

Strategies Used For Persuasion in Kimuthambi

Humphrey Kiriiri Ileri Peter Kinyua Muriungi Zachary Waita Njogu 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. This study's main goal is to provide an analysis of persuasion in Kimuthambi. The objective of the study is to identify and discuss strategies used for persuasion in Kimuthambi. The study is guided by the relevance theory by Sperber and Wilson. It utilizes both 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 persuasion in Kimuthambi is mainly through the use of logical appeals, emotional appeals and sensationalism. This study enhances the analysis of Kimuthambi as a language variety and adds to the existing knowledge on strategies of persuasion in various languages of the world. In addition it enriches knowledge on the tenets of the relevance theory. Thus it contributes to crosslinguistic studies from the perspective of a unique cultural orientation.

Key words: Persuasion, Kimuthambi, Strategies, 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 persuasion in 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 strategies used for persuasion in Kimuthambi and thus contributes to cross linguistic studies in persuasion.

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 strategies of persuasion in Kimuthambi; an area of linguistic study that other scholars have not focused on.

Various studies on the strategies of persuasion have been undertaken. Rank (1988) does a pragmatic analysis of persuasion strategies in advertising and courtrooms; Hardin (2001) examines persuasive discourse in Spanish language advertising while Chakorn (2006) makes a comparative analysis of persuasion strategies in letters of request written in English by Thai speakers and by native English speakers in the Thai business context. Tang (2009) analyzes persuading speech act and Lingzhi (2010) investigates persuasion strategies commonly used by Chinese from the perspective of pragmatics. Hardin (2001), Tang (2009) and Chakorn (2006) find that the use of logical appeals and emotional appeals are the most effective strategies of persuasion. This agrees with Stiff and Mongeau (2003) who discuss 'The three Pillars of Persuasion', ethos, pathos and logos as put forward by

Aristotle. The current research sets up the strategies used for persuasion in Kimuthambi which is a different cultural set up from the studies mentioned above, in order to investigate the universality of persuasive strategies.

Previous studies on Kimuthambi include Ireri (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 main objective of this study is therefore to identify and discuss strategies used for persuasion in Kimuthambi.

Literature Review

The classics of rhetoric, 'the three Pillars of Persuasion' by Aristotle: ethos, pathos and logos are discussed by Stiff and Mongeau (2003). Ethos they posit refers to the credibility of a speaker and includes three dimensions: competence, trustworthiness, and dynamism. Agreeing that pathos refers to emotional appeals and noting that Aristotle was suspicious of too much emotional appeal, Stiff and Mongeau (2003), posit that the use of pathos continues to become more acceptable in public speaking. The third pillar of persuasion as cited by Stiff and Mongeau (2003) is logos, which refers to the reasoning or logic of an argument. They posit that speakers employ logos by presenting credible information as supporting material and verbally citing their sources during their speech.

Many of the persuasive strategies suggested by Elizabeth et al.. (2013) are utilized in this study. They discuss the use of logical appeals, emotional appeals and sensationalism among others. They argue that emotional appeals subtly play on people's emotions such as fears, insecurities and desires while sensationalism is to exaggerate and over-dramatize; to blow up an issue and provide an example like 'our hospitals have now become deadly health hazards' Logical appeals on the other hand refer to the use of an argument developed step by step with reasoning and evidence.

Pragmatic researches on persuasion have been conducted in the field of advertising and in courtrooms. Based on Cicero's classical oration and Aristotle's ethos, Rank (1988) suggests a basic persuasive formula for advertisements. His five components are attention-getting, confidence-building, desire-stimulating, urgency-stressing, and response-seeking. This study seeks to suggest a basis persuasive formula in Kimuthambi.

Barkley and Anderson (2008) studied persuasion techniques in the courtroom and found that the persuasive effect of arguments is related not only to what is said, but also to how they are said and when they are said. The current study utilizes context of utterance to identify utterances used for persuasion in Kimuthambi.

From a pragmatic perspective, Chakorn (2006) makes a comparative analysis of persuasion strategies in letters of request written in English by Thai speakers and by native English speakers in the Thai business context. The letters of request written by the native English speakers tend to be more direct, often involving a bald - on - record strategy. In contrast, in a similarly formal context, the letters of request written by Thai speakers typically use more negative politeness in that they include more indirect, deferential and self-effacing strategies. According to the Aristotelian concept of persuasive rhetoric, the letters of request written by the Thai speakers generally use a combination of logos, ethos and pathos whereas the letters of request written by the native English speakers tend to predominantly use strong logos. Logos refers to the speech itself (that is the truthfulness and authority of the speech), Ethos refers to the speakers personal character while pathos refers to the stir of the hearers emotions. These three rhetorical appeals can be regarded as persuasion strategies; this finding reveals some culture-specific differences in the persuasion strategies used in letters of request written by Thai speakers

and native English speakers. The current study seeks to establish how Kimuthambi, a language variety spoken in a unique culture achieves persuasion.

