)*

K: If you lost the money, Ketemash? Asnake himself left the money behind and passed away.

Today, why do you involve in such money-minded case?

● *(Overlapping Speech; just chatting together.)*

A: Any way, Ketemash, let me tell you.

K: Alembanch, now, as we have lived up to now, and we have also shared all the problems you have mentioned. We got nothing from your father when he was alive.

A: It was our father that brought up and educated Asnake!

K: It means nothing even if he supported and educated Asnake for a year. Typically, Asnake was any one's child.

A: Let it be for one day, one day! You said one year, didn't you say that?

K: Yes.

A: Even giving help for a month has value.

● *(Both 'A' and 'K', begin chatting together- no one was listening.)*

A: Forget that. We shouldn't nag each other, madam.

K: It shouldn't be talked this much saying he educated Asnake.

A: I.... what I want to tell you is that Asnake...

● *(Both began chatting together- no one was listening.)*

K: I heard a gossip about that he had educated Asnake. This should not be talked about.

A: It should be talked about; it should be!

K: You now Asnake....

A: Let me tell you what 'Amiiyee was saying. He was helping Asnake at the expense of our life.

K: Enough, this means....

A: He was saying I became just dew; I would disappear tomorrow, and so he was helping him thinking that Asnake would take care of his children.

● *(Overlapping Speech; just chatting together.)*

A: Any way, forget it; everything has passed. Now, do you know last thing I want to tell you.

K: Alright.

A: Sisay has children. You let her...

K: What?

A: Sisay has children. She lives. If you move her children out of the house and you live in the house; if your mind accepts that and if God let you do that, live in. That is just what I want to tell you.

K: Let me tell you; listen to me.

A: If you fear God....

K: It is this....

A: If you are concerned about what the local people may say if you take that action, Sisay lives.

K: Give me chance.

A: Enough! It is this that I tell you.

K: Give me chance.

A: Ihi

K: I do not hate Sisay herself.

A: Why do you hate us, aren't you our aunt?

K: Listen to me, let me tell you.

A: Ihi

K: It is not that my mind does not think of that. I came to live in Addis Ababa within in five or six months just after she began living in the house. Though I had the right to live in the house, I did not complain; rather I rented a house. It was because I didn't want her to get out of the house and suffer with her children in search of a renting house.

A: Whether you or Sisay, don't you have equal right to live in the house?

K: Wait, let me tell you; it was not because I didn't deserve to live in the house. I could get into....

A: Ihi

K: and live .

A: Okay.

K: I never said that she didn't have any right, but...

A: Ihi

K: Instead of suffering with her children, I thought I became a spinster, I had better have lived in a rented house.

A: Ihi

K: How did Sisay regard what I did like that...

A: Ihi... Okay.

K: She said I never left the house for you; I had the right....

A: Ihi

K: I couldn't.

A: Okay.

K: Now, let it be....was this that she was thinking about? What I thought sound was considered as if it was nothing.

A: Okay.

K: If I let this...

A: Yet, God knows that shall I tell you the truth?

K: Ihi

A: If you took the house and if you were living in this house with your children,...

K: Ihi

A: Sisay would not ask..... We never think! We never think! Sisay does not get into the house over you.

We never involve in such kind of conflict and division. However, you have thought it. Do you know the last thing you may tell me?

K: Ihi

A: You and she...she herself wants to buy the house.....

K: Ihi

A: You, too, want to buy the house.

K: Ihi

A: How do both of you want to buy the house? The buyer should be one of you.

K: Just I you know... already you know... the house... you know... Here, you should know that there is nothing that indicates Asnake's ownershipness.

A: Alright.

K: There is nothing, just nothing. The reason way I was suffering for two months, and I was getting up early in the morning and crying at the door and in front of different people.....

A: By the way, weren't you legally assigned in the name of your relatives and brothers to accomplish the case?

K: Who did assign me?

A: Tadesse and Ermiyas..... you all were assigned to handle the case.

K: I...I... all were in their house. Ermiyas, too, was at his home, and Taddess, was too. The person we appointed for the case never do anything without money. Even that was by giving bribe...

A: All this was because you could handle the case!

● *(Overlapping Speech; just chatting together.)*

K: It was nothing. What was done means nothing for people of the same blood.

A: Yes!

K: It's just minor thing.

A: I, now, never leave that house! Ehhi... now it's mine.

K: You mean couldn't Sisay even buy the house?

A: I.... any way..... Yes, she can't.

K: It's Asnake's house; you think you live in the house?

A: So, what would you like to do?

● *(Both began chatting together- no one was listening.)*

K: I request you in the name of Trinity! You are using harsh language.

A: I'm talking to you in love, but you....

K: With great love, I'm talking to you; Heaven knows. I'm talking to you in the truthful and sincere manner.

A: Because you are my aunt, my elder. Furthermore....

K: Ihi

A: I think you're my flesh; and as you're my flesh, I hope you think for us. And that is why I'm talking with you sincerely.

K: Al...ri....ght.

A: And, I said thinking that how could she imagine of that.

K: I never say harsh things. When I came last time....

A: Wait. Now, Sisay....

K: I never said any bad thing.

A: Not that; now, you're saying that Sisay cannot buy the house? Isn't it?

