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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Storytelling in traditional African societies was and remains a significant social event. The storytelling events enable members of many African communities to interact with each other on both social and political levels. These two levels of interaction allow members of each social group to exchange ideas on many levels of communication. Perhaps most central to the interaction process, for communicative purposes, within performed events is the persuasiveness of the narratives themselves. The persuasiveness of the events is appropriated, contextualized, framed, and locally occasioned by the speaker, to emotionally and psychologically move the audience's perceptions of the events narrated. The interpretive part of the events is achieved by evaluating the frame and the context of the story that reveals the diverse moral lessons each narrative seeks to display. Morality in this respect is presented within the entertainment frame in order to avoid direct confrontation. Inasmuch as morality is partially sanctioned during the performance events, the entertainment aspect of all performed and casual social events is not completely overshadowed.

My great interest and thrust has always been to examine and evaluate the persuasive implications of traditionally performed events of storytelling and locally occasioned conversational narratives.
Additionally, I am concerned with how stories are framed and how the frame itself reveals attitudes of the teller in reference to his/her audience and the tale. The attitudes extrapolated make explicit the indirect nature of teaching morality in an informal manner through storytelling. Apparently, the understanding of a narrative is merely an operation of intentionality which, however, becomes visible to the reflective glance.

When tellers narrate their stories, they are usually under the constraints to please and entertain their audience and, at the same time, tellers are supposed to acquire some kind of satisfaction from what they are doing if they are to emotionally and actively involve the audience. Due to my interest in strictly performed and casual conversations, I am going to embark on a quest to examine social gathering events arranged by East African students. It is common knowledge that when people gather together socially, they engage themselves in talk. The objective of this quest is to reveal how people convey attitudes and morals as communicated informally in a setting characterized by entertainment. Although the talk they are engaged in are restricted to each participant’s offering a single utterance or a narrative, talks are determined by the negotiation of principles of conversation. Most often, speakers/tellers are compelled to search deep down into their souls in order to find something to share with those present, however, speakers might appear to be superficial.
Therefore, not knowing whether the material to be utilized will
teach morality, as far as talk is concerned, I decided to study a group
of East African students predominately from Kenya and Tanzania who are
studying in the United States of America. The objective being to
illustrate that these students communicate their attitudes and values
to one another indirectly in order to avoid confrontation.

It is apparent from the data collected that these students have
developed social circles that allow them to socialize informally with
one another. These social gatherings serve as occasions and
opportunities for them to engage in activities that reflect their
African ethnicity in a reflexive manner that I will refer to as
"A-Journey-Back-To-The-Homeland." The social gatherings are enriched
with oral motifs and specific cultural customs imported from East
Africa, practiced and relived in the United States. These customs, for
these students, represent the maintenance of Africanism. These
students symbolically revisit their homeland through festivals
expressed, practiced and celebrated in music, dancing, beer drinking,
chicken-and-goat-roasting. In addition, the central art form as
vividly observed in all these "get-togethers" is the storytelling
contest keyed by a traditional motif in the sense of narrative content
and more generally in themes found in expressive cultures from verbal
to customary behavior. This contest not only challenges the
participants' language competence, but also tests their knowledge of
what makes a tale a good narrative and the techniques used in order to
make it tellable.
Research Goals and Objectives:

The primary objective of this research is to investigate how East African students studying abroad still maintain some of their traditional and cultural values through storytelling from their African communities as they can best remember. Using performance-centered theories defined by Richard Bauman and conversation analysis concepts suggested by Erving Goffman, I will argue that conversational narratives are designed to impact the audience's perceptions regarding the values implicitly and explicitly indicated in the narratives. As such, it is essential to bear in mind the following questions that are the backbone of this study: "Are conversation and traditional narratives indexical of social change within the society?" or "Are their persuasive implications inherent in the indirectional form of transmission?"

This study is synchronic and not diachronic in nature since it analyzes the dynamics of storytelling performances as expressive behavior within a particular performance context. The synchronic analysis in this respect is centered upon the interpersonal relationships of the persons who narrate, their cultural etiquette, the immediate social context in which they narrate, their traditional repertoire, and their performance techniques.

This study also seeks to evaluate the issues of code-switching utilized by these participants. As a point of departure from the "conversational" performance-centered approach to folklore, I will incorporate the sociolinguistic approach to conversational narratives
rather than being strictly bound by artistically performed stories.

This study contributes to research on folklore since it investigates aspects of communicative competence relevant to the production of language in an informal setting. The interaction of the performer and his audience in the construction of the turn-taking at a speech event plays a significant role in shaping the events that take place. As such, a look at how East African students studying abroad maintain their African etiquette will encourage one's appreciation for African orality. As a scholarly work, this project brings a new dimension to folklore studies. The new concepts that this study will address involve the use of "indirectional speech" in oral narratives.

This study challenges interactional approaches to the social organization of behavior. A special focus of the work will be gained from Erving Goffman's text Frame Analysis, and Richard Bauman's Verbal Art as Performance. Goffman develops a method of analysis that examines "strips of talk," unlike Bauman who evaluates the basic keys a performer utilizes in the art of storytelling. Both these scholars' works make it possible for me to examine a performance as an event within its contextual setting and the style a teller chooses to tell his/her tale for entertainment and persuasive purposes. My primary interest in Goffman's method concerns the style he suggests for the analysis of talk and what happens in the process of talk. His hypothesis considers what occurs in a situation in which there are two or more speakers engaged in a dialogue. He asserts that the speaker involved in a conversation recounts events to his listeners by using
the following concepts:

1. Replay: When tellers are engaged in their artistic web of storytelling, they are usually constrained to exhibit their best performance. To effectively draw and capture the audience's attention, "good" tellers occasionally dramatize their telling by using what Goffman has referred to as a replay style of narration. By definition, a replay is a dramatized form of narration equivalent to running off a tape of the past experience. In an actual event when a speaker is talking, "the listeners can emphatically insert themselves into, vicariously re-experiencing what took place" (Goffman 1974:504).

2. Suspense: The success of a "good" story is based on how much its teller can be able to distribute the suspense action of the story throughout the story. Suspense by nature roughly locates the climax and precedes and delays it. Functionally, suspense keeps the audience interested in the story not by suspending the actions, but extending them. Katherine Young, a student of Goffman's, suggests the importance of suspense in the performance of stories. Young illustrates that suspense should be perceived as "one of a potentially unlimited set of consequential and inconsequential
elements that intervene between the appearance of the hairy hand and the consequences of that utterance. The extension of action projects the hunt for climax beyond the nap into the second half of the story" (1987:217). As such, when performers willingly suspend or withhold information from the audience, the audience is put in a fix whereby they are at the mercy of the speaker. If the teller successfully attains his motive, the narrative can then be evaluated by the listener as being good, funny, or scary.

3. Retelling of a story: One way tellers must consider the relationship between their listeners and the events to be recounted is in terms of the listeners' prior familiarity with the events or previous tellings. Most often, tellers might ask the audience, "Do you know the one about...?" If the audience's response is "Yes," the teller may be compelled to tell the story or search for a different kind of story unfamiliar to the audience. In telling the story, the teller must maintain his proper relationship to his tale. The teller must also tell it as if it is his first telling if he has told it before, depending on his audience, because effective performance requires first hearing and not first telling.
4. Setting up: Most of the background information necessary for understanding a story is provided in the preface that occurs immediately before the events are recounted. Not all of the story is set up in the preface. The preface sets the background upon which events in the story are to be based.

5. Reported speech: When tellers narrate their stories, they demarcate the tale from the real world by placing it in a story realm, where story realm refers to the "intersubjective world of sociality and communication, an enclave in conversation, one orienting to another realm, the Taleworld. Tellers and hearers are directed to the taleworld by the story, that direction originating in the realm of social interaction and susceptible to its strategies" (Young 1987:16). The strategies utilized by tellers, like quotations or brackets, sets the boundaries between the real world and the fictionalized world. Tellers use brackets/quotations in order to stand in a reduced personal responsibility for what they are saying in the story world. In a way, it is a teller’s way of separating himself or herself from the subject of the story she/he is telling.
From this summary of Goffman's key concepts, we can begin to see some of the inadequacies of his method. While Goffman's method is useful for studying conversational narratives in the United States, it is not sufficient for the study at hand because it focuses mostly on conversational narratives, and it does not consider other forms of talk that occur within a conversation, such as ideophones. Ideophones can be defined as meaningful paralinguistic sounds used as demonstrators in Swahili to intensify the action of the verb. Mphande has demonstrated that Bantu languages, like Swahili, have a dominant use of ideophonic constructions than any other language (Mphande 1992). For instance, the frequent use of intensifiers like "Papu Papu" sounds made when trading and "Chaaaa" sounds made when urinating, used by Beto in his narrative (see appendix A), intensifies the action being performed. Mphande has also claimed that ideophones and ideophonic constructions are very prevalent in the African oral narrative mode. I contend that ideophones are central to the study of African narratives because they give a tale its rich demonstrative colors. Ideophones are used effectively and sometimes abstractly within the narrative in the course of a direct talk.

Many scholars like Lupenga Mphande and Kunene Maduka Samarin, who have examined ideophones in African literature, have been fascinated by their functional nature that cannot be easily translated in European languages. These scholars suggest that:
(a) the dramatic nature of ideophones is inherent in its ability to intensify situations in a narrative;
(b) ideophones encourage the audience to develop a mental image that the sound produces;
(c) the ideophones' expressiveness is its ability to fuse sound and meaning and they can also enter directly into the logical representation of a sentence;
(d) at times, the majority of ideophones have nothing to do with irritative sounds; in fact, ideophones are much more involved with evoking a sense for movements and gestures, vivid situations and attitudes, emotions and feelings, colors, presence and absence of sound (Mphande 1992:118-122).

Therefore, I suggest that Goffman's methods are restrictive in nature, and like other kinds of interactional analysis, they concentrate on strips of scripts as opposed to examining vital contextual information that gives a text its macro or broader meaning. My study, however, diverges from the interactional analysis in its explicit focus on values or what might be called a "politics of everyday life interactions." In fact, it departs from the works of Goffman and his colleagues on the sequential organization of conversation, and examines some previously unexamined features of this process such as ideophones common in African tales. It will be part of my project to talk about the limits and the virtues of social interaction as both methodology and analysis. The new issues that this
study will address are several:

1. Cultural Context: The understanding of a society's cultural background and a knowledge of its social structure helps to set the context upon which scripts of talk can be analyzed. The context provided in each segment of a speech act presents a stage upon which proper interpretation of any text can be based. In addition, it allows a scholar to address the macro studies of a whole society as opposed to just a scripted talk.

2. What special colors do ideophones add to storytelling? (Special attention will be paid to the audience and narrator participation.)

3. The art of storytelling is continually reinvented in everyday life through conversational and traditional narratives. Both the traditional and conversational narratives set the ground for shaping the behavior of the members of the society by the use of "indirectional talk." I describe indirectional talk as a unique form of talk employed by the East African students to indirectly address a behavioral problem without offending the members of their emic group.

4. How does code-switching affect the transmission of oral narratives?

As earlier indicated, interactional analysis has often been referred to as micro. On the surface, the designated assumption originates from the fact that most interactional analysts work on short strips of behavior, often only a few seconds of time. The basic stress
of interactional analysis addresses only the strips of behavior and fails to focus on the real constraints on people’s lives which macro studies of whole cultures do. However, in this study, the macro focus is very specific since it refers to morals and values as opposed to whole cultures. The emergence of performance and contextually centered understandings of folklore as a social behavioral process and situated communicative process partially departs from interactional analysis theories.

The emergence of the performance-centered approach, beginning with Bauman’s *Verbal Art as Performance*, emphasizes that "performance is an organizing principle that comprehends within a single conceptual framework, artistic act, expressive form, and esthetic responses, and that does so in terms of locally defined, culture specific categories and contexts" (Limon & Young 1986:438). Bauman (1986) expresses the need for the folklorists to integrate the performance-centered approach with the social structure and a wider cultural context even as they center their attention on artful communication. As a summation of the emergence of this approach, Limon & Young indicate that:

The performance-centered approach to folklore has been recognized as the leading theoretical force in contemporary folkloristics. It has led to the welcome reconceptualization of the traditional concepts of "folk," "folklore," and "tradition." At the heart of this reconceptualization is an embedded rethink of culture, society, and the individual. No longer a superorganic force that
compels the individual, culture is now seen as a framework within which individuals strategically select and express their identities as social beings. The performance of folklore is vital to this dynamic interaction. Therefore, the ethnographic analysis of this total interrelationship should be the goal of a fully adequate performance folkloristics (Limon & Young 1986:455).

This study will incorporate the cultural aspects of storytelling employed by the East African students in their narrative style with the already existing theories and concepts of interactional analysis and the performance-centered approach to folklore. The immediate context of the talk will give the scripts of talk its social and cultural meaning.

Using a micro analysis of the collected data, I will establish that educated East Africans communicate and understand each other effectively even if they use English and Swahili as their languages of communication interchangeably. The narratives they tell through the use of English and Swahili have to be appropriated within the context of their application if they are to embody any meaning for all the members of the ingroup community.

**Storytelling Contexts:**

The data employed in this research were gathered during the summer of 1991 at Rantoul and Urbana/Champaign in Illinois. The events that took place during this gathering represent many of the social events I
attended that summer. The Urbana/Champaign social gathering was an ideal setting for these students to take a quick "Journey-To-Their-Homeland." The narratives that I collected have two macro contexts of storytelling keyed by two distinct cultural markers indigenous to the East African communities. The two storytelling contexts are systematically marked by the goat-and-chicken-roasting that serve as actual events in the context of verbal duelling. The two events occurred on two different occasions that serve as the contexts that precipitate the storytelling performance event. Within each macro context, there are micro contexts that key each narrative event. Each narrative, as will be later indicated, has specific motifs such as music, alcohol, urinating, food and women. All the narratives are male oriented especially since most of the participants are men. The narratives expose esoteric masculine cultural points of view on music, women's inadequacies and the impact of alcohol on people. Although my presence (as a woman) in the audience may not have seemed to affect the narratives told, it did in some way influence the narratives elicited. This influence is a principle of ethnographic research since I was a researcher and part of the audience. My role as a researcher orchestrated the events that took place by naming the genre of stories that were of a particular interest to my research. At the same time, all the stories told by these men were geared towards impressing me through the display of their masculinity since I was the only female participant.
Besides the aspects mentioned above, all the participants of the storytelling performance used two distinct languages in the narratives they told. The languages employed were English and Swahili used both as marked and unmarked languages of communication. According to Carol Scotton, the primary language is usually the "unmarked" language. The unmarked choice of a language refers to "a set of maxims which participants in a conversation use to calculate conversation implicatures about the balance of rights and obligations which the speaker proposes for the present speech event" (Scotton 1988:160).