In the Chinese context, Tang (2009) analyzes persuading speech act from the perspective of the theory of Chinese face and indicates that Chinese persuasion strategies are human relation-based strategies. Lingzhi (2010) investigates persuasion strategies commonly used by Chinese from the perspective of pragmatics. These strategies include the combination of reason and emotion, analogy, encouragement, irony, praise and metaphor. This study seeks to establish whether reason and emotion are major persuasion strategies in Kimuthambi.

Gqwede (2005) investigates the characteristics of persuasion in remedial interchanges based on isiXhosa pragmatics. The study is concerned with the strategies people use when persuading targets, how targets resist and/ or comply and how influence interactions are structured and what constraints on conversation need to be taken into account. Gwede (2005) applies the gricean pragmatics model (Grice, 1975) and the theory of persuasion acknowledged by the international scholars of persuasion theory (O'keefe, 2002) and found out that the main strategy employed for persuasion is rationality. This study uses a neo gricean theory (relevance) and the speech act theory and seeks to establish the strategies used for persuasion in Kimuthambi.

Theoretical Frame Work

This study is guided by the relevance theory according to Sperber and Wilson (2002). They posit 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.

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.

Strategies Used for Persuasion in Kimuthambi

There are many strategies used for persuasion in different languages. The utterances in the communicative events that were studied are analyzed following Elizabeth, et al., (2003) and using the relevance theory by Sperber and Wilson (2002) to establish the strategies used for persuasion in Kimuthambi.

Communicative Event 1 (C1)

Communicative event one (C1) (See in appendix viii), 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 C1. 7 and C1. 8.

C1.7 *Uka urutire Ngai kiria ubangite.*
Come and give to God what you have set aside.

C1. 8 *Gwi antu bakunyaga tutuni tunini betereke benyenkwa.*
There are people who give little by little awaiting pleas.

Utterance C1.7 is a logical appeal (a strategy that provides facts and evidence) that appears like just an assertion to encourage the congregants to give, but within it persuasion is embedded. The speaker (The master of ceremony) who is an Elder in that church shares a presupposition pool with the congregants. This presupposition is the habit by most people to subdivide what they intend to give so that they give it in bits. This has been inferred from the speakers earlier and latter utterances. Utterance C1. 8 (another logical appeal) further clarifies the purpose of C1. 7: to persuade the congregants to decide what they want to give and do it at once. Sperber and Wilson's (2002) Relevance theory argues that the speaker can send certain signals aware that the hearer will optimize relevance to make the right interpretation. The speaker in making utterances C1.7 and C1. 8, was aware that the hearers will make reference to previous tedious fundraisings, where they take too long trying to coerce members to give; thus convince them with these utterances to decide and give all at once. Consider C1. 9 to C1.12.

C1. 9 *Waruta wira wa Ngai umenye nourathimirwe.*
When you serve God you will be blessed.

C1.10 *Bamwe bagatura bakionaga antu bebarathime!*
Some will just be witnessing the blessings of others

C1. 11 *Kana kabukwenda tutura kamugundani gaka?*
Or you want us to stay on this small piece of land?

C1. 12 *Tutikwenda aibu*
We don't want to shame

Utterance C1. 9 utilizes logical appeal to persuade the congregants to give towards the church project. It invokes the shared knowledge among the congregants, that those who give will be blessed, to persuade them to give their best. C1.10 is an emotional appeal that is meant to invoke a positive response though it is presented negatively. The utterance is intended to emotionally provoke the congregants to give their best so that they can avoid the consequence of not buying their own piece of land (being chased away from the public land on which the church stood). C1. 11 uses sensationalism through a rhetoric question to provoke the minds of the audience. The rationale behind it is to drive the audience to give so that they can avoid the consequences anticipated by this utterance. Utterance C1. 12 is an emotional appeal continues with the same tone; presenting the consequences of not giving, in an emotional way, to persuade congregants to actually give as much as possible. Consider C1. 16 to C1.19 .

C1. 16 *Ndiambiria na kubucokeria nkatho ni gututhura twi atongoria benu*
Let me begin by thanking you for electing us to be your leaders

C1. 17 *Bamwe benu nibanegenete ni barabara, stima na buria antu batikwandikwa*
Some of you have been complaining concerning poor roads, lack of electricity and unemployment.

C1. 18 *Tigani ndiburieni? Barabara ino yathondekwa kwina mbura*
I want to ask? Can this road be repaired during the rainy season?

C1. 19 *Burienda twitura mithanga na kagoto ikinathi na ruuji?*
You want us to deliver sand and ballast then they get swept away by rain water?