K: I told you, anyway.

A: And, you mean there will be no division, then? Are you the only person who has the right on the house; is it only you who have the right to sell the house and take all the money alone?

K: Oh!

A: Yes, right it is! If there is no anything indicating Asnake's property, and you are saying that there is no evidence indicating Asnake's ownershipness of the house. Again, you're claiming that you have done everything to complete the case of the house alone. Therefore, you say there is nothing that refers to Asnake here.

K: Wait, let me tell you. I have told you how the case being here. It doesn't mean that I take everything by myself, and nobody deserves anything. Alembanch, please, understand me.

A: Do you know what Tadesse and others told us recently.

K: Ihi

A: Both Sisay and Ketemash want to buy the house.

K: Ihi

A: They think the neighboring people would guess the price of the house. And then, if Sisay is able to buy the house, she will. But, if she is not able to pay the price, the house will go to Ketemash.

K: They, perhaps, talk about their own house which they wanted to sell to her. But, I never leave this house for her.

A: Ehu, hmmm... does it mean this is your own house?

K: Yes!

A: We'll see. Anyway, okay, live in, let God allow it. Let your mind give you peace, live in.

(Both were just chatting something which was not clearly understandable.)

A:You will turn into soil tomorrow. We, too, turn into soil just like them. Live; I swear in the name of God, I'm telling you the truth.

● *(Both began chatting together.)*

K: It shouldn't be like this....

A: Let everything happens; our father passed away; Asnake was, too. You live; that is enough.

K: I, too, die.

A: Live, why do you die; you do not die. You have accumulated all that much money. Why do you die?

● *(Both began chatting together.)*

A: You live longer. Enough; leave it, Okay?

K: You're biased towards your sister, aren't you?

A: Yes, it is!

K: If truth to be told, when I was going up and down,.....

A: Enough! Leave it, leave. Even in the case of the money, she didn't say I didn't give you. She said I would give you if you promised me to buy the house. She, even, said I could complete the case for less than thirty birr (30 birr). But, she didn't say I wouldn't give you. She said this in front of the person you assigned to handle the case, and she even questioned him if she might say anything different. Enough what is the use to disseminate hear sayings? You were not there; you didn't hear what she said and so what is the use to circulate rumor? She stressed saying that I could complete the case in less than sixty (60) birr. She confirmed you that she asked different people about the case and so confident enough to complete the case successfully. It is just that!

K: In here, Alembanch?

A: Ihi

K: He phoned to her in the presence of Ermiyas and asked her why she said I didn't give money unless we assured her to buy the house. He told her that everyone should contribute some money to complete the case instead of setting precondition.

A: It's enough; why do waste my phone account? The final thing you are saying is that it is you who have the right to buy and live in the house; do you say so?

K: Yes.

A: Come, and throw away Sisay's children and her.....

K: Why does she leave?

A: And then, you live..... or else, you don't live with her together, Any way after that....

● *(The conversation ended because the line was interrupted)*

4.2 Discussion and Analysis of Data

Basically, the two participants open their discourse with greetings. Their voice and state of mood seem sincere and healthy. It could be deduced from this that there appears normally respected norms to open a conversation. Accordingly, it sounds that whatsoever the case may be, greetings are expected to be exchanged in initial turns in a conversation between relatives. To illustrate this further, let us consider this excerpt taken from the sample conversation.

Extract 1

A: Hello? Are you Ketemash?

K: Yes.

A: I'm Alembanch; thanks to Him, you get to the holiday safely.

K: Thanks, you, too, get to the holiday, Alembanch.

A: Are you all right?

K: Thanks to God.... Are you in Nazareth?

A: I'm not; I'm in Addis Ababa.

K: Are you all right?

A: I'm all right, thanks to God.....

As can be noted from the above excerpt, there are paired units, like greetings, question - answers, giving information -confirming, and eliciting-responding and so on. It seems that these paired actions usually go together as, for example; reacting to a greeting by greeting and giving answer to a question seems appropriate response in a usual interaction. Essentially, this shows ways in which conversation proceeds through utterances produced in successive turns. Conversely, it sounds that if a question is asked and the respondent ignores offering an answer to the question, this may lead to a breakdown in communication or expectation which affects the effect of interpersonal interaction.

In other words, the participants begin the conversation with speech acts such as enquiry, confirmation, and then, followed by initiating and replying to greetings and good wishes. However, the nature of the conversation steadily turns into random turn-taking, initiation of exchanges and replies. Following this, there exhibited the dominance of one participant over the other, while the other provides an eliciting signal (i.e. 'Ihi') repeatedly. And this could imply that the participant who was encouraging the other to keep on talking may appear tolerant in letting the speaker to fully express herself. Yet, such tolerant behaviour does not

stay longer. In particular, as the speaker takes more and more talk-time, the other participant appears that she loses her temper and so the conversation turns into overlapping chat. However, this situation did not stay longer. The mood of the participants and the nature of the conversation gradually become more and more serious. As the interaction is extended, the participants become quicker to move onto the core of the case. Along with this, it is noticed that there are also changes with regard to the linguistic patterns employed and the speech acts exploited.