Thus, the unmarked rights and obligations set a mode for a conventionalized exchange. A conventionalized exchange is any interaction for which speech community members have a sense of "script." Members of a society have this sense of script because such exchanges are frequent in the community to the extent that their medium is routinized (Scotton 1988:152).

The language employed during the performance brings into question the use of code-switching and code mixing among the group of men who participated. All the communicative exchanges that occurred consisted of specific participants, a code choice, and similar rights and obligations that struck a balance between the participants. During the performance, these men integrated their micro-individual aspects with the macro-collective levels of bilingual and multilingual communication to interact with each other. Itesh Sachdev and Richard Bourhis define code-switching as "the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation" (Sachdev and Bourhis 1990:293). All
the individuals who participated in this project used both English and Swahili interchangeably within a single/same utterance. It was observed that these individuals elicited four different forms of code switching that will be discussed later in detail: (a) situational switching, (b) metaphorical switching, (c) code mixing, and (d) style shifting.

Procedures and Analytic Method:

Using methods of social interaction theory, I collected narratives from East African students told in an informal setting at Urbana/Champaign as earlier indicated. Within Conversation Analysis Studies, stress has been placed on the use of materials gathered in a natural setting in everyday interaction by means of audio and video recording equipments. In this study, the data collection was completed by the use of a tape recorder, field notes, and interviews. The recorded material was then followed by interviews with the informants in order to see if the message intended by the speakers was accurate, or perhaps if my interpretation of the intended message was accurate. However, their denial of my accuracy does not necessarily imply that the interpretations drawn from the narratives were inaccurate.

Prior to taking the trip to Urbana/Champaign, I had mentioned to Ngere, who had previously visited us, that I was interested in collecting traditional narratives for my dissertation project. His first reaction was, "I don’t know how to tell traditional stories, but I have this friend called Juma who is a very good storyteller." He
told me that if I was interested, I should go to Urbana and visit him and his friends. Therefore, we (a group of East African students) made arrangements to go to visit them. On July 27, 1991 we left Columbus for Urbana. Upon arrival, we were warmly welcomed by Ngere to a hearty breakfast of eggs, sausage, hash browns, and beans. The festivities had begun. After breakfast, we went to Rantoul, a town near Urbana, to buy a goat that was roasted for this occasion. When we returned home, I took out my tape recorder and indicated to everyone present that I was interested in collecting conversational narratives. They all reacted positively to my request because they are all scholars who have done a lot of research in their respective fields. They were eager to know how I was going to utilize the data I gathered. I told them that I was going to examine their storytelling techniques/style and their language use. On this day, one of my friends, Makanyaga, handled the recorder because he was fascinated by the idea of collecting people's conversation. I was sitting right beside him and supplied him with the empty cassette tapes to continue the recording. The tape recorder was not hidden from the participants. They did not pay any attention to the recorder; and therefore, the recorder was not a distraction to the participants. In addition, I had plenty of empty tapes that allowed me to record most of the conversations taking place.

The fact that I was a participant in the events that were taking place reveals a unique facet of my analysis. The advantages of my role as a participant in the narratives collected gave me an opportunity to evaluate the stories as a member of this temporary community (or
insider). The fact that these people knew each other well and had previous historical connection with each other enabled them to tell stories of their past personal experiences in other geographic locations other than Urbana/Champaign. The shared cultural knowledge and understanding of my informants’ ethnic background paved a way for me to see the complexity of language choice and usage among bilingual speakers, where more than one language was used for communicative purposes. The encoding and the decoding of the signified word or language choice called upon the acquired negotiation of interaction among the speakers. In this respect, the broader question addressed will be: Is code-switching a subset of figurative language?

Dissertation Outline:

The work is divided into four major sections -- The Metamessage of a Frame, A Talk About Talk, Code-switching Among East African Students, and Rhetorical Implications of Conversational Narratives -- structured and framed by the introduction and a conclusion that wraps-up the entire work. The introductory section consists of one chapter that gives a detailed discussion of the aims of the work, the methodological procedures of data collection, and the theoretical framework for the analytical method. The chapter on the metamessage of a frame illustrates in-depth the theoretical and practical application of frame analysis concepts. Similarly, the performance-centered approach to the narrative style is embedded in the analytical methodology. Under the broader category of a frame are other sub-sections within the chapter
devoted to the performers and their narrative style: (a) A Frame of a Narrative (a theoretical definition), (b) The Social Community, (c) The Narrator and His Repertoire, and (d) The Narrative Style: A Case Study of Two Narrators and Their Narrative Style.

"A Talk About Talk: Interlocutors and Their Tales" is a didactic section that exclusively portrays the performers in their artistic web of storytelling. All of the performers in this section are highly persuasive in their effort to move the audience's interest in the narratives that they present. The performers go to the extent of rendering a logical and emotional justification process to accredit their tales in an effort to cajole the audience that what they are being told is true. In this respect, the performer's relationship to his narrative is discussed. Central to the above relationship, is the ritualistic process by each speaker to offer a rational justification for each narrative. This chapter also reveals the interesting relationship between the performer and the audience by showing how values are shared and transmitted within a performance event.

The issues of code-switching are explicitly discussed in Chapter 4. Closer attention is centered around the issues of language competence use and the speaker's verbal skills. Chapter 5 discusses the rhetorical implications of conversational narratives. My central focus in this chapter is to reveal how each narrator's framing devices of an event reveal the rhetorical devices.
Processing the Data:

The tape coding system:

Each tape was numbered, dated, and the context and location of the taping marked. Each tape was transcribed and the narratives were classified based on their respective genres. Concurrently, details about each individual who participated were included (see appendix A). The classification of each narrative was marked by the following symbols:

J ............... Joke or satire
N ............... Narrative (personal/impersonal)
W ............... Women
F ............... Food
M ............... Music

Language of Narration:

E ............... English
S ............... Swahili

Since most of the participants code-switched from English and Swahili, I offered an English translation of all the sections narrated in Swahili to make the material readily accessible to the non-Swahili speakers. The transcription of the Swahili segments emulate the basic features of the speaker’s dialectical pronunciation.
Cultural Attitudes and Values:

From a personal observation, storytelling in East African communities is viewed as an intricate part of the total communication system of the people. The art of storytelling in East African societies plays a significant role in structuring the basic cultural values and norms of the society. The form of storytelling by definition heavily depends on the performer who formulates the narrative event to fit the immediate social situation. The performer is usually a designated elderly man or woman who is accredited as possessing a vast body of knowledge that can be transmitted to the younger generation. The elders represent the values of the community and are, therefore, in a position to pass on whatever wisdom they have accumulated from their past as well as their familiarity with the traditional values.

The elder members' expertise gives them entitlement to be the educators. Therefore, the performers determine the values that ought to be conveyed to those present during any given performance event as will be later illustrated. Male performers emphasize to younger men the expected norms that they are required to exhibit, such as: hard work, bravery, being strong and heroic. Such qualities are respected. On the other hand, female narrators stress to the younger women that they are supposed to be nurturing, kind, hard working, and patient. Thus, the narratives elicited during any performance situation portrays significant cultural values in reference to the narrative content of the narrated story.
The transmission process of oral narratives is very intimate since it involves a face-to-face interaction between the audience and the performer. The actual dramatic enactment of the performance involves the emotional situation of the performer and the audience, especially if there is an active audience participation in the events taking place. The performance is designed to be persuasive by acting as a catalyst to capture the audience’s attention and interest in the story being narrated. As such, performers use the suspense techniques or rhetorical questions to trigger the audience’s active involvement in the events at hand. The emotional interaction between the performer and his audience is activated by the performer’s voice that involves the expressiveness of tone, gesture, facial expressions, and the dramatic use of pace and rhythm. All the above expressive forms are effected since the performer is usually engaged in a face-to-face interaction with his listeners. This kind of interaction enables the performer to monopolize the stage by manipulating the audience’s emotional involvement for motivational reasons. In so doing, the narrator/performer is able to express and emphasize the expected norms and values deemed valid in the society by capitalizing on the audience’s susceptibility.

When Does Storytelling Occur?

Customarily, storytelling is an evening activity; it takes place immediately after dinner. The designated performer for the evening usually takes the stage to elicit instructional narratives to all those
present during this performance event. Both the children and the older members present usually gather and sit around their performer in a circle. The performance is keyed by the spread of the mat and the powerful voice of the speaker that introduce the narrative in a formulaic manner of "Once upon a time..." or "Have you heard the one about..." The enchanting and captivating voice of the speaker draws the attention of the audience in the performance. Unnecessary interruption is highly discouraged while a positive participation of the audience is highly encouraged through the speaker’s systematic engagement of the audience into the narrative by requiring them to repeat and sing some key phrases of the narrative. The narratives include different varieties of genres, such as: animal tales, character anecdotes, hunting jokes, proverbs, legends, and myths. Proverbs and riddles are employed in an indirectional manner to modify the children’s behavior. It is also believed that the speaker who employs a vast use of proverbs in his performance possesses wisdom and therefore, serves as a guidance counselor. In addition, the proverbs add color to the ordinary conversation.

Stories narrated at any given storytelling situation are functionally supposed to educate, entertain, promote cultural values of the society, and pass on historical facts to those present. However, the problem that most people who have examined African oral narratives have faced is to determine how the above goals are achieved. This problem can be resolved in very simplistic terms. If we consider animal tales (that are considered traditional in terms of their form
and genre specification), their structural form, progression of events and their telling, as defined by the narrator, we can identify two features that are important to actualize these goals: 1) the performer suggests the values; and 2) the role played by the audience in the actualizing, creating, and structuring of the story shows the audience’s direct involvement and susceptibility to any message relayed by the performer.

The animals in East African orality are depicted as ludicrous characters. The animal characters are set in the human world and with human characteristics. They are often characterized as tricksters, whereby the small animals outdo the larger ones. In some instances, the smaller animals usually engage the larger animals in a tug-of-war in which the smaller animals are victorious, or they cheat other animals in a race like "The Turtle and The Hare" narrative (see appendix B). Nonetheless, on occasions where the trickster becomes the tricked, the victim becomes the butt of his own pranks.

Besides the hare, who is known for his treachery, the lion is presented as strong and powerful, but not particularly bright; the turtle is slow, but very cunning; and the hyena employs a lot of force (a kind of brute), but is stupid. Within the East African animal tales, the hyena is constantly duped by the little quick animals like the hare and the praying mantis. Just like the hyena, the leopard has never been able to escape the cunning ways of the hare. He is depicted as untrustworthy, vicious, and vulnerable. The crocodile and the monkey narratives dominate the coastal lore of East Africa. In one
narrative about the crocodile and the monkey, we are told about how the crocodile one time sought through treachery to kill the monkey in order to obtain his heart (the monkey's) for medicinal purposes. However, the monkey discovered the crocodile's intentions, and hence, he tricked the crocodile in turn. In this narrative, the monkey (who was the tricked) becomes the trickster and the crocodile, the duped.

The animals elicited during all performance situations are made to act as human characters and experience human emotions. Through this relationship a link is developed between the human rank and the animal rank. The animals are allegorically inserted into the human world, and at the same time, the fact that they are animals is not totally disregarded. Ironically, the notion that the animals can be transformed (symbolically) to epitomize humans is an aspect that makes them good tools/channels for communication.

The performer explicitly indicates to the audience that they can learn from the animals' experiences. Through the characteristic traits exhibited by the animals, the performer automatically suggests those qualities that are morally acceptable to the cultural norms of that given society, such as: strength, bravery, and hard work. During certain occasions, the performer may improvise a narrative to fit his particular motive for that particular social situation.

With the above views in mind, we can suggest that the storytelling event in East African communities plays an integral part in stressing the values of the society. Besides the animal tales, other genres of stories are utilized. These genres included jokes, character
anecdotes, and personal experience narratives. These three genres are employed for entertainment purposes and are also educational. The narratives that will be employed in this project are not traditional, but rather, they take the form and style of the orally-narrated stories. They are narratives that one is likely to collect in male-oriented circles. The fact that the participants in this project are East African students studying abroad, their need to recapture some of the storytelling situation is clearly indicated. However, although the setting of the narratives they told is not in a "traditional" environment, they take the form of traditional jokes. The tradition itself is dynamic and this represents the creation of a new tradition. The traditional setting created by the students is a mere extension of a rural African setting in a new world with different dynamics.

The jokes are embellished to fit the new setting in which these students reside. Although the students recognize each other's cultural differences, they all embrace a good situation setting in which they can chat with one another about things that happened to them in their immediate past.

Based on Goffman's model, I will contextually examine conversational narratives collected in Urbana/Champaign in order to see how oral stories play a significant role in shaping the values of this group. Goffman's method allows me to see how participants wove and embedded different speech acts into one concrete narrated event based on the immediate context. The devices that I find applicable to the texts to be evaluated include quotations, reported speeches, replays,
suspense, and embedding of different speech acts. These devices are vividly employed by the participants to portray the effect of alcohol (as a theme) on people deemed unacceptable according to the expected norms of the society. The goal of this narrative is to logically persuade the listeners that issues of alcoholism are not to be taken lightly but to be approached carefully and not in jest.

Prior to looking at the text, it is vital to point out that the conversation that follows is made possible through each speaker’s communicative competence and a knowledge of the events to be recounted. Each speaker takes his turn based on his verbal and non-verbal cues to participate in the narration of the story. The negotiation of rights to talk or to take a turn in the conversation are implicitly understood by each speaker/performer. It becomes apparent as the performance events took place that some narrators were better storytellers than others. In addition, the rules of "turn taking" were not always followed; some of the performers insisted on maintaining the floor until they would lose their audience’s attention in the performance, while others yielded to the turn-taking process.

To get into the storytelling mode of the narrated event, the first speaker, Ngere, began the performance by making reference to men’s attraction to beer and cigarettes.

The Immediate Context:

The men are sitting under a tree, listening to music, roasting chicken and drinking. The participants are Ngere, Juma and Beto. They
are all discussing men's behavior in drinking places.

Ngere: Pombe na Sigara ni kama magneti.  
(Beer and cigarettes are like a magnet.)  

Juma: Ngere, huyu wacha nikwambie.  
(Ngere, let me tell you.)