Utterance C1. 16 uses praise to position the hearer to agree with the speaker. The interlocutor has changed from the master of ceremony (a church elder), to an MCA who was a guest in this function. This interlocutor seeks identity with the people by praising them in an endeavour to persuade them in his later remarks. He is aware of the complains they have against the local leadership as evidenced in utterance C1. 17. In this utterance (C1.17), the speaker uses an assertive to show that he is aware of their concerns. This awareness is geared towards convincing them to remain patient until their issues are addressed. C1. 18 is the use of logical appeal through a rhetorical question that attempts to explain why the roads are not done as yet. Its purpose is to persuade them to remain patient aware that their concerns will be looked into at the most appropriate time, for their own good. C1. 19 is the use of sensationalism through a rhetoric question that sensationally aims at persuading the people that doing the roads during the rainy season would not have been a good idea. The roads would soon be destroyed by rain water. Lets look at C1. 20 to C1. 22.

C1. 20 *Eterani gutenie tukinathondeka njira ino ibwe buru.*
Please wait for the rains to subside the we repair this road properly.

C1. 21 *Mwena wa stima butikamake*
Concerning electricity, do not worry

C1. 22 *Ndimunenkere transformer inya na imwe ni yenu*
I have been allocated four transformers, and one is yours

Utterance C1. 20 is a logical appeal that gives the reason that necessitates the waiting. The political leader then moves on to address the concern on lack of electricity. He urges the people not to worry in utterance C1. 21 using another logical appeal and goes on to give evidence through yet another logical appeal to show that the electrification of that area was on course through utterance C1.22. This shows that logical appeals: the giving of evidence serves a great role in persuasion in Kimuthambi. Now consider C1. 23 and C1.24.

C1. 23 *Bamwe bariuga ntikwandikithia antu ba guku county*
Some are claiming that I am not recommending people from this area for employment by the county government.

C1. 24 *Mbirani onabwi. Kethwa muntu atina maratathi ri, akandikwatia*
Tell me. How can we employ people without proper qualifications?

In utterance C1. 23 the MCA using the exclusion strategy claims that only ‘some’ people are complaining. Though many people could have complained, the speaker decides to exclude the ‘bad ones’ in an endeavour to show that the majority are not complaining and thus they are satisfied with his leadership. Utterance C1. 24 is a logical appeal structured rhetorically to provoke the minds of the people so that they are persuaded that the ‘small’ group is misguided. Finally in communicative event one lets focus on C1.26 , C1. 27 and C1.31.

C1.26 *Twikaraga ndi, tukagaira ward jionthe; indi ngacoka ngeta MCA wenu
nkamwongera kanyamu*

We allocate money to all wards but later I call your MCA and give him something more

C1.27 *Watho wa mbiti uugite atia?*

What does the law of the hyena state?

C1. 31 *Riu 2017 bukaraita wira wakwa bukinarutha buria kubaterie*

In 2017 you will evaluate my performance and act accordingly

Some of the utterances by the governor are indirectly trying to persuade the audience to believe that he loves them and thus they should reciprocate by loving him, supporting him and vote him back in the next general election. He uses logical appeals in utterances C1. 26 and C1.27 to explain how he favors them and to justify why he does so. In utterance C1.31 the governor uses a logical appeal to explicitly declare his ultimate goal: To convince the people to elect him in the forth-coming general election.

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 necessitated 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.

C2. 2 *Muntu arithi gikundini agakoba mbeba njingi aiji ati atiremwa kuria
niagukama.*

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

C2.3 *Aremwa kuria akathi gikundini kingi ageukia mbeba kenda aria gikundini kiria
kiambere*

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

C2. 5 *Muntu uu atiomorerwa nyomba?*

Won't this person's property get auctioned?

C2. 6 *Rui antu betu menyerani butikaririeni twana bukirira*

Oh! My people take care so that you don't make your children cry as you cry

The main speaker in communicative event 2 was an assistant chief, who had set out to convince members of his area not to borrow irresponsibly. In utterance C2. 2, he uses an attack to demean such behavior. In utterance C2.3 he uses logical appeal to present the state of affairs among many members in his area then in utterances C2.5 and C2. 6 he utilizes sensationalism to depict the consequences of borrowing indiscriminately.

After using attack and sensationalism, the speaker turns to emotional appeals in utterances C2.7 and C.2 8, pleading with the people to stop that kind of ‘play’ and be content within their life standards. Utterance C2.9 uses sarcasm since ironically It appears to encourage the behavior that the speaker has been condemning. In this context it is actually meant to reinforce the demerits of borrowing without a proper plan thus persuade people to desist from the risky behavior.

C2. 7 *Tiganani na ichecho ino rui.*

Please stop this habit.

C2. 8 *O muntu nieganirwe ni kiria enakio rui.*

Let everyone be content with what they have.

C2. 9 *Tiga baria bagutonga batonge.*

Let those determined to get rich alone.

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.

C3. 8 *Untu uria wa bata muno ni gikeno kia jiana ino*

The most important thing is the joy of these children

C3. 9 *Tugერიენი მუწო თუბაუთირე მაუნთუ*

Let's try as much as we can to lighten their burden

C3. 10 *Na bakirathimwa, onatwi tutitigirirwa*

And we will partake of their blessing too.