In particular, speaker 'A' tries to employ religious approach whenever her interlocutor appears angry or shows a relatively rough verbal behavior. At this point, it is possible to analyze how such approach affects the other speaker. To illustrate this further, let us examine the following extract.

Extract 2

A: Sisay has children. She lives. If you move her children out of the house and you live in the house; if your mind accepts that and if God let you do that, live in. That is just what I want to tell you.

K: Let me tell you; listen to me?

A: If you fear God....

K: It is this....

A: If you are concerned about what the local people may say if you take that action, Sisay lives.

K: Give me chance!

A: Enough! It is this that I tell you.

K: Give me chance!

A: Ihi

K: I do not hate Sisay herself.

A: Why do you hate us, aren't you our aunt?

K: Listen to me, let me tell you.

A: Ihi

K: It is not that my mind does not think of that. I came to live in Addis Ababa within in five or six months just after she began living in the house. Though I had the right to live in the house, I did not complain; rather I rented a house. It was because I didn't want her to get out of the house and suffer with her children in search of a renting house.

As it could be inferred from Extract 2, Speaker 'A' senses the need to use religious language and approach as a means to turn down the cold behaviour of participant 'K'. And this could imply that such approach and utterances might be used to initiate a repair sequence of exchanges, (Wooffitt 2005), through which the participant reflecting rough verbal behaviour could get back to him/herself. It, thus, sounds that such discourse acts might be employed to

avoid communication barriers or to maintain positive verbal behaviours in the process of interaction.

More typically, Speaker 'A' is repeatedly using religious language in her speech more than her co-participant. Perhaps, she might intend to use religious expressions or language as discourse tact to get the attention of Speaker 'K', or as a strategy to cool down her partner's behaviour, or as a signal to reflect that she becomes genuine and honest in her approach.

In this case, speaker 'A' appears very diplomatic since she tries to shift the mood of the conversation back to the normal whenever there happens unfavorable verbal interactions. She repeatedly tries to cool down her aunt's strong verbal behaviours, especially by using religious language or by addressing their social ties. She, for example, uses utterances like ' *I request you in the name of Lord*'; : *Wait, I beg you in the name of your mother, let me finish; if you fear God; Yet, God knows that shall I tell you the truth, I request you in the name of Trinity! You are using harsh language. etc'*- (እኔ የምልኽ ነገር አለ በጌታ ይዠኝለው; ቆይ አስጨርሽኝ በናትሽ አስጨርሽኝ;እግዚአብሔርን ከፈራሽ.....;---ግን እግዚአብሔር በሚያቀው እውነቱን ልንገርሽ አይደለ; ነገ ጠዋት አንችም አፈር ነሽ እኛም እንደነሱ አፈር ነን ኑር እግዚአብሔርን እውነቱን ነው;....በስላሴ ስም ይዠኝለው አንች ክፉ የሚትናገረውን ነገር እኔ በፍቅር ነው ያናገርኩሽ መዳህንአሉም በሚያቀው በትክክለኛው በንፁሕ ነገር ነው የሚናገረሽ ምክንያቱም አክስቱ ነሽ ታላቃ ነሽ ከዚያ በተረፈ.....)

It is evident that in all the above instances, the listener tends to cool down herself and seemingly appears to be back to the normal verbal behavior. And that could be one of the reasons why the conversation continues afterwards.

Another important part of this conversation is the choice of some conversation encouraging words or expressions or signals to keep the conversation alive. Both participants do this by using a variety of expressions that give positive feedback. Words such as *okay, alright, right*, and signals like '*ihi*', and phrases like '*say why*', -(እሺ; እህ; ለምን በይ) are mainly used to secure the flow of ideas and communication in the process.

The conversation also reflects the use of social status and relations. The participants appear that they tend to avoid unnecessary and further conflict by trying to remark that they are close relatives who should manage differences peacefully. In this case, let us consider this extract:

Extract 3

K: I request you in the name of Trinity! You are using harsh language.

A: I'm talking to you in love, but you....

K: With great love, I'm talking to you; Heaven knows. I'm talking to you in the truthful and sincere manner.

A: Because you are my aunt, my elder. Furthermore....

K: Ihi

A: I think you're my flesh; and as you're my flesh, I hope you think for us. And that is why I'm talking with you sincerely.

K: Al...ri....ght.

A: And, I said thinking that how could she imagine of that.

K: I never say harsh things. When I came last time....

A: Wait. Now, Sisay....

K: I never said any bad thing.

A: Not that; now, you're saying that Sisay cannot buy the house? Isn't it?

K: I told you, anyway.

Just like using religious point of view in the conversation to create positive verbal behavior, addressing issues such as social or blood relationship seem to be used as a discourse tact used to avoid harsh conflicts in the interaction. The utterances, for instance, *'Because you are my aunt, my elder; I think you're my flesh and as you're my flesh, I hope you think for us'*, reflects how the participant uses their social status and relation to control verbal behavior in the process. She points out that as you are my flesh, I assume that you do not do something harm against us reflects the ideology of the participant.

Outwardly, such utterances are apparently tended to be used as an act of creating closeness and considerateness in the process of argument. It also appears that the participant employs such strategy to influence the other's thinking, moral and psychology status so that the other participant may appear more understanding and negotiable or open to fair discussion.