In the above lines, the narrative is keyed by the use of a simile as a figurative language to indicate that the "normal" conversational language has been changed to a performance mode. In reference to Bauman, the use of figurative language is a key element of a performance that illustrates a "speaker's expressive intensity and special communicative skills central to verbal performances" (Bauman 1977:18). Ngere's opening formula characterizes him as a good storyteller who bombards his listeners with a creative narrative style. However, with respect to the narrative at hand, Ngere's artistic skills in verbal performances are inhibited by Juma, the second speaker, who competes for the floor to tell us a story in which Ngere was involved. Juma, taking control of the stage, re-frames the opening formula of the narrative by saying "Let me tell you," a statement that designates him as a performer at the same time acknowledging Ngere and us as his immediate audience. This statement in itself is a metanarrational frame because it calls attention to the teller and the listener and it sets the theme of all the stories that are to follow.
The speaker’s statement: "Wacha nikwambie" (Let me tell you) makes the audience know that the speaker is about to tell a story, since the use of the pronoun shifts of "me" and "you" exemplifies a storytelling technique. Although the first speaker is not given an opportunity to speak, Juma takes the stage and controls it until he has captured the attention of all those present. By taking the stage to talk about a subject that is common to the audience, Juma sets himself up for evaluation as a storyteller. In essence, Juma’s evaluation is based on how well he is able to narrate a story that can be qualified as being "good." The evaluation aspect in oral performances comes into the picture in regard to how the teller tells his tale, how well he tells his narrative, and whether he can be able to keep his audience interested in the narrative itself. If the narrator successfully manages to keep his audience’s attention and participation in the events taking place, he or she can be then labeled as a good performer because he told a funny or interesting story. It is the issue of determining whether the story told by a narrator is appreciated by the audience as good or bad that brings into question the notion of evaluation. Therefore, to capture the attention of his audience, Juma has to organize his narrative carefully in a logical and coherent manner in order to achieve a desired degree of narrative competence.

Juma:  
Huyu jamaa mmoja  
(This guy, one - this one guy)  
Anaitwa Mark Kutoaka Nakuru  
(called Mark from Nakuru)  
Huyu jamaa bwana  
(This guy Mr. -)  
Huwa hataki kununua pombe
(he does not like to buy beer)
Lakini anakunywa
(but he likes to drink)
Siku moja alikuwa anakunywa na Ngere
(one day he was drinking with Ngere)
Huyu jamaa huwa anaongea na anacheka sana [pause]
(This guy usually talks and laughs a lot)
Piga pombe zake namma hii [demonstrates]
(He was drinking his beer like this)
Lakini anakunywa tu
(but he drinks only - i.e. he doesn’t buy)
Ngere bwana [akasema] akamwambia
(Ngere Mr. said told him)
Yaani Mark, yaani wewe, yaani wewe wanywa tu [laughter]
(That is Mark, that you, that is you just drink)

Beto:  Was there a message behind that?

Juma:  Hanunui [stress]
(He does not buy...beer)

Beto:  OK

Ngere:  Yaani yu aa eh
(That is, you aa eh)

As is the case in many oral narratives, Juma’s role as a storyteller sets him up for evaluation by the audience and those other participants like Ngere who collaborated the information being provided. In fact, Ngere was the first person to mention the incident that Juma narrates. Although he does not appear frequently in Juma’s telling, he merely sums-up Juma’s story. The collaborative participation authorizes co-narrators to tighten loopholes that are likely to occur in storytelling duelling performed in a face-to-face interaction. The collaborated narrative style requires that both narrators must have been present when the event that they are discussing took place. Due to this, they both share the same
background information about the events and they can, therefore, narrate the events simultaneously with one speaker filling up the gaps left by the other speaker. Although Juma takes the authority to narrate the story, without Ngere’s permission, we note that they both become co-narrators in the construction of the whole narrative. I believe that had Ngere told the narrative, it would have been somewhat different than the narrative we have. This assumption can be deduced from the narrative because Ngere was actually present when the events that Juma narrated occurred. In other words, Ngere would have narrated the story with a lot of emotional attachment; analogous to reliving the event. However, both Ngere and Juma do not relive the events they tell. This is due to the fact that the enactment of the events in the story are not dramatic. In addition, the performers failed to insert themselves into the events elicited. Although reliving the telling is not a rule, it adds color to the story by making it current. For a narrator to successfully relive an event, he/she has to tell it as if the event being elicited were taking place at the very moment it is being retold. Unfortunately, both performers in this case did not fulfill this aspect of narration.

Juma narrates the story in a reported fashion since he’s retelling us something that he saw happen. Mark, who is the subject of the narrative, represents a group of many young men who love to drink but choose not to buy the beer. Most of us who formed Juma’s audience had never heard about the story. Therefore, he employed suspense in order to capture our emotional involvement in the events being elicited.
According to Goffman, suspense is a performer's willingness to suspend or withhold information from the listener. In such narratives, the listener is at the mercy of the speaker. In essence, the speaker has control over the audience. Instead of Juma telling us directly that Mark did not share the costs of buying beer, he simply states "Yaani! Wewe wanywa tu" (i.e.: "You. You just drink."). This phrase is quite meaningless to the audience until we learn of Mark's mistake. Therefore, the narratives become a joke about Mark who is a penny-pinner. Although the message of the story is not directed to Mark, it is intended to teach all those present not to act like Mark.

Another important factor that comes up in the above narrative is the use of quotation marks or brackets. As has been suggested by Bauman and Goffman, when a speaker uses quotations in the telling of a narrative, it is a stylistic venture on his part to stand (in some cases) in a reduced personal responsibility for what he is saying. Consequently, a speaker chooses to use another person's words by giving credit to the first speaker or originator of the first thought. In the narrative at hand, Juma does not want to take any responsibility for Ngere's sarcastic remark to his victim, Mark - "wanywa tu." In fact, it is very interesting to note that Ngere does not directly tell Mark that he is not playing a fair game in the buying of the beer, but rather he only makes a direct reference to his drinking as a clue to him (Mark) to share in the cost of the beer. It would appear insulting had Ngere said "Why do you like to drink beer that you cannot pay for." Here, Ngere employs the indirection style of communication to
indicate to Mark that his behavior is not acceptable among his friends, and therefore, he should try to do something to make amends.

The data that will be utilized in this work will reveal the effectiveness of conversational narratives based on their persuasive implications. These implications are exhibited through each performer's narrative style or strategies designed, by the teller, to capture the audience's attention and involvement in the narrated events. This work will argue that conversational narratives are persuasive in nature, especially if used by speakers to inform the audience, in reference to the performer's and the audience's emotional involvement in the elicited narratives. The question of whether the audience is swayed to believe the values suggested by the performer will depend on their reaction to the implied values (both explicit and implicit) and attitudes revealed through the framing devices of each story.
CHAPTER II
THE METAMESSAGE OF A FRAME

The introductory section of this work has established that Goffman’s text Frame Analysis examines conversational narratives. Goffman proposes ways in which a conversation occurs and how it is managed by the people involved in the talk. He emphasizes that speakers engaged in a conversation must present facts to their listeners by: replaying the narratives they tell as if the events being discussed were taking place at the particular time that they are being recounted; weaving and embedding different speech acts by using suspense as a means of withholding information from the audience to capture their attention in events being elicited; employing quotations as a stylistic technique to make the audience know that the words being spoken are not the speaker’s own, but someone else’s; and ultimately mimicking the original speaker as a performance style that shows a register shift in the performer’s tonality (Goffman 1974).

My emphasis in this chapter is focused on the sequential organization of conversations in order to investigate how social actions of turn-taking contribute in the construction of the frame of a talk. I will evaluate the discourse in reference to relationships and frames of utterances and the interaction that considers the relationships among the tellers and their audience.
These forms of relationships articulate the significance of language in the transmission process of a narrative. At the same time, the performer's persuasiveness in the narrative delivery will be viewed as the central aspect of the overall transmission process.

Prior to discussing the details and the application of the issues listed above, it is essential to talk about some of the concerns prevalently examined by conversation analysts are and how these research issues affect my work. With reference to the work at hand, it is central in this segment for me to address the following questions that pertain to the study of the frame of a conversation:

(a) What is a conversation?
(b) How is the frame of a conversation defined?
(c) Why is the frame of a conversation important in the organization of utterances?
(d) How is a frame signaled?
(e) Why is a context important in determining the meaning of an utterance?
(f) How is the notion of narrative style utilized in conversational frames?

These questions reflect central issues that pertain to the understanding of conversational narratives, and they will be discussed throughout this chapter.
What is a Conversation?

The term "conversation" is a word that most people use in a day-to-day basis. Recently, when I interrupted two of my friends' serious discussion regarding women's role in the African societies, Mr. Y immediately said "Judy, can't you see that I am having a serious conversation with Mr. X?" Of course my friend's use of the word "conversation" made me think of several definitions of the term. Eventually, based on the incident mentioned above, I viewed the word "conversation" to mean a series of organized and negotiated principles of turn-taking revolving around both participants to calculatively maintain a single focus in the utterances. As such, it is a most generalized form of talk. Talk, as defined by Ronald Wardhaugh in How Conversation Works, is "a social activity and therefore, a public activity. It involves others and each time you are involved with another person, you must consider him or her," (Wardhaugh 1985:2) because the basic purpose of a conversation is to communicate an idea to the other person. However, Sandra Stahl makes a distinction between public and private as contexts for personal narratives (1989:45). Goffman's definition of the term "conversation" is based on a larger concept of interaction. In his definition, Goffman suggests that "conversation is the kind of interaction that occurs when persons gather close together and openly cooperate to sustain a single focus of attention" (Goffman 1963:24), while C. Goodwin suggests that the term conversation can be viewed as "equivalent to talk or spoken interaction" (Goodwin 1981:1).
We must consider that a conversation cannot be said to have occurred unless there is an interpersonal communication as opposed to verbalized interpersonal thoughts. A good example to illustrate this point can be drawn from anyone's verbalized thoughts directed to no one in particular (i.e. talking to oneself). Have you ever imagined what people would say or think if one day, for instance, in an elevator you started talking out loud to yourself in a dialogue form? In fact, if anybody were present with you in the elevator when you performed such an act, they would label you crazy or insane. This is because a "normal" conversation has not taken place. To have a "normal" conversation, it is a must to have an "addressee" (who is the recipient), and the "addressee" engaged in a talk.

Dell Hymes in "Towards an Ethnographic of Communication: The Analysis of Communicative Events" identifies basic factors central to the communication theory that are relevant to the fundamentals of talk. He claims that it is vital to have various kinds of participants in communicative events such as: (1-2) senders and receivers, addressers and addressees, interpreters and spokesmen and the like; (3) the various available channels and their modes of use, speaking, writing, singing, face and body motion as visually perceived, smelling, tasting and tactile sensation; (4) the various codes shared by various participants, linguistic, paralinguistic, kinesis, musical and other; (5) settings (including other communication) in which communication is permitted, enjoined, encouraged, abridged; (6) the forms of messages and their genres all constitute the essential catalysts for a
conversation (Hymes 1972:22-23).

Therefore, for a conversation to be said to have taken place, each speaker must have an audience that he/she can communicate with. The participant’s mood and the physical setting of a conversation should be considered as a vital marker of a conversation. Furthermore, both the verbal and the non-verbal gestures or paralinguistic communication constitute a broader view of a conversation. In addition, a talk can take place quite effectively with the use of non-verbal cues. A conversation involves an interaction in which participants are engaged in both verbal and non-verbal dialogue by employing gestural features both linguistic and nonlinguistic as central communicative devices. Within this category, I consider body movement, eye contact, behavior that goes beyond talk, and the environment that precipitates the occurrence of a conversation. Michael Moerman suggests that "talk and other human sound, is only one component of interaction. Like all components, it is neither impermeable nor functionally specific. A word, a wink, an intonation, can each, in context, do the same job" (1990:3). Besides the above mentioned issues, it is vital to stress that talk is very central in the organization of a conversation.

Two important questions to be addressed at this point are: "What signals a conversation?" and "How is it managed?" In most conversations, a talk is signaled in a form of a question. The question in turn sets the frame of the conversation. For instance, when we talk to our friends, we always discuss various themes marked by a question or recount to them our day-to-day experiences marked by a
question like: "Do you know what happened to me today?" or "Let me
tell you what I saw today." When a conversation is signaled in this
manner, it can proceed in a positive manner if the addressee responded
"What happened?" This kind of response triggers a conversation as
opposed to a response such as "I do not have time," which of course
would terminate any further communication. Therefore, if a positive
response is attained from a signal to talk, we have a series of
negotiable turn-takings between the "addressee" and the "addresser."

Turn-taking is a pivotal issue for defining conversation. It
allows the participants to organize and manage their dialogue in a
manner that they can speak alternately. At the end of each utterance,
other participants will feel at liberty or entitled to participate in
the talk. As such, each speaker in any given speech event must obtain
permission to talk at any given time. However, such is not the case in
most speech events. When speakers maintain the floor for a lengthy
period of time, they risk being interrupted by any of the other people
present. Usually, speakers who sustain extended turns at a talk end-up
telling short stories (or what I am going to refer to as conversational
narratives) as opposed to a single focused utterance. C. Goodwin
defines turn-taking as "the talk of one party bounded by the talk of
others constitutes a turn, with turn-taking being the process through
which the party doing the talk at the moment is changed" (Goodwin
1981:2). Deborah Tannen (1984) sees turn-taking as heavily influenced
or bound by each speaker's conversational style and the cultural
background.
Conversation as Informational:

People-watchers or conversational analysts look for meaning in every utterance people say, how they say it, and how what they say reveal to us something about the speaker's themselves. In any form of talk, people tend to portray certain images of themselves through their utterances. Goffman stipulates that "When people talk they communicate not only information, but images of themselves" (Goffman 1981:78-123). Therefore, we, as "normal human beings," interpret people's utterances based on how they present them to us, and in turn, we develop an understanding of the person and the message being relayed. In this respect, whatever deductions that we formulate from any utterance are signaled by the social context of its occurrence that gives that utterance its background information for interpretive purposes. Moerman extrapolates that "all meaning is in relation to context. Explicating the meanings requires stating the context. Every context is multi-layered: conversation-sequential, linguistic, embedded in the present scene, encrusted with past meanings, and more" (1990:7). Therefore, the components of meaning, that are the ingredients for interpretation, ought to be locally occasioned. In so doing, contextual interpretive frameworks delimit the misconceptions that are likely to occur if the components of meaning are not locally significant, not locally occasioned, and if the audience is not familiar with the cultural background of the narrated text.

Additionally, conversation as informational requires that the participants involved should attain a degree of understanding of the
relationships between participants. The relationship between participants can enable us to extrapolate why speakers speak in a certain way when communicating with their colleagues as opposed to their students or superiors since hierarchy is only one aspect of participant relationship.

To illustrate the preceding arguments, I would like to give a brief example here to show how what people say in a conversation sends very powerful images of themselves to the listeners. In one of the conversations I recorded about phonographic speakers, Juma (one of the participants) is striving very hard to explain to George the functional mechanism of the speakers he innovated (constructed).

Juma: When we are here,
  when we get drunk,
  I remove them (the stereo speakers)
  and put them inside immediately,
  and lock them in the bedroom.

George: Are they working?