Utterance C3. 8 uses generalization to persuade all not be overbearing on the bride and the bride groom as they prepare for their wedding. Utterance C3. 9 is an emotional appeal that continues to convince the hearers to make it easy for the ones marrying. Utterance C3. 10 is a sensational statement meant to reinforce the intention embedded in Utterances C3 8 and C3.9. These utterances are well understood by the hearers because all share the same presuppositions. The utterances are said in the context where a couple that is seeking the parents and society's blessings before they wed is really troubled with many demands. The hearers are able to decode this information by inferring from the prevailing situation.

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 C4.1 and C4.3 .

C4. 1 *Ajiari betu gwi gauntu tukwenda kubwereca*

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

C4. 3 *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 (grumbling).

The principal uses utterance C4. 1 as a set induction to prepare the parents for the serious matter he intended to introduce through the strategy of inclusion; showing them that they belong together 'Our parents'. Utterance C4.3 quotes authority (That the decision was done by eminent people: leaders) to validate the information being delivered. The context (grumbling from the parents), that shows discontentment inform the persuasion that follows. Consequently the principal continues trying to persuade his audience as shown in C4.4 to C4.7.

C4.4 *Mpani kanya ndibwereese kaora antu betu*

Please allow me to explain step by step our people

C4.5 *Ka mbere kwina twana twinge tukuthomera guku na tumaga kuraja muno*

Firstly there are students that commute from very far

C4.6 *Baingi bariraririrua guku nturani*

Many are spending in the villages

C4.7 *Butikwona ni kaaba tubaruthire antu a kurara ?*

Don't you think we need to accommodate them?

In utterance C4.4 the speaker emotionally appeals to his audience to listen to what he has to say. This emotional appeal is not overt in the words but from the tone and facial expression (from observation) due to the negative feedback the speaker was getting from the audience. In utterance C4. 5 the speaker uses logical appeal to

persuade the hearers; he begins by enumerating the reasons for the boarding wing. Utterance C.4 6 uses sensationalism with the aim of provoking parents and other education stakeholders. The principal uses this statement to show that the school has attracted many students beyond the locality and because the school does provide accommodation, they are accommodated by some well wishers in the villages. This is sensational and is meant to show the audience the sense in having a boarding wing. The utterance leads to the conclusion- utterance C4.7 , a logical appeal through a rhetoric question, that was meant to lead the audience into even deeper thought about the whole issue. The audience most probably must supply the answer that the speaker intends if they maximize the contextual features. The speaker will therefore have persuaded the audience. Lets see how the principal continues in his persuasive agenda in C4.8 and C4.9.

C4.8 *Untu ungi ni wa ugitiri.*

Then we have the issue of insecurity.

C4.9 *Kwi mwana atirimanine na amba aukite cukuru rukiri.*

One student encountered thieves as he came to school.

Utterance C4.8 is a logical appeal that introduces another reason that necessitates a boarding wing. This sounds logical and the audience would most likely get moved to agree with the speaker especially because insecurity was on the rise during the time of this communicative act both in the country (Kenya) and in the locality (Muthambi). Utterance C4.9 sensationally presents a case at hand and this gives the principal an upper hand in persuading the stake holders. By this time the protests (through murmuring) that were evident at the beginning of the presentation had subsided and were replaced by frequent nods and agreement responses. He gives the parents an assurance that the day session will not be affected using C4.10 and C4.11.

C4.10 *Rwangi rwa kwinukaga rutithira. Tigani kumaka.*

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

C4. 11 *O murutwa akathomera kuria akenda.*

Students will choose the form they prefer.

Utterance C4.10 is a logical appeal that aimed at assuring the parents and other stakeholders that the introduction of the boarding wing does not mean that the day wing will be closed. The utterance was necessary because the speaker was aware of many fears the parents had regarding the introduction of the boarding wing. Utterance C4.11 uses logical appeal too to extend the message communicated in C4. 10 by showing that it is possible for the two wings to operate simultaneously and that parents and students will have the privilege of deciding which one they prefer.

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 C5. 8 to C5. 11.

C5. 8 *Antu betu tumanitie kuraja muno.*

My people, we have come along way.

C5. 9 *Gatutigeni Kuriganirwa na mpwi.*

Let's not forget quickly.

C5. 10 *Twambiririe dairy ino guti na ingi guku kunthe!*

We began this dairy as a pace setter in this region

C5.11 *Ni uma kurari na kathina indi nitugukathiria.*

There has been a problem but we are addressing it

In utterance C5. 8 the speaker uses inclusive language to show that he is part of the group. He emotionally appeals to the audience not to forget their past in utterance C5. 9. This is in an endeavour to persuade the audience to change their minds. Utterance C5. 10 uses a logical appeal to show the background of the dairy thus make the audience link up with the history of the dairy hence promote ownership. The dairy official used Utterance C5. 11, which is a contention (a strategy where a speaker appears to agree with the hearers on some facts) to agree with the dairy farmers that there is a problem. Through this agreement the speaker hoped that the succeeding utterances will be accepted and that his ground will have softened to enable him persuade the audience. Subsequently in C5.12 and C5.13 he uses logical appeals by providing reasons for the low pay out rate.