4:3 Major Findings

1) The Structural Form of an Argumentative Conversation

The result of the study shows that the dominant content structure of the conversation seems providing background to the case, setting grounds or reasons, and then trying to propose solution.

In the opening, the interaction seems to be characterized by smooth, friendly and dialogical exchanges. It is structured by a series of moderately unbiased turn-taking sequences of moves. The exchanges are more or less arranged as initiating moves, responding to the moves, and questioning and answering forms of exchanges. It gradually turns into random turn taking, overlapping speech and interventions.

2) The Speech Acts

A) Locution of Utterances

Vocabulary

The vocabulary items used in this authentic argumentative conversation can be described in terms of lexical occurrences and lexical collocation.

● Lexical Occurrences

- i) *Plain Words*: These are words often used in everyday interaction. Yet, these words are possibly used in this conversation to describe social relations and positive verbal behaviours.

Examples: *uncle, father, aunt, children...*

- ii) *Proper Names*: Some are used to refer to names of relatives of a family-(*Almbanch, Ketemash, Ermiyas*). Some others are proper names used to refer to religious aspects.-(*God, Lord, Trinity*).

- iii) *Vocatives*: (*madam; Amiiye, my aunt*)

- iv) *Deixis*: The participants used different types of deixis in their conversation.

- *Person Deixis*: It is used in the conversation in the form of personal pronouns.(*I, we, she, you, they, me,*)

- *Temporary Deixis*: (*now, today, then*)

- *Location Deixis*: (*there, here, this, that, these*)

- v) *Affirmatives*: (*Yes, Okay, Right, alright, not to say that*)

- vi) *Negators*: (*no, not that, never,*)

- vii) *Interjection*: (*Oh!*)

● Lexical Collocations

There exhibited a variety of lexical collocations in this conversation. The common patterns of lexical collocation manifested in the conversation could be characterized as:

- i) *Adjective + Noun*: (*required people, actual situation, no problem, much money, minor thing, harsh language, great love, rented house*)

- ii) *Verb + Adverb*: (*came lately, getting up early, told recently*)

- iii) *Verb + Noun*: (*educated Asnake, helping Asnake, rented house, circulate rumor*)

- iv) *Verb + Pronoun*: (*say why, sacrificed myself, get that, confirmed her, blaming me, said that, leave it, give me, understand me*)

- v) *Adverb+ Verb*: (*exhaustively tried, just listen, only support, never think, legally assigned, never leave*)

It has also found that there appear seemingly atypical collocation patterns, for example, (big lie- 'ትልቅ ልሽት'). The question is that do the word big and lie collocate? This appears a rare case in standard Amharic or English because if we try to understand the very concept of lie, there is no little or much lie. A lie is a lie.

B) Illocutionary Acts of Utterances

In this conversational analysis, the illocutionary utterances reflect the implied motives of the participants' utterances. Each participant reflects their intention in their utterances by acts such as encouragement, elicitation, requesting, enquiry, comment and the likes. In particular, the following excerpt could exemplify the above points.

Extract 4:

A: What is the reason behind; let you tell me.

K: Before this time, we said it was Asnake's...it means when we asked money to accomplish the case at that time, Sisay refused to give money saying she didn't have money. She claimed that we had the money to handle the case without help.

A: Ihi

K: In that case; she, too, knows the way to be used.

A: Ihi

K: I went on. That was failed. Eventually, the required people came.

A: Ihi

K: When the people came, nobody asked the case and what happened then. I told everyone about the actual situation though she did not ask me anything about the case.

A: Ihi

K: Now, after I have gone through all these and I have exhaustively tried...

A: Ihi

K: That is I have sacrificed myself...

A: So, is it for what you have gone through that you want to buy now?

K: Yes.

A: Oh! I'm very sorry, Ketemash.

K: There is nothing you're to be sorry about.

● *(Both 'A' and 'K' begin chatting together- no one listens.)*

A: Let me tell you something.

K: Ihi

A: We are your children though you didn't give birth to each of us. The children who 'Amiiyee' (Amene) gave birth to...

K: Ihi

As shown in Extract 1, both speakers repetitively utter 'ihi' -(ʔiʔ), and words like 'Okay' or 'alright' -(ʔiʔ), instead of interrupting the interlocutor. If we try to critically examine such repetitive responses used throughout the conversation, they might signal some hidden acts or intention of the responder. This, perhaps, signals that the intention of a speaker in using such utterances now and then could be to encourage the other to express herself more, or it could be used as a discourse tact to access the unspoken intention of the other. Likewise, such discourse tact might, for instance, imply something about the fact that the listener might be thinking about what discourse acts to use, or how to react to her co-participant's utterance, or it could be to try to identify her participant's weakness. A further point is that such features might be used as a means to get think-time for the next utterance or to let the speaker exhaustively express her ideas through which the listener could readjust her next step or utterance.

As the conversation is getting more and more serious, the language and tone of each participant is becoming stronger. The linguistic features used at this point appear hard and touchy. And this is followed by overlapping utterances where none of them is listening.