In this conversation, people who do not know Juma, who do not know his conversational style, are likely to draw wrong impressions about his personality by labeling him as a "bragger" as will be clarified later. In the dialogue in which Juma talks about the speakers, we see him marvelling at his creation. In fact, when I began to record this dialogue, Juma had been talking about the importance that he attaches to the speakers to the extent that when his friends come to visit him, he usually would lock them in the bedroom. He asserts that "When we are here, when we get drunk, I remove them and put them inside
Immediately, and lock the bedroom."

From Juma’s remarks, I deduced that he did not trust his friends enough, therefore he had to lock the speakers in the bedroom. On the other hand, it was explicit that his actions are protection-based because he would like to protect his speakers from being knocked over by anyone of his friends after they get heavily inebriated. As Juma continued to talk about the technical and functional mechanism of the speakers, we learned that he was fascinated by the amount of watts that the speakers could produce. He suggested that the speakers that he made are so strong and powerful that they cannot be blown out unless supplied by 350 watts.

Juma: You cannot blast these speakers, whatever you do. Forget about it. If you supply 350 watts per channel, you are going to blow it.

His strong aspiration or goal in life is to develop a unit more powerful than the first. Juma says "What I am doing, and I am just across over to be able to have four speakers in one box." From Juma’s last remark, I concluded that he is a very intelligent person; his motive for discussing the speakers was educational which revealed his bragging nature despite his desire to share his knowledge with us and to display his experience. He was able to define to us in simple terms how speakers function, since he’s an expert in this area.

Going back to the concept of turn-taking, Juma, in this conversation, controls the stage because he is discussing a subject
that is not common to his interlocutors. Turn-taking is almost remote because the relationship we have existing between him and his audience is reduced to the teacher/student relationship. This relationship helps to illustrate the point that the frame of a conversation, in a student/teacher relationship, can sometimes be signaled by a question. George, who is Juma’s student, responds to his dialogue by asking him probing questions regarding the speakers. Thus, if we consider Juma to be speaker A and George to be speaker B, we notice that speaker A (who is the expert) gives a lot of information to speaker B (who is the "addressee").

**How is a Frame Signaled?**

Frames are one way of giving structure to each narrative text. Frames constitute and uncover the limits of a narrative (Young 1987:19). According to Deborah Tannen, "no message can be interpreted except by reference to a superordinate message about the communication intended" (Tannen 1984:24). Tannen illustrates that a frame of a narrative is signaled by a metamessage communicated by a narrative. To demonstrate this point, Tannen cites an example from Gregory Bateman's work (1972) of a play as a metamessage; that is "a play, for example, within which a bite or a slap is not hostile. The metamessage play signals the context within which a bite or a slap does not stand for what it is known to mean, namely, aggression" (Tannen 1984:23).

Again here, referring to Juma’s phonographic speakers, the speakers themselves do not convey a metamessage for the artist and also the
listener, but the talk about them embodies its metamessage. In fact, one might say that the talk about the speaker does not convey any metamessage, but rather, presents the problem of referentiality; that is what the phonographic speakers refer to. The fact that Juma talks about them by displaying a strong attachment to them cannot be construed as a sign of bragging, but of displaying expertise. Displaying expertise is ego enhancing and cannot necessarily be viewed as negative. "Bragging" is a word that negatively judges the display of expertise. Culturally, one does not talk openly about his success or fame. Modesty is highly encouraged while self-praise is ego-damaging. The same display might cause different reactions among different people. However, the major objective of the conversation as indicated earlier is to illustrate a point to Juma’s listeners about the technical and mechanical functions of the speakers. In other contexts, Juma’s utterances would have been interpreted as bragging.

The speakers, as visual objects, and the quality of the music they produced both signal the frame of the conversation. The metamessage that we deduce from the account reflects the addressee’s professional expertise. Tannen, discussing the issues of metamessage, suggests that "The information conveyed by the meaning of words is the message. What is communicated about relationships -- attitudes toward each other, the occasion and what we are saying -- is the metamessage. And it’s the metamessages that we react to most strongly. If someone says, "I’m not angry," and his jaw is set hard and his words seem to be squeezed out in a hiss, you won’t believe the message that he’s not angry; you’ll
believe the metamessage conveyed by the way he said it" (Tannen 1986:30). The same argument can be extended to Juma’s attitude towards his speakers. We believe that he made the speakers and the way he talks about them using technical terms reveals the metamessage of the entire text as being that Juma is an expert and he knows exactly what he is talking about.

Definitely, "a frame is a category within which meaning must be interpreted. That is to say that the notion of meaning as a use entails that there can be no referential meaning" (Tannen 1984:24). Goffman on the other hand defines the word "frame" as a "situation built up in accordance with the principles of organization which govern events - at least social ones - and our own subjective involvement in them" (Goffman 1974:10). Peter K. Manning and Keith Hawkins indicate that the frame is a "code which shapes, typifies, informs, and even confirms the nature of the choice. It determines, for example, what information is sought, seen as relevant and significant, and that information conveys" (1990:207-208). Katherine Young, discussing two distinct sorts of frames, suggests "Frames codify stories among other kinds of events or codify kinds of stories on the other hand, that they invite or reveal an attitude toward the story which illuminates the relationship between its tellers and hearers...for narrative events, a passage of a conversation can be framed in the first sense as a story and in the second sense as cruel, revealing, disingenuous, rude, clever, funny, sad, or the like" (Young 1987:20).
All the scholars cited above emphasized two major issues relevant to the understanding of conversation frames. First, they illustrate that frames enable hearers/listeners of a narrative to enclave (Young 1987) its meaning based on the principles set by the frame. Certainly, the meanings of a narrative within such a bound and contexted mode should be communicative-based in reference to the socially and locally occasioned events. Secondly, frames are metacommunicative, that is communication about communication (Ruesch and Bateson 1968:209), by determining, as Manning and Hawkins indicate, "the information sought and seen as relevant" (1990:208) illuminating appropriate interpretive frames to determine the evaluative aspects of a narrative as either good or bad, funny or sad. Therefore the frame of a narrated event is constructed and shaped by the immediate events (or context) that surround its occurrence and the complex interaction between the persons involved in its construction.

Again, referring to Juma’s phonographic speakers and the way he talks about them in a bragging manner functions as the frame of the conversation and can be interpreted as presenting the microcontext upon which the objective interpretation of the text can be deduced. From Tannen’s description of a frame, we note that the word "speakers," just like "hammer," cannot embody any meaning to somebody who does not have any referential point of how the word is utilized in a conversation. As she indicates, the word "hammer," like the object it names, can be understood only by reference to a frame or set of expectations about human behavior which includes the use of a hammer (1984:24). In
reference to the word "speakers," we have to have a referential point
in order to determine its meaning. Without the context of its usage,
many people may misunderstand what the word signifies. Thus, to
eliminate any form of ambiguities that are likely to occur, words or
expressions must always be contextualized to determine their intended
meanings or the metamessages being suggested.

The Context of a Narrative:

In most oral performances the larger social context of a
performance, the performance event, and the event referred to play a
very significant factor in the understanding of the narrated event.
When a speaker is talking to his audience, his utterances are supposed
to convey a specific message to the audience/listener. The message
conveyed by the speaker can be in many forms, that is, for
informational or for persuasive purposes. Without any appropriate and
locally occasioned parameters, the listener is bound to misinterpret
the intended message. As such, the context enables the listener to
have a solid ground upon which to base the interpretation of the text.
Obviously, after the message is attained, the listener can act
accordingly by either approving, supporting, agreeing to, or rejecting
the suggested message. Therefore, context as suggested by Goffman can
be defined as "immediately available events which are compatible with
one frame understanding and incompatible with others" (1974:441). The
context provides the listener or the reader with the background
information that allows him/her to interpret the event referred to
within the social setting of its occurrence. The context enables the
interpreter not to misjudge the elicited details or to misinterpret
them.

The significance of evaluating any oral texts in their immediate
contexts of use was well defined as early as 1925 by Malinowski in
"Myth and Primitive Psychology." Examining the Kukwanu (fairy tales),
Malinowski asserted:

The text, of course, is extremely important, but without the
context it remains lifeless. As we have seen, the interest of the
story is vastly enhanced and it is given its proper character by
the manner in which it is told. The whole nature of the importance
of the performance, the voice and the mimicry, the stimulus and the
response of the audience mean as much to the natives as the text;
and the sociologist should take his cue from the natives. The
performance, again, has to be placed in its proper time setting...
the hour of the day, and the season, with the background of the
sprouting gardens awaiting future work, and slightly influenced by
the magic of the fairy tales. We must also bear in mind the
sociological context of private ownership, the sociable function
and the cultural role of amusing fiction. All these elements are
equally relevant; all must be studied as well as the text. The
stories live in native life and not on paper, and when a scholar
jots them down without being able to evoke the atmosphere in which
they flourish he has given us but a mutilated bit of reality
Discussing the importance of context, Ronald Wardhaugh suggests that the most ignored issue in the field of ethnomethodology is the debate concerning the significance of context use in conversation for persuasive reasons. Wardhaugh's major stress here is that if we are to attempt to say what any utterance in a conversation means, we have to take into consideration not only the linguistic context of utterances, but also pay attention to "those utterances that precede and follow in question, the surrounding physical context, previous conversations between the participants, relevant aspects of their life histories, the general rules of behavior the parties subscribe to, their assumptions about how the various bits and pieces of the world function and so on" (Wardhaugh 1985:101). Therefore, it is only by acknowledging the factors described above that we can with no doubt accept the notion that the context of any utterance contributes to the meaning of a talk; and also understand what is going on when people talk to each other.

Still, re-emphasizing the essential nature of context, Amy Shuman, citing Alfred Shutz, takes the idea of context one step further. According to Shutz, immediacy is "the fundamental characteristic of all actual experiences of experiencing; immediacy is spatial and temporal, here and now" (Shuman 1986:55). Shuman further expands on Wardhaugh's definition of context by saying that stories based on immediate relationships are current and contemporary with the on-going situations in which they are narrated and evaluated and that ongoing events are narrated differently than past events. It is my belief that if other fields of study can incorporate some of the issues suggested above
surrounding the interpretation of words in context and as signifiers, it will be much easier for anybody to appropriately determine what that particular object or words signifies or to understand where ambiguity lies. Therefore, the immediate context of any event, be it words spoken in jest or in reference to other issues, must be analyzed within these proper parameters. The context provides the listener with the following factors:

(a) it creates possibilities for interpretation;
(b) it helps to remove multiple ambiguities that utterances would have if they are analyzed and interpreted in isolation, or perhaps complicates the apparently simple;
(c) it helps us to understand whether the individuals involved in a conversation share a common knowledge of the issues being discussed depending on the manner they phrase their utterances with each other, including facial expressions or non-verbal behavior that enable the listener to understand the words being spoken; and
(d) it helps us understand the focal point of a conversation. Most often, people tend to misinterpret hearsays or utterances that were not meant for them because they fail to conceptualize the origin of a conversation based on the fact that it is "hearsay" and thus, lack the basic common knowledge to deduce the intended implications.
A Frame of a Narrative:

In order to discuss issues surrounding the notion of a frame, I would like to pose the following question to awaken our analytical and interpretive faculties: How does the dynamics of frames operate in language? Frames constitute and uncover the limits of a narrative. Frames enclav[e a story in a manner that enables the listener to codify the stories and place them in their respective genres. They also illuminate attitudes towards the narrative that allows the listener to draw out the relationship between the speaker and his audience. Since most speakers' major task is to communicate, clarity and persuasiveness is not required to affect the audience's attitudes. It is only if we understand the dynamics of a frame that we can acquire an understanding of the construction of any narrated event. Frames in a conversational language, as well as in tales, operate in different forms such as interpretive and metacommunicative. Addressing the metacommunicative aspects of frames, Katherine Young illustrates that:

Frames are metacommunications of two sorts about two orders of events: they set the realm status or disclose an attitude towards either taleworlds or storyrealms. Story frames distinguish stories from other sorts of discursive events like conversations, explanations, quotations, descriptions, reports, confessions, and so on, and from other sorts of narrative events like plays, games, mimes, films, or dreams; and they distinguish among genres of story among myths, legends, folktales, fairytales, tall tales, anecdotes,
and personal experience narratives (Young 1987:21).

Frames are metacommunicative in reference to the formulaic techniques employed by the tellers in their narration in order to make the genre specifications more explicit and to capture the audience's attention in the events being narrated.

A classical example to extrapolate the metacommunicative aspect of frames was articulated by John Gumperz. According to Gumperz, "metacommunicative frames can be considered operative by the use of paralinguistic and prosodic features of speech such as intonation, pitch, amplitude, rhythm, and so on." Gumperz calls these features when they are used to signal interpretive frames "contextualization cues" (Gumperz 1977 & 1982). The contextualized cues of the frame help to determine the metamessage of the narrated event. For instance, if Mr. X was talking to Mr. Y with a serious look on his face, throwing his hands in the air with a high pitched voice claiming not to be angry, the metamessage that Mr. Y is bound to draw from Mr. X's behavior will be the opposite of what he suggests. The contextualized cues enable the audience to determine the mood and the message being conveyed. In addition, the metamessage allows the audience to consider certain aspects of the contextual analysis theory such as register shifts, pitch of the voice, paralinguistic language employed (such as throwing of the arms into the air), figurative language, and repetition with a systematic variation, that are determinant factors in appropriately drawing the meaning from the event. Therefore, frames as
Young asserts "are transfixual: they are persuasive qualifications of the events they span and inform (Young 1987:23).

Barbara A. Babcock, in her essay "The Story in the Story: Metanarration in Folk Narratives," defines metacommunication in narrative performance as "any element of communication which calls attention to the speech event as a performance and to the relationship which it obtains between the narrator and his audience (vis-a-vis) the narrative message" (Babcock 1984:66).

Babcock is strictly concerned with those elements of an event that identifies the speech event as a performance. Gumperz's definition deals with the paralinguistic features that clearly demarcate a normal discourse from a performed event. By and large, both scholars examine those elements that deviate from an ordinary discourse by showing that frames "communicate about the ontological status of other events, but they have a different ontological status from the events they communicate about" (Young 1987:22).

In folklore theories and studies, the issues of metacommunication are synonymous to what Gumperz seems to be suggesting above because the paralinguistic features of a narrative and the prosodic features provide the technical colors that enrich the narrative style of the speaker. In fact, they are "contextualization cues" that offer an audience a key understanding of the relationship between the audience and the speaker by providing, as Tannen suggests, "a way of eliminating a breakdown of communication" (Tannen 1984:24) in situations where the intricate cultural dynamics are lacking that set the base for proper
interpretation of a text.

Unlike metacommunicative frames, interpretive frames organize the gathered facts. Manning and Hawkins (1990:208) have argued that "the three necessary elements to an explanation of the process of interpretive framing are: the event (and system and units involved), the interpretive frame for the events (or a series or set of events), and the outcome." Therefore, it is through the employment of the interpretive frames that we can elucidate the purpose of an event or develop conclusive assumptions of any narrative based on the keying devices employed by the speaker. It is central to point out that any shift in the keying of an event or re-keying of an event may or is likely to alter the message intended to be conveyed by the speaker.