C5. 12 *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?

C5.13 *Into iu nijio iratumire mbecha inyia*

That cost affected the pay rate

The speaker, in C5.12 and C5.13 explains using past interactions with the audience to bring them to the realization of the possible decline of the payout rate. The speaker invokes the presupposition pool to bring the audience to realization that they had spent lots of money to do several other things. Lets now consider the strategies the speaker use in C5.14 and C5.15.

C5. 14 *Riu niturikitie kuria buru*

We have settled the payments in total

C5. 15 *Tueni mieri iiri yonka aki bwoneni*

Please give use only two months and you will note the difference

Utterance C.5.14 uses a logical appeal to assure the farmers that things will change. This assurance is based on the reason that all the cost has been paid. Utterance C5.15 uses a logical appeal by asking for some time to rectify the problem. The logic is that –given more time (two months) the pay out rate will have improved. The speaker then changes strategy in C5.16 to C5.18.

C5. 16 *Kana uria akwenda kuthi gikundini kingi athi.*

Or if someone wants to try another group, we let them.

C5. 17 *Buria akona gutiwe akera.*

The consequences such a person will get will be serious.

C5. 18 *Tiga tumanirieni tukurie gikundi gietu.*

Lets encourage one another and grow our group.

Utterances C5.16 and C5.17 use sensationalism to try to persuade the hearers. This is a stringent strategy, a kind of last resort and the speaker seems as if he does not care; that whoever would want to leave the dairy to do so. The speaker actually cares and the implicit message is that no one should go elsewhere for those places are not safe. Utterance C5. 17 uses sensationalism to show that no other dairy is as good and so the members who would leave that one would regret. The speaker concludes with an emotional appeal to the members to stick with the group so that they can grow it together in utterance C518.

Communicative event six (C. 6) involves 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. The two groups are being represented by spokespersons, as follows.

C6.1 *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.

C6.2 *Tutiumba gwitikiria butiretere 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

Speaker A (grooms spokesman) in utterance C6. 1, uses logical appeal to persuade the brides people to allow the couple to begin planning their wedding without the full amount they were asking for. Speaker B (brides's spokes woman) insists that the amount asked must be surrendered before wedding preparations begin. The utterance C6.2 also uses logical appeal; and claims that some amounts are determined by the clan and so they cannot be changed. The conversation takes another turn in utterances C6.3 and C6.4 as follows.

C6.3 *Iukiani kiria twaruta na gikeno bukimenyagirira aana baba batikambirie uturu wao na mathina.*

Please accept what we have gladly, being careful so that these children do not begin their lives badly.

C6.4 *Tika tukurega, bwaruta ngiri mirongo ithandatu na tutinenkerete aka nombi. Ongerani ikinye Igana.*

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

In utterance C6.3 the groom's speaker applies sensationalism to try and persuade the bride's side to cede ground and make it easier for the couple. The speaker uses the contextual information known to all the participants—that when a newlywed couple spends a lot of money during negotiations and wedding preparations, they are bound to suffer financially as they begin life. In utterance C6.4 the bride's spokesperson uses logical appeal to diffuse the sensational remarks by speaker A; clearly showing that what the groom's spokesperson is talking about cannot apply in that situation. His utterance is aimed at persuading the grooms people to add more money so that all the parties involved in their negotiations can be appeased. Let us look at C6.5, C6.6 and C6. 8.

C6. 5 *Iu itioneka, ntibuenia, nonga uiki utire.*

That isn't possible, unless we postpone the wedding.

C6.6 *Tigani kwaria ugu, tibu antu baragia ugu. Bukongera jiigana?*

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

C6.8 *Ari, kinyiani kibau, kibau gionka onakaba tukongera tukagaira antu.*

Make it twenty, twenty only. We can even help you for the sake of others.

Speaker A in utterance C6.5 utilizes sensationalism to persuade the bride's people. By declaring that it is not possible to get such money; and that the wedding cannot be if the brides people continue with their demands, the grooms' people use the greatest effort to persuade or even destroy the negotiations. Utterance C6.6 uses logical appeal to show that this utterance actually worked and the hearers began to cede ground. Sensationalism therefore strongly breaks through the persuasive discourse by speaker A. Speaker B. in utterance C6.6 discourages speaker A from using such an approach but offers a solution to the stalemate. After the speaker A in utterance C6.7 (See appendix viii) insisted that they will only add ten thousands, speaker B uses an emotional appeal to persuade them to add twenty thousands in utterance C6.8 . They even promise to assist because of appeasing the clan. This is a face saving strategy which pragmatically is supposed to show that the people in group B are not that bad and that they were only executing a cultural practice. Concession is finally arrived at in utterance C6. 9. (See appendix viii).

Communicative event seven (C7) 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.

C7.2 *Nitukwenda tumurutire gantu kanini kamutethererie.*

Let us contribute something small that will help him.

C7. 3 *Mbeca jiongwa ikinyite ngiri Magana manana.*

The bill adds up to eight hundred thousand.