In some cases, the conversation turns into overlapping chats, especially whenever an interlocutor raises some touchy family or background stories related to their life. Seemingly, the relatively calm conversation turns into chaos whenever the listener senses that the point raised could affect her intention or moral aspects. So, it seems that the listener understands the intention of the speaker in the utterance so that the listener tries to counteract or interfere and disrupt the conversation. In this sense the motive could be not to hear points that could make the listener change her mind or it could be to divert the other's intention and make her change her utterances.

Extract 5:

A: Oh! I' m very sorry, Ketemash.

K: There is nothing you're to be sorry about.

● *(Both 'A' and 'K' begin chatting together- no one listens.)*

A: Let me tell you something.

K: Ihi

A: We are your children though you didn't give birth to each of us. The children who 'Amiiyee' (Amene) gave birth to...

K: Ihi

A: are your children; aren't?

● *(Both 'A' and 'K' began chatting together- no one was listening.)*

As it is exemplified in the above extract, Speaker 'K' disrupts the conversation, perhaps because she understands the intention of Speaker 'A' ahead of her further utterances. So, it

would seem that Speaker 'K' senses the risk of allowing Speaker 'A' to continue her utterances in the way that it could affect her moral judgments. This implies that participants who engage in an argumentative conversation may sense the intention of the other in advance and then take action to interrupt the conversation or to divert the approach of the speaker.

C) Perlocutionary Acts

The perlocutionary acts practiced in this conversation are characterized by utterances which result in rebuff or refusal reaction from the listener. Both participants appear indifferent in the course of argumentation whatever reasons and persuasive methods used by an interlocutor. In addition, each appear defiant and then rising challenging and counteract to refute the other's opinions or suggestions. Let us, for example, consider this excerpt:

Extract 6:

K: It was nothing. What was done means nothing for people of the same blood.

A: Yes!

K: It's just minor thing.

A: I, now, never leave that house! Ehhi... now it's mine.

K: You mean Sisay even couldn't buy the house?

A: I.... any way..... Yes, she can't.

K: It's Asnake's house; you think you live in the house?

A: So, what would you like to do?

● *(Both began chatting together- no one was listening.)*

In the above extract, when person 'K' says, 'I now never leave the house. It's mine.' In this instant, firstly, the word 'leave' was pronounced out or stressed in the utterance of the speaker. Secondly, the word 'never', could signal the strongest reaction of the speaker and so little is expected to negotiate on the case. As a result, it is apparent that Speaker 'K' reflects unfolding and perhaps, firm stand about the house. And this happens when Speaker 'A' raises their close family relation as an approach to make the other change her firm stands about the house. However, Speaker 'K' reacts differently.

Most often, whenever a participant speaks something which appears against the intention of the other, the conversation becomes disordered and turns into hot and unmanageable chatting. To illustrate this, let us take the following extract of the conversation.

Extract 7:

K: I know how much it is.

A: No matter how much you spent, you will be compensated. She...

K: Why was it repaid for me? If I didn't succeed, you would ignore me.

A: What?

K: If I didn't succeed, you all would ignore me.

A: What.... What did you say?

K: If I didn't succeed, weren't others laughing at me?

A: If you lost the money, what is the matter, you did it for your brother's children.

● (Both *began chatting together- no one was listening.*)

K: If you lost the money, Ketemash? Asnake himself left the money behind and passed away.

Today, why do you involve in such money-minded case?

● (*Overlapping Speech; just chatting together.*)

A: Any way, Ketemash, let me tell you.

As can be seen from Extract 7, Speaker 'K' appears hot-tempered and a bit emotional whenever her co-participant says something which seems against her intention. Seemingly, Speaker 'K' does not have the intention to leave the house that is why most often the smooth flow of ideas and communication turns into chaos and overlapping talks. Even more to the point, as Speaker 'K' reacts passionately and sensitively, Speaker 'A' appears that she could not clearly understand what was said, and that is seemingly why Speaker 'A' was asking the question 'What?' repetitively.

Moreover, as the conversation is being extended, the participants fail to collaborate and propose a solution to the cause of the argument. This implies that whatsoever reasons and discourse acts used by a participant engaged in the conversation, the co-participant appears resistant rather than submissive to other's utterances. As a result, most of the utterances of both participants raise disagreement and even further counteracts in the process of the interaction.

3) Supra-linguistic Features

i) Stress

It has been found that the participants tend to reflect their opinions and intentions using some supra-linguistic features like stress or tone. In this sense, stress, for example, is meant to imply the intention of a speaker though it appears contained. In K's turn, for example, the utterances such as '*In fact, this is a big lie!*' and '*I, now never leave that house*' or (እንደውም ይህ ትልቅ ውሸት ነው; ያንን ቤት አሁን እኔ አለቀውም), the first underlined phrase and the later underlined word were pronounced with more powerful utterance. This indicates that the speaker has emphasized or stressed the underlined phrase and word.

In this case, we had better pay attention to not only what was said but also the way the word was said or pronounced. The way the word was pronounced might reflect the very concern of the speaker. Moreover, it could express the very intention of the speaker as the word was said

with greater stress and louder tone. Significantly, this could imply that the speaker might appear hot-tempered, or emotional, or it could signal the acts the speaker tends to reflect on the case.

ii) Intonation

The result of the study shows that some utterances in the process of conversation were pronounced with a rising tone. It seems that some utterance, like '*How come!*' (አንዴህ!) with a rising intonation may not only signal the breakdown in a speaker's expectation, but also it may have the power to divert the mood of the interaction. Let us, for instance, consider this extract:

Extract 8:

A: They said something: Ketemash wants to buy the house.