With the above preliminaries, let us now bring this argument closer to home by establishing a vivid picture of how frames function in the detailed discussion between Juma, Judy, Makanyaga, Ngere, and George. In the conversation between the speakers mentioned above, we find a combination of all the metacommunicative dynamics of a frame represented through chanting, falsetto breaks, laughing, onomatopoeia, and sighing. Within this conversation the speakers are deeply engaged in philosophical discussion regarding African music versus the American music. In this brief discussion, I will demonstrate that each speaker’s narrative style is made apparent through the contextualized (metacommunicative) lines of communication for persuasive reasons. The explicit frames of the talks to be examined are keyed by the music playing on Juma’s stereo as transmitted to us through the speakers he
constructed. Juma, the moderator of this subject, displays his vast knowledge of music by alluding to the well-known African musicians. His conversational style is very fast and highly involving.

Conversational style, to take a semantic definition, refers to "the co-occurrence changes at various levels of linguistic structure within one language and suggests that the linguistic choices are made on two levels; the syntagmatic relations following rules of low occurrence that result in identifiable styles and the paradigmatic relations following rules of alternation resulting in choices among styles and makes possible style-switching, on the model of code-switching" (Tannen 1984:8). The latter, paradigmatic relations of the conversational style appear to be overriding in the narrative referring to music. This assumption is due in part to the intense level of code-switching within this narrative style itself.

Therefore, the following text demonstrates Juma's intense use of metacommunicative devices in his conversational style in which the contextualized cues of communication are explicitly utilized to frame the conversation.

Juma: Natafuta record moja
      (I am looking for one record)
Natafuta record moja ya Franco
      (I am looking for one record by Franco)
Alitepu na nani before he died [pause, music]
      (He taped it with this guy before he died)
it goes: tatata ah ah [iye olema]
      3
I do not know how to connect it
      4
Sijaipata
      5
(I have not found it)
kuna huyo mjamaa anaigiza sauti ya
      6
(There is that guy who is putting in that bass)
bess hiyo
      7

Line 1
we have it
we have that record
lakini inambwa na Franco na Sam Mangwana
(But it is sung by Franco and Sam Mangwana)
similar to that [referring to the music being played on the stereo. This music frames the conversation.]
Judy: Ninayo
(I have it)
Juma: Unasikla bess hiyo hmm hmm aah aah
(Do you hear that bass hmm, hmm, aah, aah, aah)
Iye olema - [humming the music]
Judy: Ninakanda moja ya Franco
(I have one tape by Franco)

Immediate Context:
The on-going discussion concerns the music that was playing. The playing music keys, and at the same time, frames the conversation.

Interlocutors:
Beto, Hamisi, Ngere, Makanyaga.

Significance:
The text above illustrates Juma’s use of metacommunicative devices in his talk. Juma employs both a register shift in his tonal voice as he talks and, at the same time, uses special paralinguistic features salient to the nature of oral performance. Referring to the music that he was looking for, Juma tries to sing the song (that he was looking for) in a rather crude manner:
Natafuta record moja ya Franco
(I am looking for one record by Franco)
it goes: tatata ah ah [iye olema]
unasikia bess hiyo hm hm hm
(Do you hear that bass hmm, hmm, hmm)

The song playing on the stereo frames this speech event. The fact that Juma employs a shift in his tonal voice when he sings the song he is looking for is equivalent to what Gumperz refers to as contextualized cues of communication. In the conversation, Juma's attempted singing is supposed to convey a specific message to us. From his singing we are supposed to deduce from the melody he is humming the record that he is looking for; and in so doing, help him to find it. However, Juma's singing is so poor that we were not able to help him identify the record. He even goes to the extent of saying that the song he is looking for was sung by Franco and Sam Mangwana; "similar to that" in reference to the record that was playing. The fact that he called attention to the tape being played on the stereo was metacommunicative. The frame of the song in this example reveals to the listener Juma's attitude towards music. The listener learns of Juma's love for music through his serious attempt to reproduce or hum the song he is looking for.

He also uses parallelism here to ensure that his audiences are actually familiar with the music that he is looking for. The idea of parallelism is evident in his double use of the humming sounds of the song he is in search for with a systematic variation (i.e., "it goes: tatata ah ah and unasikia bess hiyo hm hm hm").
The Analysis of a Frame:

The frame analysis method established by Erving Goffman is a big contribution to the understanding of conversational narratives. Inasmuch as this method is strictly concerned with strips of talk, usually excerpts that are decontextualized, it does include certain aspects of the social structure and the interaction between the participants involved in the talk. However, the analysis itself is usually so abstract that the essence of the audience/speaker relationship becomes almost insignificant. The central focus in such analysis is usually on the nature of how the speakers engaged in a talk communicate with each other and how they manage this kind of talk. As previously indicated, one aspect of the management of a talk is attained through the speakers’ alternate turns in a talk.

The frame analysis method allows me, as a folklorist, to examine the aspects of language in a narrated event as opposed to being strictly bound to keys of performance displayed by many performers in their storytelling events. Through the adaptation of Goffman’s method and the folklore theories of performance, I would like to take a close look at two performance events in order to portray the effectiveness of these methods.

The Social Community:

The analysis of the following conversational narratives can be better understood if all the participants involved can be viewed as individuals who belong to the same temporary social community. I see
all my informants as members of the same social community because establishing an identity for their tale-telling session, in a way, was an act of establishing their community through "self-definition, underscoring group values, aspirations, and apprehensions" (Lindahl 1987:19). The social community and the immediate context serve as a stage for the oral storytelling. [All the participants in this temporary community in the United States of America are, in a way, dealing with the dilemmas of living in a foreign country by bringing their shared values to the group.]

I equate the relationship established among my participants as a "temporary community" because to them, a community refers to a group of people who are tied together by their shared understandings and interests -- be it religious, political, or social. As Alfred Shutz illustrates, each of us "are members of the group into which we are born or which continues to exist if some of its members die and others come into it" (Shutz 1973:246). George, Ngere, Beto, Hamisi, Makanyaga, Juma, and Judy are members of their ethnic groups, but yet all shared the social aspects, cultural background, language and similar interests in music that classify them as members of a social group situation. "People who belong to a community also shares rules of conduct and interpretation of one linguistic variety" (Hymes 1972:54). We note that these participants are united as a temporary community due to their common academic goals and aspirations for success. Everywhere (as suggested by Shutz) "there will be systems of kinship, age groups and sex groups, differentiations according to
occupation, and organization of power and command which leads to the
categorization of social status and prestige" (1973:246). All the
participants in this work have their own similarities and differences
as suggested in the above quotation, but yet they still embrace the
same value systems that bring them together as one group. These
students are all on an educational journey in a foreign country in
order to achieve their academic ventures and later return home to apply
their accumulated knowledge.

During the social events at Rantoul in Urbana/Champaign, these
students share the challenge of a storytelling performance which serves
as the epitome of a perfect context. The fact that all the
participants are involved in drinking, listening to music, and eating
goat meat sets all these students up with an ideal situation for a
total communicative performance stage. The performance stage, for me,
served as a framing operation, a creative process for maintaining the
cultural authority for storytelling, and refining the inner artistic
and cognitive capabilities of the performers. Since all the
participants were aware that I wanted to collect oral narratives, that
was incentive enough for them to lay grounds for a competitive
performance. Once the performance was framed with alcohol as a theme,
the first narrative was used as a mapping tool for all the stories that
preceded it. The performers wanted to outdo each other by presenting
narratives that portrayed them at their best. The narratives collected
on this day can be analyzed from the face value although the message is
always symbolic.
Central to the symbolic aspect of the narratives collected is the distinct cultural patterns and expressions revealed through the events taking place. The cultural definitions are made explicit through the students' interpretation of meat roasting. It was the contention of all that meat roasting makes apparent the social structure, philosophy, and the value system that exists within this temporary community -- and I must say that these students' social ties are temporary because after they finish school, they will be returning to their respective countries. The notion of chicken or goat roasting denotes the cultural "togetherness" of these students. It is a motif that they have carried from their native countries as a way of providing them a relaxing atmosphere for discussions and interaction among each other.

Central to the goat-roasting is each individual's schematic interpretation of the event. To us, it was a way of meeting other people. Some students that I talked to mentioned that the goat roasting embodies the above mentioned function of continuity and, in addition to that, this kind of event is supposed to be ritualistic in essence if performed during certain rights of passage such as circumcisions, weddings, and burials.

Having discussed the framing devices of conversational narratives, based on the sociolinguistic approach, and how these devices signal the frame of a narrative event, I will examine in detail two performances by Beto and Juma. Through a close examination of the way in which these two narrators strategically structure, frame, and manage the telling of their stories, this analysis is intended to demonstrate how
the general principles of storytelling performances are manifested. Through a dramatic enactment of events, each narrator has to exhibit a superb performance to the extent that each narrator achieves the optimum level of acting within the performance mode.

The narratives that will be evaluated in this segment will be based on the immediate context of their occurrence. [The emphasis upon the immediate context of use reveals to the addressees how the social situation contextualizes the meaning of a speech event and foregrounds the themes relevant to the narrative in question.] By taking this kind of approach (i.e. a social interaction analysis of these performances) in a detailed version is an attempt, on my part, to view these conversational narratives as highly structured and integrated forms of interpersonal behavior.

Speech Act 1: The Narrator and His Repertoire:

Inasmuch as we are entertained by the narratives told, whether they are fabricated or not, their significance cannot be underestimated. The narratives that follow serve as a vehicle for a social protest against the expected religious norms for all the participants. Most of the performers are Muslims, and drinking is not allowed. When the participants drink and talk about alcohol, that is their way of sanctioning an act that is religiously condemned. On the other hand, the narratives are humorous. We laugh at the uncouth behaviors displayed by the characters depicted in the stories. At the same time, we cannot overlook the fact that the individuals described within the
narratives can be people like us or those people we relate to intimately.

Conversational narratives are narratives told by groups of people for entertainment purposes. Although the functional aspect of imparting values to those present is not necessarily the goal of conversational narratives, the implicit message that condemns unacceptable behavior often comes across. The expected norms are most often proposed in an indirect manner. That is to say that the audience is given the opportunity to examine characters' behavior, who might be social misfits, within the narrated event and draw their own conclusions. In so doing, the audience is compelled to draw the positive aspects suggested within the narrated event by rejecting the negative attitudes.

Beto's narrative that follow is an embedded text that occurred after a series of other conversational narratives that report on the mishaps that befalls people once intoxicated. Importantly, the narratives were not only fabricated, but they were very far-fetched, such that the only valid truth in them was the fact that the characters mentioned within the narratives themselves had previously drank so heavily that they could not recall what happened to them or what they did upon returning home. The narratives in this section, however, are less personalized, but yet thematically interrelated because they report on other people's behavioral misconduct after being intoxicated. Precisely, these are narratives that abridge or diverge from the expected norms of behavior within the social context. It is
important to note that these narratives are very fitting for these occasions because they caution all those present on the negative impacts of alcohol on people. Categorically, the functional agendas of these narratives are to entertain and, at the same time, educate us.

Transcript of Beto’s Narrative:

Beto: We had a friend. Line 1
His name was John. 2
There was a time we were living in a carpeted house. 3
We were like four guys. 4
This guy just woke up [John]. 5
We had not even slept. 6
We had just went there [to the bedroom], 7
and when we were just getting ready [to sleep], 8
this guy woke up. 9
And he went to the nearest wall 10
and he started peeing right there very noisily 11
Prrrrrrrrr [dramatizing through demonstration, laughter] 12
Waah, I mean, 13
Some of us who were awake were like 14
"John, don’t do it! Why? [shouting, pause, laughter] 14
George: Stop it right there [also shouting] 15
Beto: And this was a good, clean carpeted house [group laughter] 16
and all that. 17
Juma: Ah! Ah! 18
Beto: And the guy started peeing on the wall. 19
We had to clean the house [low voice, group laughter]. 20

In this narrative, Beto reports to us an incident that he witnessed that deviates from the normal social conduct. The narrative is framed formulaically with a phrase that marks the genre of the narrative as a joke that parodies John’s social misbehavior. This narrative can be viewed as impersonal based on the narrator’s choice of words and
narrative style. It is also a personal experience narrative which shares some features with the joke or a comic story. At the onset, the narrator's use of the "he" or third person pronouns indicates the distance he would like to create between him, the narrative, and John. At the same time, the use of the "we" draws him close to the characters mentioned in the narrative. This relationship or association offers a false sense of closeness.

We had a friend.  
His name was John.  
There was a time we were living in a carpeted house.

The above lines offer the orientation part of the narrative. This orientation segment depicts the micro context within the narrated event upon which we derive and establish the genre of the narrative. At the same time, it sets the stage for comprehending the functional nature of the narrative as a joke that rules out the unintended meanings of the tale. In so doing, the narrator suppresses the misunderstandings that are bound to occur apart from the sophisticated cultural competence or incompetence of the audience. Most often, misunderstandings that occur within the interpretive frameworks arise as a result of the storyteller's or audience's cultural incompetence. The cultural competence and a shared understanding of events at the beginning of each elicited episode enables the listeners, both active and passive, to participate in an oral performance to retrieve either knowledge of the events being recounted and relate them (past events) to the immediate ones, and in so doing, offer objective deductions of the
event at hand.

Beto, as a performer, furnished his audience with the relevant information that enabled them to follow the events in the narrative. Lines one and two quoted above establish the person who is to be discussed in the narrative while line three is the opening formulae that introduces the joke. According to Bauman, such formulae mark the genre of this narrative as a joke and it also serves as a key to the performance to us as Beto's audience (Bauman 1977:21). On the other hand, when openings and closings are formulaic, as Young claims, like "Once upon a time," and "The end," not only do they make a discontinuity in the order of discourse, but also, by convention, they specify the realm status of the enclave as fairytale-like (1987:34). Both Young and Bauman see the opening formulae of a narrative as serving the same purpose. However, in Young's other illustration, she makes a distinction between conversation and performed events. Young suggests that "openings and closings can also distinguish a narrative event from other enclaves in a conversation" (Young 1987:31). Young's definition sets a distinction between conversational narratives and performed events. In conversations, a speaker is allowed a few seconds to talk based on the negotiated principles of talk/turn-taking while in performed or staged events, the performer is given the stage to perform and does not have to negotiate for turn-takings as is the case in conversations.

The opening formulae places the action of the story in the past or what Goffman would refer to as the "reported form of a narrative." The
story is in a reported form of a past experience which is a common phenomena in all conversational narratives. According to my understanding, for any utterance to be a story, it has to invoke an account of the past in reference to the timeline -- that is, the time difference between when events being told occurred and the time they are being retold. This definition sets the distinction between a speech event and a narrated event.