Utterance C7.2 is a logical appeal to persuade the hearers to give some money to aid in clearing the medical bill. Utterance C7. 3 is another logical appeal that provides the actual figure as prove that the bill is too much and so

one person or a single family cannot handle it. This should lead the members to infer that they need to give a hand as the speaker continues to substantiate further in C7.5 and C7.6.

C7.5 *Antu betu gatutethieni umwe wa jietu riu ena thina.*
Our people lets help one of us in this time of need.

C7.6 *Gutiwe utigwatwa ni thina teno.*
Anyone of us can get into such a situation.

Utterance C7.5 is a logical appeal to the hearers to assist one of their own. Utterance C7.6 then uses sensationalism to appeal to the emotions of the hearers in an endeavour to persuade them to aid a colleague. The speaker continues with this strateg in utterances C7.7 to C7.10.

C7.7 *Kana ingi muntu agwatwa ni untu akebanga ?*
Do we leave individuals to struggle alone?

C7.8 *Mauntu mama guti muntu matigwata.*
These things can affect any one.

C7.9 *Omundi ni niu, ru nigweu.*
If I am affected today, remember tomorrow is your turn.

C7.10 *Omuntu arute akimenyaga untu uu ni munene*
Let's give aware that this is a big task

The speaker who is the convener of this meeting utilizes sensationalism extensively. Utterances C7.7, C7.8 and C7.9 are all sensational. Sickness is dreaded by people in all societies and hearers in this context are no exception. The speaker takes advantage of the fact that serious sicknesses are dreaded and sensationally using rhetorical questions sometimes like in utterance C7.7 to persuade the hearers to give. Indeed it was observed that the members gave 'emotionally' after these utterances. This shows that in some contexts especially those dealing with sicknesses, deaths and burials this style may be very effective. The speaker therefore used utterance C7.10 to demonstrate the magnitude of the problem at hand so that he could persuade the audience to give.

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 using C8.3 and C8.4.

C8.3 *Ikiirani ruji ruru muno, niuntu rukabutethia.*
Support this project and you will benefit.

C8.4 *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.

Utterances C8.3 and C8.4 are logical appeals to the people to get involved with the project. The speaker provides the reason as to why the project needs support. The offer, that those who participate will pay less, given in utterance C8.4 is very effective because from other utterances (Context) it was something that had been happening. Hence a strong tool for persuasion. Consider C8.5 and C8.6.

C8.5 *Ndigwa ona kwibo batikwenda ruji rwitukira kwao. Tamaka?*
Imagine some are opposed to the pipes passing on their lands.

C8.6 *Tonga muntu emurogi?*
Unless one is a witch.

Utterance C8.5 is a direct attack on some people who could either be at the meeting or not. The speaker excludes them and attacks them very sensationally in utterance C8.6. This utterance uses sensationalism to persuade people not to tolerate such behavior. Such people may or may not be in the meeting and even if someone was in such a meeting they would save face and pretend to denounce such behavior. The statement could also be aimed at persuading those at the meeting to prevail upon those opposed to the project and did not attend the meeting. Finally on C8 lets look at C8.7 to C8.9.

C8.7 *Ka ruji rukuria mugunda uriku?*

How much land will the water pipes occupy?

C8.8 *Gwanca ona rwinjagirwa ndi muno. Gutibu rukugiria kurutha.*

Actually the pipes are placed quite deep and they can't deny you any space.

C8.9 *Ringithwa ni nkoro bai nomenye ruji ni mwoyo.*

Think again and know that water is life.

Utterance C8.7 uses a logical appeal through a rhetorical question to provoke members into seeing the folly of those who are opposed to water pipes passing through their land then Utterance C8.8 also uses a logical appeal by give a credible reason as to why such an act is unjustifiable. Finally the speaker emotionally appeals to the audience and the entire community to support the project fully; since water is very important in life in utterance C8.9.

Communicative event nine (C9) 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.

C9.5 *Mugunda ti muthuku indi milioni ni nyingi muno, iukia ngiri Magana mathandatu.*

The land is not bad but a million is too much. Take six hundred thousands.

C9.6 *Aiii, tibu migunda ikuma ugu, gokwenda kumbinyiria atia*

Ooh no! That's not the cost of land presently unless you want to under pay.

The buyer uses logical appeal in utterance C9.5 to persuade the seller to charge him less for the piece. He uses the reason that a million is too much. The seller also uses logical appeal in utterance C9.6 to dispel the buyers claim and insists that the deal is fine. Consider C9.7 to C9.9.

C9.7 *Ndutarutira bai tiga kumiria oaria wambiririe, gotukumenya twibamwe.*

Adjust downwards knowing that we are one people.

C9.8 *Ruta Magana manana turikanie indi na utikarie kairi.*

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

C9.9 *Kandute mugwanja bai na nkoro imwe.*

Let me pay seven hundred sincerely.