K: Right.

A: Is it true!?

K: Yes, it's true.

A: How come!?

K: Say why?

A: Ihi

K: It has reason.

A: What is the reason behind; let you tell me.

As can be noted from the above extract, the utterance: '*How come!?*' does not only an enquiry, but also it signifies surprise. The speaker may make this utterance because the response she expects from her interlocutor may not be responded in the way she expects. As it was uttered with a rising tone, it could signal the breakdown in the speaker's expectation. Considerably, from that point onwards, the moods and the verbal behaviours of the participants gradually change the discourse tactics and the nature of the interaction. As a result, the conversation appears more and more argumentative.

It would, therefore, sound that in some case, supra-linguistic features such as stress, intonation or tone are meant to be used as a discourse tactic to dominate others speech instead of using directive utterance to listen to each other.

4) Syntactic Patterns

The following features of syntax exemplify the syntactic characteristics of utterances used in this conversation.

A) Sentence Types

It has been witnessed that various sentence functions are exercised in this conversation. Though the predominant mode of interaction is characterized by informative, eliciting

utterances, incomplete and to some extent instructive sentences, it seems that there are almost all varieties of sentences types.

- i) **Declarative:** (I went on; That was failed; she, too, knows the way to be used; We are your children though you didn't give birth to each of us, etc)
- ii) **Interrogative:** (Are you in Nazareth?; Is it true?; couldn't Sisay even buy the house? What? etc)
- iii) **Imperative:**
 - **Request:** Give me chance; shall I tell you the truth; I request you in the name of Trinity, etc)
 - **Suggestion:** (let you tell me; Let me tell you something; Let everything happens)
 - **Command:** (Just listen to me; wait; Forget that; Enough!)
- iv) **Exclamatory:** (How come!; Oh! I'm very sorry, Ketemash!
- v) **Conditional Sentence:** (If I didn't succeed, you all would ignore me; If you lost the money, Ketemash; If you fear God...., etc.)

In addition, there are some features characterized by elliptical or fragments as exemplified below:

'Today, you...; The money I spent on it....; You now Asnake....; I couldn't.; You let her..., etc)

B) Sentence Structures

i) Mono-transitivity

Most of the sentences used in this conversation are characterized by mono transitive sentence forms though there are a few mono-intransitive sentences. Consider this example:

- *Let me tell you something.*
- *They did not raise this issue to me.*

ii) Mono-intransitivity

- *Tadesse and others came lately.*
- *She, too, knows the way to be used.*
- *I have sacrificed myself.*

The use of mono-transitive or intransitive sentences could imply that the participants were mainly using short sentences. More typically, this could entail that the participants tired to express their ideas momentarily, or it was because there were intermittent and sudden interruption of speech before the speaker completed her idea.

ii) **Voice:** Most sentences used in this conversation are active sentences. Yet, there are some passive sentences. Consider the example given below:

- *This should not be talked about.*
- *Yet, how was she allowed to live in this house?*

iv) **Mood:** Most sentences appear in declarative or indicative moods modality. Yet, there are also interrogative moods with and without modality. Consider this example:

● **Interrogative Moods with Modality**

Examples: - *Are you Ketemash?*

- *Is it true?*
- *Couldn't this be something great?*
- *Did she request you to live in the house?*
- *Do you know what Tadesse and others told us recently?*
- *You're biased towards your sister, aren't you?*

● **Interrogative Moods without Modality**

Example: - *How?*

- *What?*
- *In here, Alembanch?*
- *You think you live in the house?*
- *Enough; leave it, Okay?*

v) **Reported Speech:** (*He said they didn't give her the promise that she would buy the house; they told her that let's, first, be clear about it; He said they didn't give her the promise that she would buy the house.*)

In line with the grammar, it appears that a great number of sentences are used in past time form. This is so, perhaps, the fact that the participants tried to give more time and value to describing the very background and reasons related to the topic of argument. Each of them tried to cite their own reasons and evidences that they might think lead to success or negotiable point in the process. Besides, they tried to link the topic of argument to their past life and family history.

C) Cohesion

The result of the analysis of the conversation shows that the main cohesive devices used are:

i) Anaphoric, Cataphoric and Exophoric References

Let us consider the following extract to identify Anaphoric, Cataphoric and Exophoric References

Extract 9:

A: Hello? Are you Ketemash?

K: Yes.

A: I'm Alembranch; thanks to Him, you get to the holiday safely.

K: Thanks, you too get to the holiday, Alembranch.

A: Are you all right?

K: Thanks to God.... Are you in Nazareth?

A: I'm not; I'm in Addis Ababa.

K: Are you all right?

A: I'm all right, thanks to God... something. Hmm... Tadesse and others came lately....

K: Ihi

A: They said something. Ketemash wants to buy the house.

The above extract contains anaphoric, cataphoric and exophoric references as shown below.