Beto in his narrative strategy transforms the narrated past into an almost current occurrence through his dramatic enactment of the urinating process. Prior to the optimum dramatic effect of Beto's narrative, he offers us very detailed information that becomes central at the end of the narrative. It is important for us to know at the beginning that these guys stayed in a carpeted house as indicated in line three. When John urinates on the wall, we all share in Beto's dismay of "we had to clean the house."

Beto, in his narrative style, frames his story with an opening formulae that sets the narrative mode of the tale in the past. The information we receive in line three is essential to the audience in order to establish a coherent order between the introduction, the body, and the closure of the story. The orientation knowledge that we get in the first three lines eradicates the issue of misinterpreting the frame of the narrative due to misconceptions. The orientation parts of stories "provide information deemed necessary in order to understand what is transpiring in the taleworld story" (Young 1987:47). The orientation knowledge is most often information to ensure the
appropriate comprehension of the story attained. "It also orients the
listener (as Beto does) in respect to the person, place, time and
behavioral situation" (1987:48). Or rather, the sequence of context
employed by the teller to locally occasion the events, characters, and
places within the narrative, permits the audience's appreciation of
what is transpiring that is relevant and that which is not. Obviously,
a detailed description of the orientation part of the narrative will
support the claim that for an audience to effectively attain the
audience's interest in events taking place for persuasive reasons,
she/he has to furnish them with the appropriate knowledge -- be it
historical, philosophical, or social. Thus, the organization of a
coherent narrative is a central function of talk. "Talk is (supposed)
to provide the talker with some means of taking up a self-saving
alignment to what is happening around him even while he forgoes any
immediate effort to redirect the situation" (Goffman, 1981: 501).
However, in occasions where the speaker/narrator fails to be coherent
or redirect his talk to fit the surrounding situation, we have a
disruption in the telling itself and hence the frame is broken.
Therefore, to maintain uniformity, the speaker has to present to his
audience all the desired information just like Beto does in his
narrative. Beto maintains uniformity by breaking the story into the
following four major parts:

a) The orientation section leads into the story and, at the same
time, informs the audience of the topic of the story. Within
this section, Beto offers the audience the background information necessary in order to understand the story. It also names the person who is the "butt" of the joke, and not in the sense of a victim of a prank.

b) The body (narration) refers to the structural weaving of the story to make it a complete whole (the actual transmission process). The transmission process of events occurs through the performer's employment of suspense in its telling, and the non-verbal communication between the performer and the audience.

c) The climax of the story reveals the joke by exposing John's indecent behavior.

d) The formulaic closure that informs the audience that the story has ended.

**Beto's Narrative Strategy:**

Beto's narrative is recounted in a replay style. This assumption is drawn from the manner and the style of the narrative delivery. A replay style of narration as described by Goffman refers to a dramatized form of narration equivalent to running off a tape of a past experience. I suggest that the replay concept is much more complex than just the running of a tape of the past experience. I argue that this narrative strategy, if effectively and accurately utilized by the performer, is supposed to move the audience, as Goffman suggests, to the point that they can "emphatically insert themselves into
vicariously re-experiencing what took place" (Goffman 1981:504). When Beto demonstrates John's indecent behavior, he not only uses ideophones that heighten the action being elicited, but he also "physically" illustrates (not urinating) the standing position adapted by men when performing this act. In fact, his action is highly dramatized that George, in a shout, requests him to stop, "Stop it right there!" The high tone employed by George clearly indicates that the narrator has achieved his goal to maintain the audience's interest in the story. The tone also marks the climax of the narrated event. But since Beto has to go through all the ABC forms of the story, he cannot end his narrative in the middle. Instead, he ends it a few lines later in a sad manner "We had to clean the house." Although the statement "We had to clean the house" is not formulaic, it terminates Beto's story. The ending is not formulaic in nature, like "They lived happily ever after," but it refers to the closing of this particular conversation narrative that brings out the distinction between fairytales and conversation stories.

Beto recounts this narrative in both personalized and impersonal forms. The personalized aspect of the narrative can be explained through Beto's language choice of communication. In this work, most of the impersonal narratives were told in English while the personalized ones were recounted in Swahili. In this section, however, the impersonal and the personalized nature of events can be revealed through the examination of the pronoun shifts within the narrative event. In this event, Beto's use of the "we" pronoun clearly indicates
that he was making an effort to identify himself with the other guys implied in the story. In addition, the "we" pronoun suggests that he was a witness to the events that he is telling; therefore, he should be considered as a reliable narrator. Several issues point to this assumption. Line four "We were like four guys," suggests that he and three other guys were staying in a carpeted house in which an event occurred. It is central to Beto to point out that the house was carpeted because it becomes central when we learn of what John did. Concurrently, the carpeted house offers an implicit metamessage that these guys were leading a "good" life in a "good" house, and they belonged to a middle social class.

On the other hand, Beto distances himself from the main events of the story when he talks about John. In this respect, the third pronoun form is used. I noticed that Beto shifted constantly from the "we" pronoun (when referring to his friends) to the third pronoun when referring to John. John was not probably included in the "we" or the "us" forms. He was constantly mentioned through the use of "he" or referred to directly as John. Although the speaker acknowledges him as a friend in line one, he does not appear to be a "close" friend, partly because of his indecent behavior. There is also no mention, apart from line one, that John was his friend.

Beto also employs a suspense narrative technique. This style is a way of capturing the audience's attention in the events taking place. Although the narrative told by Beto could have been told in one sentence, "A friend of mine, named John, urinated on the wall of our
carpeted house," the narrator goes through several steps prior to telling us what John did, leading us to the punchline of the story. The statement mentioned above does not embody the form and the structure of a story; therefore, Beto has to go through 20 lines to make the events recounted tellable. Through the use of suspense or a deliberate withholding of information from the audience, as narrators and performers are compelled to do, the audiences are systematically led by the performers in a gradual manner to the discovery of the outcomes of the story. In essence, the audience "must put themselves in the hands of the teller and suspend the fact that the teller knows what is to occur and that the individuals in the story including the teller in his "I" form, will have come to know and therefore must know" (Goffman 1981:501) the climactic condition and outcome of the story. The audience, in ideal terms, is at the mercy of the performer and the performer, in turn, has control and power over his audience. Certainly, Beto was cautiously aware of his narrative technique, and therefore, he chose to reveal events to his audience bit-by-bit till the climax of the story when he employs a register shift in his tonality and also the change of the pronoun "we" to "I."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waah, I mean</th>
<th>Line 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of us who were awake were like</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, don't do it! Why?</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This change, and the act itself, brings all the details Beto described in lines 1-11 to the climatic point of the events. We realize that what Beto was consciously trying to do is to tell us that John urinated
on the wall instead of in the bathroom, in the presence of his friends. Therefore, the heightened moment of this event is the act of urinating that John does. This information was withheld from the audience until the speaker knew that he had the full attention of his audience. [According to the narrator, the events being discussed occurred at night. All the implied audience within the narrative itself were getting ready to go to sleep.] When Beto demonstrates John’s action, he states:

And he went to the nearest wall
and he started peeing right there very noisily.
Prrrrrrrr (dramatizing through demonstration)

There is a register shift in his tone. This shift is a very effective tool for the performance because it heightens the actions of the event. The speaker uses paralinguistic features. Paralinguistic features, as illustrated by Bauman, refers to a series of conventions for indicating such features as "rate, length, pause duration, pitch contour, tone of voice, loudness, and stress that seem relatively simple and straightforward, but are revolutionary in conception" (Bauman 1987:20). In fact, Beto’s tonal voice is very high; it is an exclamation in ideal terms. It appeared to me that at this point Beto had completely inserted himself in the events he was describing that when he says "John, don’t do it!" it seemed like John was present during the time Beto was performing this indecent act.

Beto performs a dramatic enactment of what John did through the use of Prrrrrrrrrr sounds made when urinating. In so doing, Beto heightens
the events in the narrative. One can argue that Beto's high, or rather heightened, narrative style goes back to what Goffman has discussed in terms of the organizational principle of narratology. Goffman suggests that "the organization of whatever is meaningfully said will have to satisfy the rules of language competence in which a participant will have to bring the requisite acoustical equipment. The competence is closely linked with another, one that bears on the actual social situation in which it is exercised, for there will be required use of "indexical expressions" (Goffman 1981). For example, those of time, place, and person which are responsive to this setting -- the one in which the speaking is occurring as opposed to the setting that is spoken about. Further, the participants will be bound by norms of good manners: through frequency and length of turns at talk, through topics avoided, through circumspection in regard to references about self, through attention offered eagerly or begrudgingly, through all these means -- rank and social relationships will be given their due (Goffman 1981:500).

The informality of the subject matter, as discussed by Beto, is very general to all the participants because they have a story related to Beto's. Due to this informality, almost all the people present become active participants in the on-going events. In fact, George's remark "Stop right there" is a conversation style that most speakers use if they want to participate in a talk and, at the same time, terminate the speech of the current speaker. George's outburst was not effective because it did not terminate Beto's story, neither did it
enable him to get the chance to perform after Beto’s tale. Instead, it encouraged other performers, like Juma, to participate.

Another essential key to performance employed by Beto is the parallelism. This concept can be seen in Beto’s repeated use of the following statements with a systematic variation:

There was a time when we were living in a carpeted house
And this was a good clean carpeted house.

The phrase "There was a time" is metanarrational because it sets the timeline of the narrative as being a past account considered essential by Goffman. Concurrently, he uses parallelism as a metacommunicative device to illustrate the point about the house they were staying in. Apparently, the repeated point that the house was carpeted becomes very central when Beto states:

An he [John] went to the nearest wall
and the guy started peeing on the wall

It is quite obvious from the narrative itself that John’s act was very unacceptable to expected norms of behavior. Even as Beto narrates, he offers the closure of his narrative in a very sad manner "We had to clean the house."

Any good performer in his/her performance has to use a register shift in the telling of the story. This shift is very salient, especially when the speaker wants to make a point that whatever he/she is saying should be viewed as somebody else’s words and not the
speaker's own. In this respect, the narrator is compelled to use mimicry, quotation, or brackets to let the audience know that he/she is deviating from the ordinary performance by inserting another person's voice within the narrated text. Therefore, Beto, like many other performers, employed the register shift when he was demonstrating the act of urinating performed by John within the narrated story. This issue is explicitly realized when Beto exclaimed, as if John was indeed present, "John, don't do it! Why?" In the above quotation, Beto not only raised his voice, but he addressed John as if he was present during his retelling of the story.

Therefore, Beto's narrative strategies can be summed up in the following manner:

1) When Beto attained the stage to perform, it appears that he did not acknowledge the presence of his audience; although all those present knew that he was the next speaker based on the non-verbal exchanges that took place, such as eye contact.

2) With the acknowledgment that he was the next speaker, Beto framed his story formulaically with an opening formulae, a climax, and a closure to his story without yielding to the audience's interruption.

3) He used a dramatic enactment in his telling.

4) He did not encourage audience participation, but yet maintained eye contact with them.
5) He used paralinguistic language, parallelism, and both the opening and closing cues of a conversation story.

Speech Act 2: Juma and His Tale:

Juma’s narrative is keyed by Beto’s story. The subject matter that Juma discusses in his tale can be seen as an extension of Beto’s story. However, both Juma and Beto have different narrative styles. Juma’s primary goal in the following text is to tell a tale that is insidious with the objective of outdoing Beto’s story. Apparently, one notable difference between the two narratives is in reference to those persons who are satirized, when and where. The events addressed in Beto’s narrative take place at home while those described by Juma occur in public. The person who is parodied in Juma’s tale is a dignified person, one who is expected to display proper social behavior, a person who is likely to be emulated by the younger generation.

Transcript of Juma’s Narrative:

Juma: It happened, it happened in Line 1
it happened in Bukura, Kenya. 2
Kamau got drunk. 3
Really drunk. 4
You know the Agricultural Resource Center (ARC)? 5
You know the ARC? 6
You know you come out of the door, 7
you walk, and then there is a plant. 8
There is a plant in-between the main ARC and the bathroom. 9
Inside the ARC already 10

Beto: inside OK! Inside... 11

Juma: We are inside the ARC. 12
When you come out of the ARC, 13
you go around to go to the bathroom; in the middle there is a plant.

Beto: Uh huh.

Juma: This man came out [Beto laughing], and according to him, he had arrived in the bathroom, laughing. Chaaaaaaa [demonstrating how Kamau was urinating near the plant]

Beto: Aarrrrrrr.

Juma: And that day, that day, that thing was actually, was actually, ah ah was a United States mission that was in Kenya. The man just came out, and he believed that he had arrived at the point. Chrrrrrrrr. [again demonstrating sounds made when one urinates] Everybody saw him, but nobody could stop him.

Judy: Sasa hiyo story iliishaje? (How did the story end?)

Juma: He couldn’t do anything about it.

Judy: Na mti ulikufa? (Did the tree die?)

Juma: No, hata hakukojolea mti. (No, he did not urinate on the tree.) He did not use the tree. He just went next to a tree. Alikuwa anakhoja na mikojo inaenda on the floor. (He was urinating on the floor.)

Although Juma’s narrative does not begin with a special opening formulae, the fact that the narrator, from the onset, attempts to accredit the story as a true account makes the audience know that the performance has begun. Juma, in his narrative style (unlike Beto), is constantly aware of his audience. He frequently asks for approval and continuation of the performance within his narrative technique. Prior
to evaluating the text, let us see how the events in Juma’s story can be broken down.

Part a: Setting of the story and the claim that the story is a "true" account -- lines 1-4.
Part b: A guided tour to the ARC that epitomizes the optimum level of a satire -- lines 5-16.
Part c: The victim’s appearance and the climax -- lines 17-25).
Part d: Formulaic closure.
Part e: Comments on the story -- audience’s input.

Juma, as a narrator, at the beginning of his tale is not confident about his performance; the main reason being that two people in the audience were Juma’s former colleagues, and therefore, they affected the nature of his performance. Juma’s uneasiness is also due to the fact that his former colleagues are familiar with the surroundings that he wants to describe. Therefore, he has to be extremely careful in giving specific and accurate details of the place he wishes to describe. Again here, accuracy plays a big role in persuasive narratives in which the narrator hopes to convince the audience that the events he is describing are true to the best of his knowledge. The "truthfulness" of the descriptions here are supposed to be accredited if not validated by those persons familiar with the place described. Since none of Juma’s colleagues discredited the locale described, we can assume that the information he presented was accurate. At the
beginning of the story, or "Part a" of his narrative, Juma has to accurately offer the setting or the location where the story took place.