The buyer uses the strategy of inclusivity in utterance C9.7 to show how close relational wise he is to the seller to convince him to sell at that low price. This convinces the seller to lower the price by two hundred thousand shillings but uses an emotional appeal to the buyer in utterance C9.8 not to negotiate further. The buyer does not heed to this appeal and in utterance C9.9 he uses another emotional appeal so that the price can drop by one hundred shillings, which seems to frustrate the seller in C9.10.

C9.10 *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.

C9.11 *Muriwa ni mwene atithiraga*

You will not run broke by supporting your people

In utterance C9.10 the seller uses a sensational statement to stop the buyer from further haggling. The buyer uses a logical appeal through a proverb in utterance C9.11, to dilute the effect of the sensational utterance by the speaker and it works. The seller accepts the buyers proposal in utterance C9.12.

Communicative event ten (C 10) 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 sestings 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. Lets look at C10.2 and C.10.3.

C10.2 *Rui antu betu twiumieni turutaruteni mbeca ino.*
 Kindly our people, let us try and give more please.

C10.3 *Kana kabutikwenda antu baba bagurana?*
 Or don't you want these people to marry?

Utterance C10.2 is an emotional appeal to the committee members to give their pledges as fast as possible. In utterance C10.3 the speaker gets sensational in an attempt to persuade the committee members to expedite the process. Consider C10.4 and C10.5.

C10.4 *Onatwi gatwatethirwe, tigani tutethenagieni bai.*
 We were helped too, let us keep helping each other.

C10.5 *Kana ingi tubere beukie runi baturugire uiiki bacoke kuthina*
 Do we ask them to get a loan, to finance the wedding, and then they are left to suffer?

Utterance C10.4 is an emotional appeal while C10.5 is a sensational utterance that takes the committee members, most of whom are married, to their own wedding planning meetings. The audience is aware of the planning process and the financial constraints that the couple involved may go through during this process. The speaker then moves to suggest a solution in C10.6 and C10.7.

C10.6 *Tukendelea ugu tutikinyia mbeca itutethia*
 If we continue giving at this rate, we can't help the situation

C10.7 *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

The speaker finally uses two utterances, C10.6 and C10.7 to logically appeal to the members to honor their pledges. Utterance C10.6 does it by giving the consequence of not giving while C10.7 by declaring the way forward to solve the stalemate. Table 2 shows the summary of the strategies used for persuasion in Kimuthambi.

Table 2
Summary of the Strategies used for Persuasion in Kimuthambi

Technique	Frequency	Percentage
Logical appeal	38	45.24
Sensationalism	19	22.62
Emotional Appeal	14	16.67
Inclusive Language	3	3.57
Exclusion /Attack	3	3.57
Assertion	2	2.38
Authority	1	1.19
Generalization	1	1.19
Praise	1	1.19
Contention	1	1.19
Sarcasm	1	1.19
Total	84	100

From the ten communicative events captured for the purposes of this study, one hundred and thirty six utterances were identified and transcribed. These utterances had various techniques, as suggested by Melanie (2002) which are employed in persuasion. Using the relevance theory by Sperber and Wilson (2002) the researcher identified eight four (84) utterances used for persuasion.

From the data collected, it is clear that persuasion in Kimuthambi is mainly through logical appeals. This is a strategy that involves the use of facts and evidence to support a line of thought. The speakers used logical appeals in thirty eight (38) out of the eighty four (84) utterances used for persuasion. This accounted for (45.24 %) of the total utterances that were used for persuasion in Kimuthambi. This means that the speakers had to reason with the audience, provide evidence and support their points of view rationally. Utterances that used logical appeals usually followed those that stated various facts. For example, in utterance C1.20 below the speaker who is the MCA, tries to reason with the audience. He tells them that the reason the county government had not repaired the roads was due to the heavy rains that were pounding the area. This meant that the leaders were concerned about the condition of the roads only that the circumstances, to repair the road, were not favorable.

C1.20 Eterani gutenie tukinathondeka njira ino ibwe buru.

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

This rhymes with Lingzhi (2010) who investigated persuasion strategies commonly used by Chinese from the perspective of pragmatics and named reason and analogy as the key strategies. In this study the use of analogy, which refers to the comparing of two things in explanations, was considered to be under logical appeals and so this study agrees with Lingzhi (2010). It also agrees with Stiff and Paul (2003) who does an analysis of Aristotle's three pillars of persuasion; logos, pathos and ethos. They argue that logos refers to the reasoning or logic of an argument and that speakers employ logos by presenting credible information as supporting material and verbally citing their sources during their speech. They assert that research shows that messages are more persuasive when arguments and their warrants are made explicit.