● **Anaphoric:** (I, you, they, yes)

● **Cataphoric:** (something)

● **Exophoric:** (Him)

ii) Linguistic References:

Let us consider this extract to identify some of the linguistic references exploited in the conversation.

Extract 10:

A: We mean, your children. Amiiyee's children are your children.

K: Yes, yes.

A: Though he is not alive, he replaced us for you.

K: Right.

A: Before, when we were in poverty, no one remembered us.

K: Today, you...

A: Wait, let me finish. Please, in the names of your mother, let me finish.

K: Not to say that; you...

Some of the linguistic references in the extract are:

- 'children' refer to 'we'
- 'your' refers to 'K'/Ketemash'
- 'yes, yes' refers to 'you're my children'
- 'he' refers to 'Amiiyee'
- 'that' refers to 'when we were in poverty, no one remembered us'
- 'me' refers to 'A/ Alembranch'
- 'Today' perhaps, refers to 'when we are self-sufficient'
- 'before' refer to 'when we were in poverty'

iii) Ellipsis: Consider this extract:

Extract 11:

A: Hello? Are you Ketemash?

K: Yes.

In the above extract, the speaker uses ellipsis in saying 'Yes.' In here, 'Yes' refers to ' I'm Ketemash..

iv) Conjunctions

As it is more of an argumentative conversation, the dominantly used conjunctions are contrasting conjunctions (like *but, yet, however, no matter how, though, even if*), additives (like *and, too, also, moreover, in addition, furthermore*), and result conjunctions (like *so, as a result, therefore*).

5) Conversation Maxims

As to the result of the analysis, there witnessed that maxims of politeness is greatly respected and employed to draw the attention of a co-participant in the conversation. It even sounds that the attempts to maintain maxims of politeness throughout the conversation makes the interaction to end more or less peacefully. Moreover, it helps the participants to come back to their sense whenever anyone tends to be emotional or hot-tempered. Let us, for example, examine how maxims of politeness are maintained in the following three extracts taken from different parts of the sample conversation.

Extract 12:

K: There's something I want to tell you...ehu..I request you in the name of Lord.

A: Wait.

K: Ihi

A: It means nothing; you'll tell me.

K: Alright.

Extract 13:

A: Wait, let me finish. Please, in the names of your mother, let me finish.

K: Not to say that; you...

A: Wait, I beg you in the name of your mother, let me finish. A person does not only support others just by giving money.

K: Ihi

Extract 14:

K: I request you in the name of Trinity! You are using harsh language.

A: I'm talking to you in love, but you....

K: With great love, I'm talking to you; Heaven knows. I'm talking to you in the truthful and sincere manner.

A: Because you are my aunt, my elder. Furthermore....

K: Ihi

A: I think you're my flesh; and as you're my flesh, I hope you think for us. And that is why I'm talking with you sincerely.

K: Al...ri....ght.

A: And, I said thinking that how could she imagine of that.

K: I never say harsh things. When I came last time....

A: Wait. Now, Sisay....

K: I never said any bad thing.

As can be noted from the above extracts, the participants try to use polite language or they try to use religious language to make anyone who appears out of the smooth norm of communication. Utterances like *'I request you in the name of Lord; Please, in the names of your mother, let me finish; I request you in the name of Trinity! You are using harsh language; With great love, I'm talking to you; Heaven knows. I'm talking to you in the truthful and sincere manner; And that is why I'm talking with you sincerely'* and so on are meant to secure maxims of politeness.

Moreover, as could be deduced from the sample, it sounds that maxims of relations and manners are sometimes exploited in the process of the interaction, especially to calm down emotional feelings and reactions. And this can be exemplified by the fact that Speaker 'A' often uses social relation or religious approaches to control her interlocutor's behaviours whenever she senses something different.

The other point is that Speaker 'A' may attempt to raise social or family issues and this may signal her attempt to employ different discourse tactics. She uses mutual contextual aspects by linking the case to their family background, perhaps, to turn away the harsh mood of the conversation to something which could soften the approach of her aunt. She raises the issue of how kind was their father and how he treated their uncle when he was alive. Consider this:

It has also been found out that maxims of quantity and quality are reflected in the utterances of the participants engaged in the conversation. As an illustration, let us scrutinize the following excerpt taken out from the conversation.

Extract 15:

A: How come!?

K: Say why?

A: Ihi

K: It has reason.

A: What is the reason behind; let you tell me.

K: Before this time, we said it was Asnake's...it means when we asked money to accomplish the case at that time, Sisay refused to give money saying she didn't have money. She claimed that we had the money to handle the case without help.

A: Ihi

K: In that case; she, too, knows the way to be used.

A: Ihi

K: I went on. That was failed. Eventually, the required people came.

A: Ihi

K: When the people came, nobody asked the case and what happened then. I told everyone about the actual situation though she did not ask me anything about the case.

A: Ihi

K: Now, after I have gone through all these and I have exhaustively tried...

A: Ihi

K: That is, I have sacrificed myself...

As noted from the Extract 15, Speaker 'K' elicits Speaker 'A' to challenge or ask her the reason way she determines to buy the house. So, Speaker 'A' enquires Speaker 'K' to reason out and explains her grounds for why she decides to take such action. Accordingly, Speaker 'K' tries to describe her rationales to reach such decision. This in turn indicates the attempts made to respect maxims of quantity in their conversation.