According to Goffman, the setting up of a narrative, which is what Juma does in lines 1-4, involves considerable extensive forward and backward scripting, now finding a statement to follow from a prior one, now finding a prior one for a statement that has already been scripted as one that is to come later (Goffman 1974:510). The setting becomes the orientation part of this particular story. Whether the story is fabricated or not, the physical setting of its occurrence is accurate to the knowledge of the other people who knew the place. Since the majority of us did not know where Bukura is, Juma in detail offers the guided tour of the Agricultural Resource Center (ARC) where the events took place.

In most oral performances, the question of whether a narrative is "true" or should be "believed" is an issue that scholars and folklorists have wrestled with for a long time. I also believe that Juma's lines 1-4 in this narrative ought to be understood along the lines of a performance performed for entertainment. Due to the entertainment nature of the events taking place, there are high chances for narrators to fabricate issues, but yet claim that what they are saying is "true." Bauman (1988) addresses in depth this question of expressive lying. Within Bauman's context, there are two kinds of tales -- one true and the other one false -- whereby the relative truth of the narrative is a direct corollative of the story and the events
being recounted. As manifested in many oral performances, "truth and lying may well be of social and cultural concern to members of communities with regard to stories. What is needed are closely focused ethnographic investigations of how truth and locally salient storytelling criteria within specific institutional and situational contexts in particular societies" (Bauman 1988:12). In reference to Juma's account, two phrases are evidenced; despite the unaccountability of an empirical truth of the narrative, that is:

It happened, it happened, it
it happened in Bukura, Kenya.
You know the Agricultural Resource Center,
you know the ARC.

The four lines are two repeated phrases to establish the validity of the narrative. The "it happened" and "you know" are statements made by the narrator to strategically get the attention of his audience. The first phrase is metanarrational and, at the same time, metacommunicative. It is metanarrational because it calls attention to the narrative as narrative and, at the same time, communicates a specific message to the audience -- the story is "true." The "you know" aspect is the narrator's attempt to get approval from the audience indicating that whatever he has said is true to the best of his recollection. This approval is attained through the audience's acknowledgement made apparent by nodding. Thus, when the audience offers the narrator the approval to continue, they are categorically playing a big role in framing and structuring the narrative.
The on-going argument explicitly indicates that any kind (form) of communication, be it verbalized or non-verbal, always takes place in a situation in which people confront each other face-to-face and relate to each other directly. Therefore, the teller, unlike Juma, knows the audience and relates specifically to them, and the listener likewise knows the performer and reacts to his narrative based on the nature of his presentation (Ben-Amos 1971:84). Although the arguments discussed above seem to put more emphasis on the importance of the interaction between the audience and the performers, the major thrust of all the activities that took place here were for entertainment purposes. Categorically, in some cases, especially in social gatherings, conversations and conversational narratives always play a major role in influencing the audience’s/participants’ attitudes toward what has transpired. Arguments, in a form of speech acts, are adapted for argumentative reasons. As seen from Juma’s and Beto’s narratives, their stories are told to pass time and illuminate narrators who are better at the game of storytelling.

As a narrator, Juma is very captivating. Having attained the stage to perform, his major task using the suspense method is to lead his listeners to the room where the actual "act" or climax of the story takes place. Juma gives his audience a guided tour to the Agricultural Resource Center in a very dynamic manner. [In fact, the tour is synonymous to the path taken by blood from the right ventricle to the left ventricle where, in essence, everything occurs.] We are given a guided tour through the hallway, around the corner to the bathroom, and
to the middle hallway where all the action takes place. Descriptively, Juma, in his narrative style, appeals to both our audio and visual sights. Here is the illustration:

You come out of the door,
you walk, and then there is a plant.

The first underlined words makes the audience visually (imaginary) see the door, open, and then walk through it. Immediately after walking through the door, the audience is supposed to see a plant. The next statement is even more significant:

There is a plant in-between the main ARC and the bathroom. We, as the audience, are not aware of what the narrator was leading to, although we could guess from the preceding story. However, when the climax of the narrative is reached, the events in the story unfold. We realize why the word "plant" is said twice to be between the main ARC and the bathroom. The narrator ascertains that we are "inside the ARC already." This fact is indeed acknowledged by Beto who strengthens the validity of Juma's story. The next step by the narrator is to walk us to the next room since we are already "inside the ARC."

Apparently, it is very important for Juma to lead us to this room so we can meet Mr. Kamau. Having demonstrated and captivated our attention in the transmission of his detailed description of the room where the event referred to took place, Juma makes Kamau to appear before our eyes. We can indeed see (imagine) Kamau standing before our eyes from what Juma illustrates.
Juma: This man came out [Beto laughing], and according to him, he had arrived [in the bathroom, performer laughs] Chaaaaaaaa [demonstrating how Kamau was urinating]

At this point in his narration, Juma is somewhat carried away with the events that he is describing. He dramatically enacts Kamau’s behavior by employing the chaaaaaaaa and the chrrrrrrrr sounds that are produced when one urinates to heighten the effectiveness of his eloquent narrative style. As a matter of fact, Juma demonstrates Kamau’s misconduct twice to ensure that all those present during his performance do not miss his main point...that is, Kamau exhibited an inappropriate behavior. Juma’s enactment of the episode is very graphic and effective because a performed event is more captivating than a flat description. I believe that if Juma or Beto in their narration had used the word "urinating" instead of "chaaaaaaa" or "chrrrrrrrr," we would not have received the same impact or effect that we get when they dramatize John and Kamau’s behavior. The demonstrations that they employ indicate their mastery of storytelling. They indeed know what it takes to capture the audience’s attention and when to offer the confirmation or the punchline of their narratives.

The tragedy of Kamau’s misconduct is highly magnified, unlike John discussed in Beto’s story, because it took place in a public area. Kamau’s social status within the society as a head of a department makes his behavior very outrageous. In fact, he shamed the entire institution. According to Juma, nobody could stop him because it happened so fast. Juma ends the story in a formulaic manner in a low
tone "Everybody saw him, but nobody could stop him."

The Similarities and Differences Between Juma's and Beto's

Narrative and Style:

Beto's narratives are framed by the narrative told by Makanya as discussed in the next section while Juma's story is keyed by Beto's. Both performers are very persuasive in their telling. They both have one common agenda -- to entertain their audience by drawing everybody's attention to the misconduct of John and Kamau. Both Juma and Beto talk about unsanctioned behavior for entertainment purposes. At the same time, the storytellers have pleasure in discussing social misbehavior conducts. In so doing, they glorify drinking that is otherwise considered bad and acts performed by characters in the storyworld that would be labelled as misbehavior. Above all, such narratives told in male circles show the men's quest for freedom outside the constraints of societal expectations. Although both social misfits perform the same indecent behavior, Kamau's act is more insidious than John's. John urinates in a public place, but his act occurs among his friends in his own home, while Kamau's act occurs in a public building where there is a delegation of USA dignitaries. Both performers implicitly condemn the behaviors displayed by the two men. I come to this conclusion based on their closing formulas. Both performers, in offering a closure to their narrative, lowered their tonal voice. Beto, in a low tone, said as a closure to his tale "We had to clean the house," while Juma concludes his by saying "Everybody saw him, but
nobody could stop him." These two performers are almost apologetic. As such, the narrators separate themselves from the subject of the story.

Despite the similarities of the narratives told by these two performers, they both had different narrative strategies to capture the audience’s attention in their narratives as indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beto</th>
<th>Juma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keys his narrative with an opening formula &quot;We had a friend...&quot; 1-4</td>
<td>Lacks opening formula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Very precise. Describes the events systematically without approval from the audience.</td>
<td>Describes events in detailed manner. Consults the audience for acknowledgement and approval of elicited data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fast paced, less detailed.</td>
<td>Fast paced, a lot of details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Audience less involved in the construction of the frame of the story, but yet moves them to the point that they demand the narrative to be stopped.</td>
<td>The audience is actively involved in the construction of the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uses repetition to make the main point.</td>
<td>Uses repetition to make the main point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Uses ideophones to heighten the dramatic enactment of events taking place.</td>
<td>Uses ideophones twice to heighten the dramatic enactment of events taking place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Claims the event referred to actually happened.</td>
<td>Claims the event referred to actually happened.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the similarites and the differences illustrated above, all the performers successfully managed to entertain the audience. Beto does not encourage the audience participation because he does not want the progression of his story to be broken. Unlike Beto, Juma requires constant feed-back from the audience as a deliberate narrative strategy to get the audience's attention, and ultimately reveal the punchline of the joke at the opportune time. In addition, to convince the audience in more subtle ways that drinking in excess is bad.

Thus, the examination of the two narratives suggests that the frame of a story can be managed in many ways. One way is that exhibited by Beto whereby the interruption of the audience is inhibited since it's likely to break the frame of the story. Even when George exclaims "Stop right there," the performer ignores his out-burst by maintaining composure and almost the same tone of voice as if nothing happened.

On the other hand, Juma as a performer encourages the audience to be active participants in the construction of the frame of the story. In this example, the audience is not a distraction, but rather they encourage the performer to perform by acknowledging all that he talks about.

Regardless of whether we consider Juma or Beto to be the best entertainers, the framing devices of the story enables the audience to draw attitudes of the performer from the narrative told. At the same time, the performer's attitude in one way or another through the interaction process influences the audience's perception about the narrative and the performer.
CHAPTER III

A TALK ABOUT TALK: INTERLOCUTORS AND THEIR TALES

Introduction and Background:

The trip to Urbana/Champaign to visit Ngeré and his friends is a journey we had waited for for a long time. Ngeré, our host, had previously come to Columbus to visit us early Summer of 1991. During his short visit in Columbus, he spent a lot of time with us. During this period, we discussed our educational goals and what we were doing in our studies (see appendix A). It was during these discussions that I mentioned to him that I was collecting data from East African students. And I wanted to know if he would be willing to tell me any stories or allow me to tape record our conversations. From my association with Ngeré, I had noticed that most of the time he talked, he had a story to tell. It was his conversational style of using stories to illustrate whatever he said that made me decide to ask him for assistance in such a delicate matter of being recorded in conversation. I clearly told him that I was interested in examining how people/friends talk to each other, what they talk about during their socialization hours, and whether what they say is storyable or tellable within a speech event. Shuman asserts that "storyability and tellability are concepts that most often arise in discussions of oral narratives since they both concern the relationships between text and
context, a concern central to oral communication and not always considered in the examination of written texts. However, storyability and tellability can be restated as ways of understanding the distance between teller and audience and the related distance between the characters in a story and the participants (readers, listeners, tellers, narrators, authors) in a storytelling situation" (1988:54).

Ngere's first reaction explicitly indicated that he did not know how to tell stories, but that if I wanted to tape record his conversations among his friends, I should visit him so that he could introduce me to Juma who is an excellent storyteller. A few seconds later, he went on to say that he had a fascinating story to tell me about his car. Upon pressing him for the story about his car, he said "You just have to come to Champaign if you want to understand the story about this car." There was no further discussion or mention of the subject. He deliberately refused to disclose any information about the car. Ngere's behavior here is synonymous to what Bauman (1987) has analyzed by suggesting that storytelling (as power) has a means of manipulating others in a benign way.

When we started our journey from Columbus to Urbana/Champaign I could not help but think about Ngere's car, what it looked like and what kind of story he was going to tell me about it. It was on an early Saturday morning, around 3:00 a.m., that we started our five-hour journey to Urbana. On this trip, Beto, Makanyaga and I were the first people to leave Columbus and the first group to arrive in Urbana at around 9:00 a.m. The second group of people, George, Dan and Hamisi,
arrived at around 3:15 p.m. When the second group arrived, we had gone to the nearby city, Rantoul, where they joined us. When they came, we had already bought the goat that was to be used for the occasion.

When Makanyaga, Beto, and I arrived at our host’s house, he welcomed us to a very hearty breakfast of eggs, beef sausages, hash browns, sweet baked beans, and tea. After breakfast, Ngere suggested that we should all have at least one drink prior to going to Rantoul to buy the goat. There was no objection to this suggestion. It is central to note Ngere’s suggestion to drink sets the ground for drinking -- a theme that dominates all the narratives collected. Therefore, we all took a drink and then went to Rantoul. Just before setting off to Rantoul, Ngere called me and said "Look at this car. This is my famous car." When I looked at the car, the first thing that I noticed was that the car was very rugged and really beat-up. The car which was originally white had turned to brown. There was no way one could tell its original color without looking on the top of the car. The remarkable thing he said about his car was "My car runs very well even in the cold weather." He stressed that most people who have "good" cars usually ask him for a ride in his car when their "good" cars have mechanical problems caused by the freezing winter conditions. We did not ride in his car until the following day. Seeing Ngere’s car itself was a story of its own. I could not have imagined him driving a car so rugged and yet be proud of it. However, the essential point is that the car was a property he owned, and it represented something significant to him. It was something that
triggered memorable moments that he experienced during the many times he had driven it. Although he is not responsible for making the car, the pride he displayed in talking about it with a lot of intimacy made me think of people's attachment to homemade quilts. In his article on folk art, Henry Glassie suggests that the "objects of material culture such as the crucifix [and I might add a car] simultaneously gives pleasure and serves some practical social economic end" (Glassie 1972:253). A car is both art and craft, with pleasure-giving and practical functions intertwined. According to Ngere, the car is functional because it enables him to have transportation from one place to another and hence giving him freedom of movement. It also puts him in a position to be of service to others and in so doing, he becomes elevated socially among his friends as a person you can always count on. The car, regardless of its ragged nature, symbolically as an art form, represents Ngere's short history in the United States.

When we arrived in Rantoul around 1:00 p.m. we went directly to the nearby farmer to buy the goat that was to be used for the occasion. At Rantoul all the activities took place in the backyard. There was a grill ready to go. We did not start roasting the goat meat until very late in the evening because the weather was toasting hot. Therefore, we spent the afternoon getting to know the people we met and also drinking. Drinking, therefore, plays a significant social role in the events that took place on this particular occasion. Drinking as a social event sets the context for storytelling since it allowed the participants to drink and, at the same time, interact with each other.
When everybody was settled, I took out my recorder and then I told them that I wanted them to give me permission to tape record their conversation. I indicated that I would not turn on the recorder until they gave me approval. If any one of them had raised any kind of objections, I would not have recorded anything. They all gave me an okay. Makanyaga, upon hearing their approval, told me that he wanted to operate the recorder. I did not object. My major task on this day was to provide him with empty tapes whenever he needed any.

Unfortunately, most of the data I collected on this day was not very clear because there was a lot of noise in the background, music and mixed-up speeches, that I could not follow very well. Although I could not use the material that I collected on this day, it was a significant day because it enabled me to meet Juma, talk to him, and make an acquaintance with him prior to going to his house the following day. I did not have to re-introduce myself when I met him the next day.