The second main way that persuasion is achieved in Kimuthambi is through sensationalism. This is a strategy in which the speaker blows up or exaggerates an issue to arouse the extreme emotions of panic or anger in the hearer. For example 'our hospitals have become deadly health hazards' referring to a hospital that is dirty and over crowded. The speakers used sensationalism in nineteen (19) out of the eighty four (84) utterances that were used for persuasion. This accounted for 22.62 % of the total utterances used for persuasion. Sensationalism was used mostly as a last resort. That is when persuading the target became difficult the speakers would employ sensational utterances –and it worked. In utterance C6.5 for example speaker A uses sensationalism to persuade the hearers to cede ground. After much negotiation without much success he said that the groom to be could not afford more money and that the only viable option was the postponement of the wedding. That made speaker B soften his stance. (refer to utterance C6.6 in appendix viii).

C6.5 Iu itioneka, ntibuenia, nonga uiki utire.

That isn't possible, unless we postpone the wedding

These findings agree with Rank's (1988) persuasive formula for advertisements. His five components are attention-getting, confidence-building, desire-stimulating, urgency-stressing, and response-seeking. Sensationalism followed this formula though differently because the communicative events were different from the advertisements. The sensational utterances sought to 'get attention, build-confidence, stimulate desire and seek response'.

The third main way in which persuasion is achieved in Kimuthambi is through emotional appeals. Emotional appeals play on the emotions of the hearer such as fears, insecurities and desires. They manipulate the listener to take notice of issues by triggering an emotional response. The speakers used emotional appeals in fourteen out of the eighty four utterances used for persuasion in Kimuthambi. This accounted for 16.67% of all the utterances used for persuasion. Emotional appeals were done mostly after logical appeals and before sensationalism. When emotional appeals worked the speakers would not go on to sensationalism. Emotional appeals were more in communicative events that the speaker needed to get the audience into feeling for someone or towards something for instance in cases like raising money to sort a medical bill like in utterance C7.7. In this utterance the speaker through a question wants the listeners to place themselves in the victims situation.

C7.7 Kana ingi muntu agwatwa ni untu akebanga ?

Do we leave individuals to struggle alone?

Hardin (2001) examines persuasive discourse in Spanish language advertising and finds that memorability (making the audience remember the message), force (emotional and logical appeals and the strength of a message), and participation (the desire for a response or audience/hearer involvement) are primary persuasive goals. Hardin (2001) therefore posits that to achieve persuasion, the speaker has to use emotional appeals. This study agrees with the view that pathos is very important in persuasion. It establishes that Kimuthambi utterances utilize emotional appeals in a big way, second only to logical appeals, to achieve for persuasion. Stiff, B and Paul A (2003) posit that Pathos refers to emotional appeals. They note that Aristotle was suspicious of too much emotional appeal, yet this appears to have become more acceptable in public speaking. Indeed stirring emotions in an audience is a way to get them involved in the speech, and involvement can create more opportunities for persuasion and action (Stiff & Paul, 2003).

Other ways through which speakers sought to persuade their hearers in the utterances collected were use of: inclusive language (3 utterances 3.57%), assertions (2 utterances 2.38%), authority, generalization, praise, contention and sarcasm each 1 utterance accounting for 1.19 %.

As seen in this discussion, persuasion in Kimuthambi is mainly achieved through the use of logical appeals, sensationalism and emotional appeals. It is rarely achieved through the use of inclusive language, assertions, generalization, and contention among other strategies suggested by scholars in the field of persuasion. This study establishes that persuasion in Kimuthambi usually begins with the use of logical appeals. If persuasion is achieved then no further strategies are employed and if not the speaker would follow the logical appeals with emotional appeals. If persuasion is not achieved the speaker would finally use sensational utterances and these would work most of the time. The hierarchy of persuasion in Kimuthambi can therefore be postulated as follows: logical appeals – emotional appeals – sensationalism.

Summary

Persuasion is inherent in every day communication in Kimuthambi and it involves several strategies. The strategies vary due to context and other cultural phenomena, hence the impetus for this study.

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 %).

Firstly, persuasion in Kimuthambi is achieved mainly through the use of logical appeals. Logical appeals are utilized in thirty eight (38) out of the eighty four (84) Utterances which accounts for (45.24%).

Secondly persuasion in Kimuthambi is achieved through sensationalism. The speakers used sensationalism in nineteen (19) out of the eight four (84) utterances that were used for persuasion which stands at (22.62%).

Thirdly persuasion in Kimuthambi is achieved through the use of emotional appeals. The speakers used emotional appeals in fourteen (14) out of eighty four (84) utterances, accounting for 16.67 %. The hierarchy of persuasion in Kimuthambi is established as: the use of logical appeals followed by emotional appeals then sensational utterances.

Conclusion

Persuasion in Kimuthambi is mainly through logical appeals, sensationalism and emotional appeals.

Suggestion for Further Studies

Persuasion is dependent on culture and culture is highly embedded in a language. This study recommends studies that compare persuasive strategies between languages of different cultures.

References

- 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.
- 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.
- Hornby, A., Cowie, A. & Lewis, J. (2005). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Ileri, H. (2011). *Misinterpretations in English-Kimwambi 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson. D. (2002) *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford. Blackwell.
- Stiff, B & Mongeau, P. (2003). *Persuasive Communication*, 2nd ed. New York: Guilford Press.