It has also been witnessed that the participants try to respect and entertain maxims of quality in their speech. To exemplify this point, let us consider this extract.

Extract 16:

A: Let me finish! I'll listen to yours. Just listen to me.

K: There's something I want to tell you...ehu..I request you in the name of Lord.

A: Wait.

K: Ihi

A: It means nothing; you'll tell me.

K: Alright.

A: We mean, your children. Amiiyee's children are your children.

K: Yes, yes.

A: Though he is not alive, he replaced us for you.

K: Right.

As shown in Extract 16, Speaker 'A' raises the fact that Speaker 'K's' brother's children are her children. And Speaker 'K' accepts this reality and responds positively. She even tends to magnify how much is what is said true by saying '*yes, yes*', and later saying '*right*'. So, this implies that though the two interlocutors are now in a different position regarding their opinion and stand on the issue of argument, they are less likely to deny the fact that they have had close blood-ties.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

This study tries to consider the ways in which different discourse acts and linguistic patterns are employed to enrich and elaborate certain verbal behaviours or actions. It further attempts

to analyze the tactics through which an individual tries to interweave verbal acts with linguistic or supra-linguistic features, (for example, pitch, tone), to infuse them with own feelings, actions and intentions in the process of interaction. The overall purpose of this study was to try to give hints into how language functions as an instrument of influencing the nature and direction of interaction as well as the intended behaviors and actions of participants engaged in a discourse or conversation.

The results show that the role of the participants in the conversation is not fixed. That is to say there is no as such limited position of the participants. A participant could act as an initiator of an exchange or as a responder. So, as the interaction is made up of spontaneous exchanges of utterances, we do not see, for example, transfer exchanges as mentioned by Coulthard & Asby (1976) as cited in Adegbite and Odebunmi (2006). So, information flows not only spontaneously but also bi-directionally. Seemingly, both participants retain equal status in turn-taking, initiating exchanges, responding to a move, confirming information and repairing communication gaps.

The use of some discourse tact like repeating utterances, eliciting exchanges using lexicons like okay, right, alright, yes and features like 'ihi' extend and facilitate interactions. More typically, the use of such recurring utterance might be produced so as to give the speaker more time to be self-conscious, morally-committed and more approachable to negotiate the case. It means that it might be used as discourse tact to get the speaker to employ moral judgment rather than being driven by emotional moods. Consequently, using such words or phrases could possibly imply that a participant engaged in a conversation might choose some words or expressions to influence the cognitive, moral and psychological perspectives of co-participants in a conversation.

In much the same way, the result magnifies the power of religious approach and point of view to influence other's cognitive, linguistic and verbal behaviors. It, thus, sounds that the use of religious approach as a discourse tact could pressurize a co-participant of a conversation to readjust his/her act of responding, linguistic choices, and speech acts to meet the demands of constructive interaction.

It entails that the ideology behind using religious language or mentioning the name of God over and over again in a conversation might be meant to get truthful information and intention of a person engaged in a conversation. Or, it could be used as a means to influence the other's psychology and moral aspects in order to pressurize the person to meet the religious demands of being honest.

The study also witnesses that participants of this argumentative conversation tried to employ more of constructive and polite language through which they could reach mutual understanding. Prior to this, they insistently tried to hold a genuine and reasonable conversation through which they might reach the true resolution to the argument. And to achieve this goal, different maxims of conversation like maxim of politeness, quality, quantity, manner and relation are being exploited whenever the need arises. In particular, it has been witnessed that the maxim of politeness is exploited time after time to maintain the conversation alive as a means to come to a possible way out from the conflict.

A further point is that having a smooth argumentative conversation tends to mirror a spontaneous and bi-directional flow of ideas. The conversation would appear not just transfer-exchange type, where information flows from a responding participant to an eliciting co-participant. In particular, the repetitive use of speech fillers as indicators of the continuity of a participant's speech facilitates more of an even interaction. For that reason, it is concluded that when participants in an argumentative conversation belong to same kinship, they tend to maintain relatively equal status and involvement though there happens irregularities to certain extent in terms of turn-taking, initiating exchanges and respecting maxims of conversation.

REFERENCE

- Adegbite, W. & Odebunmi, A. 2006. "Discourse Tact in Doctor-Patient Interactions in English. An Analysis of Diagnosis in Medical Communication in Nigeria." *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 15(4): 499-519.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Coupland, J. & Gwyn, R. 2003. *Discourse, the Body, and Identity*. Great Britain: Pargrave Macmillan.
- Douglas, A. Demo. 2001. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Grundy, Peter. 1995. *Doing Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Edward Arnold.
- Hatch, E. 1992. *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Jorgensen, M. and Phillips, L. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Leeuwen, Theo Van. 2008. *Discourse and Practice*. New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy. 1991. *Discourse Analysis*. Practical Perspectives. Longman
- Paul Gee, J. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. (2nd ed). London: Routledge

Slumberous, S. 2003. *What is meant by Discourse Analysis?* Stef Slembrouck.

Wooffitt, Robin. 2005. *Conversation Analysis & Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: SAGE Publications.