On Sunday, 29 July 1991, Juma (whom I had been told by Ngere would be my major storyteller) invited us to his house for further socialization activities. Again on this second day, drinking as a social activity not only sets the context for storytelling, but it also becomes the major theme of the stories narrated by all the participants. The festivities of the previous night had left us so incapacitated that it was absolutely very hard for us to be charmed by another event of chicken roasting. A majority of the people who Juma had invited were already tipsy if not nursing the previous night’s hangover. It was around 12:00 noon that we all struggled to wake up in
order to get ready for the next event. When we woke up, we each took a shower, ate breakfast, and got ready to go to Juma’s house.

When we arrived at Juma’s house, which was approximately a five-minute walk from Ngere’s house where we had spent the night, we found that he had already arranged a place where we were supposed to spend the afternoon. Juma had set four benches under a tree, his phonographic speakers were in front of his bedroom window and connected to the main stereo by wires passed through the window.

Under the tree there were four benches set in a square form with a table at the center on which drinks will be served. The benches were actually four pieces of wood supported by cement blocks. Each piece of wood was supported by two blocks on each side. The table at the center was also made in the same fashion with four blocks instead of two. At the extreme left-hand side of the table was a huge grill that would be used for grilling/roasting chicken. The grill was already filled with charcoal because Juma was expecting us. On the table were several cans of beer, both opened and unopened. The arrangement that Juma had made appeared to me to be very simple, but yet ideal for the occasion. The setting that he had created was equivalent to what most people from the rural African societies are accustomed to during the oral storytelling events. The atmosphere was so relaxing that it set my mind wondering about the many occasions that my family and I have shared, relaxing moments under the shade of a tree talking about all the world events. This occasion, for me and many of the other participants present, was indeed our symbolic short trip to our homeland to revisit it with
friends in a foreign land. No sooner had we sat and been served with drinks, than people started talking about their past experiences and our experiences with those people that we have encountered in our lives. The storytelling event was marked by the common background that most of us shared -- of our African ethnicity. The fact that almost all those present were drinking instigated the course of the narratives that follow.

Prior to discussing the narrators and their narratives, I would like to state that the nature of storytelling engrossment that occurred on this particular event is equivalent to what Deborah Tannen has referred to as the "High-Involvement style" of storytelling. Tannen suggests that the high-involvement style of conversation is one way of establishing rapport among the participants. The features of this style of communication made me think of the topics discussed by participants, be it personal or general. In reference to the narratives they told, the topics discussed easily fit the following categories:

(a) personal topics
(b) shift of topics abruptly
(c) introduce topics without hesitance
(d) persistence if a new topic is not immediately picked up, reintroduce it, repeatedly if necessary (Tannen 1984:30)

Although topics discussed by my participants bear a gross similarity with those addressed by Tannen, I will not adopt her method per se, but
rather allude to some specific terms/issues that she employs that are relevant to this section. The major factor of the previous chapters was to illuminate the persuasive implications of conversational narratives based on the frames of each narrative. This section, however, exclusively portrays the tellers in their artistic web of storytelling for both entertainment and persuasive reasons. The tellers in this chapter are highly interested in entertaining their audience by satirizing a serious problem of drinking alcohol as a dominant theme. Since most of the teller's goal is to convince the audience that the stories they are narrating are true, each performer is compelled to offer a justification process to accredit his/her story. This section also deals with personal narratives and topics as articulated by the performers. All the performers, as noted, shifted the topics of their narratives abruptly. For persuasive purposes, each performer offered a logical, rational justification for each episode elicited. In narratives discussed by Tannen, the justification process does not occur. The nature of the narratives I collected calls for the process since most of the stories are fabricated.

The Unexplained Mishaps:

The first narrative that we are going to discuss in this section addresses the topic of alcoholism and its effects on people. This topic is introduced by Makanyaga who claims to be telling a "true" account of what happened to him the previous night. This narrative can be perceived as very personal because it focuses on Makanyaga's
unexplained mishap of the previous night. During the previous night, we had all drank quite a bit in Rantoul, and at the same time, socialized with those people that we had met. On this particular night, Makanyaga had had too much to drink that he became very intoxicated. His narrative, therefore, explains his unpleasant experience that very night.

Makanyaga: Suruali yangu (my pants)

Judy: Ulikwua unaibadilisha suruali? (were you changing your pants)

Makanyaga: Ah, ah, suruali yaani niliamka (ah, ah, pants that is when I woke up) Halafu nikajikuta sina chochote (and then I found out that I did not have on anything)

Hamisi: Asubuhi? (in the morning?)

Judy: Yaah pengine uliamka (Yes, perhaps you woke up) Halafu ukazivua mwenyewe (and then you undressed yourself)

Hamisi: Wewe ulifirwa leo (somebody did you in)

Makanyaga: Ngojea asubuhi nimeamka (wait, I woke up in the morning) Nguo zote zimevuliwa (all my clothes had been removed)

This short narrative, narrated by Makanyaga, illustrates the dilemma most people who have had too much to drink face in the morning when they wake up and fail to recall what happened to them. In this narrative, Makanyaga is trying with a lot of difficulty to explain to
Hamisi and me what happened to him when he went to bed upon coming from Rantoul.

When Makanyaga started talking about the pants, I immediately interrupted him by asking him:

"Ulikuwa unajabadilisha suruali?"
(Were you changing your pants?)

In fact, I think that it was somewhat awkward for me to ask Makanyaga whether he was removing or changing his pants or not. Culturally, it would be impolite to ask a man whether he was taking his pants off or not. His major dilemma is that he could not remember taking them off. The only thing he recalls when he woke up was that he was naked.

"Yaani niliamika"
(that is, I woke up)
"Halafu nikajikuta sina chochote"
(and then I found out that I did not have on anything)

Hamisi and I, who were listening to Makanyaga's story, found it rather absurd and also untrue. This was due in part to the fact that most of the guys who had travelled with Makanyaga had spent the night in one huge room and would have verified his claim had anybody undressed him. Since nobody supported Makanyaga's claim, we concluded that he was probably making up the story to pass time.

To let Makanyaga know that we were interested in his story, we decided to also play his game. I remarked "Perhaps you woke up and
undressed." In a way, I was trying to humor him by offering him a false sense of encouragement to perform. However, before he could offer any response to my comment, Hamisi retorted in a high-pitched voice:

"Wewe ulifirwa leo"
(somebody did you in today)
[teasing him]

In fact, according to Tannen when speakers change the pitch in their music of talk, they change the metamessage of the word spoken. Just like Hamisi when he retorts "Wewe ulifirwa leo." Thus, "Pitch shifts are a basic tool for signaling meaning. For example, pitch going up at the end of a sentence can make the sentence into a question. But it can also show uncertainty or ask for approval" (1986:51). The loudness expressed by Hamisi is an emotional expression signal to humor Makanyaga, and at the same time, show a sign of disgust of the whole narrative, per se. On the literary level, Hamisi’s remark denotes that Makanyaga was sodomized. This is a joke that most people who are not engaged in homosexual acts can employ to serve their own satiric purposes. I concluded that based on the cultural background of all the participants that anal intercourse is an act not explicitly practiced. If practiced, it is an act performed in absolute secrecy since it emasculates the parties involved. If such persons are known, they become discredited as men. It becomes even more absurd if we take this interpretation literally because one cannot be sodomized without realizing that he or she is being sodomized. In essence, if this were
true that he was sodomized and he failed to realize it, then it implies that alcohol is a dangerous drink that destroys one's common sense or the ability to control his actions. It also reflects on how much Makanyaga was inebriated to the point that he cannot remember what happened to him the previous night. This statement makes me stress the point that has been illustrated under the discussion of the context of any narrated event; that when analyzing any kind of text, we should always consider the social and immediate context of its use because the context enables us to appropriately interpret the text. Concurrently, the investigation of the immediate context of use affirms that the social situation contextualizes the meaning of a narrative and foregrounds the themes which are salient, if not relevant, to the narrator on a particular occasion. With reference to Hamisi, he did not really mean that Makanyaga had been sodomized. What he was saying is equivalent to the American expression of "You were fucked up" which, if said in jest, does not bear a negative connotation. The same can be said of Hamisi's reaction to Makanyaga's story. The two remarks Hamisi and I made regarding the narrative were not taken seriously by the narrator because his major motive was convincingly to tell us what happened.

I might add that the narrative of Makanyaga's mishap could have been said in one sentence, like "I found myself naked when I woke up this morning." However, he repeats the same story twice for communicative purposes to ensure that we get his point. We did hear him, but whether we believed him or not is another issue altogether.
Whether his story is true or fictionalized, it sets the groundwork and the pace for the other narratives that occurred during this event. Concurrently, it also sets a dichotomy for examining the objective versus subjective viewpoints, the rational versus the irrational, and true versus false aspects of storytelling.

**Justification for Makanyaga’s Narrative:**

The justification and rationalization of Makanyaga’s narrative appropriately occurred later in the storytelling performance. It is essential to note that although this justification is discussed later in the storytelling events, it is salient to examine it here because it offers a buffer for the unbelievable events mentioned above. The justification immediately after the narrative helps to either make the narrative credible and convincing to the audience, or it discredits the entire narrative as a true account. The significance of the following comments on Makanyaga’s story are supposed to validate the narrative, and at the same time, provide a formulaic closure to the story. Makanyaga’s failure to provide a closing formulae to his narrative can well be understood if his narrative strategies are explained. Makanyaga’s narrative is not highly involving, lacks suspense, and his tone of voice is rather low. Due to the above problems in his narrative techniques, it was easier for Juma to acquire the audience’s attention, and at the same time, tell two stories prior to getting a closure to Makanyaga’s narrative.
Thus, the following transcript gives everybody’s “rational” or “irrational” interpretation of Makanyaga’s mishap based on whether we perceive the interpretations offered to be valid or invalid. Concurrently, the irony implicit in the justifications should be closely considered.

Makanyaga: Wewe hunywi (You do not drink) [referring to me] Line 1
Judy: That is why I drink enough to know what I am doing. 2
Kila Mtu alikuwa amelewa Jana. (Everybody was drunk last night.) 3
Beto: I saw George trying to undress you. [to Makanyaga] 4
Judy: You mean he had done it before? 6
George: "Again" is a cliche’ we use at Holiday Inn. 7
Makanyaga: Unajua mimi bado bikira bwana. (You know I am still a virgin, mister) 8
George & Beto: It is an inside joke. 9
Hamisi: Nafikiri jana ulikuwa unataka. (I think yesterday you wanted it.) 10
Ndiyo sababu ukavua nguo. [laughing] (That is why you undressed.) 11
Judy: Uliamka ukajikuta uchi? (You woke up and found yourself naked?) 12
Makanyaga: I woke up [pause] 13
You know it became too hot. 14
Judy: It was hot like late in the night. 15
Kwa hivyo nafikiri (Therefore, I think) 16
Aliamka na akazivua nguo mwenyewe na akasahau. (he woke up, undressed, and forgot that he did it.) 17
Juma: Yaa because when it gets too hot
unaskikia jasho na unataa nguuo
(you feel warm and then you take off your clothes)
because of the consciousness of the body
unataa nguuo lakini it is not definite
(you take off your clothes, but it is not definite)
in your mind that you are removing your clothes
Me, I am telling you I have gone into
my house with shoes and socks outside
that beat me
Soksa ziko nije vijatu viko ndani. [stressed point]
How?

The justification and the rationalization process of storytelling
in this section occurs when each participant/audience attempts to
objectively interpret Makanyaga’s tale or what had happened to him the
previous night. To mark the beginning of this ritualized-kind-of
process, Makanyaga in line 1 is highly perturbed by my decision not to
drink alcohol, but rather quench my thirst with a huge glass of water.
My response of "That is why I drink enough to know what I am doing" is
not very clear as to what I was trying to say. Precisely, I refrained
from drinking in order to ensure that my data collection was accurately
handled.

Beto keys this section by making fun of Makanyaga because he knew,
like most of us, that whatever Makanyaga had said was not true. He
asserts, "I saw George trying to undress you." The fact that Beto
claims to have seen George undress Makanyaga is his effort to
ironically validate an account that is incomprehensible, untrue, and
too irrational to be true. Beto, being an eye witness, attempts to
give the story its credibility and here we have a serious, logical
justification process. For the justification process to be considered logical, the rationalization of events has to be gratified by the explanation given. That is, every speakers' constructive details have to be geared towards making the story true, not vice versa. Prior to the philosophical discussion of the episode, Beto and George make fun of the whole narrative, and in so doing, Beto deconstructs what he had sought to achieve - validating the story as being "true." Both George and Beto joke about a cliche' they both share from their workplace. At first, I did not understand why they were both amused by the word "again." I asked both of them what the word meant for them in my statement: "You mean he had done it before" (referring to George as having undressed Makanyaga). But I was told that it referred to something that had happened to them at work. According to Beto and George, the cliche' "Again" came into being as a result of a sick joke one of their co-workers formulated. Beto stated that one day as they were working one of their fellow workers started rumors that Beto and George were homosexuals. To extend the joke, he elaborated that the two (George and Beto) were caught in the Meijer's department store engaged in their homosexual acts. As such, the rumor-monger went to their boss and told him the same fabricated story. The boss' response was "Again." Therefore, the response "Again" made by Beto and George's boss did not discount the story as being false, but instead, it perpetuated the story to be true and as having taken place another time other than that time implied by Beto's co-worker.
Hamisi’s rationalization of Makanyaga’s narrative is totally different from Beto. However, his comment has a more sexual connotation not forgetting that he was the same person who claimed that Makanyaga had been sodomized. Hamisi suggests in line 10 and 11 that Makanyaga was sexually starved and therefore, he decided to undress himself.

Nafikiri jana ulikwa unataka.
(I think yesterday you wanted it.)
Ndiyo sababu ukauva nguo. [laughing]
(That is why you undressed.)

Hamisi’s interpretation of the story is not only satiric, but also absurd. Hamisi explicitly indicates that if Makanyaga was sodomized, it was an act he earnestly desired. Implicitly, Hamisi suggests that Makanyaga camouflaged his intentions by claiming that he did not know who undressed him. Of course this logical assessment and interpretation of the events Makanyaga told were not true, but accounts fabricated for entertainment purposes. Among all assumptions made to logically justify this narrative, both Beto and Hamisi’s remarks were a bit off base. However, my claim that Makanyaga must have unconsciously undressed in the middle of the night and forgot about it is slightly logical. My assumption is in agreement to what Juma suggests that Makanyaga must have got too hot in the middle of the night, took off his clothes, and went back to sleep because when we sleep, our body generally adjusts to the temperature.
Background to Juma’s Narrative:

The immediate setting for Juma’s tales can well be understood if we can make reference to Deborah Tannen’s concept of the enthusiasm constraint. This strategy involves aspects of the behavioral pattern between interlocutors involved in a conversation. The strategy effectively works when speakers are engaged in some sort of an argument in a public place and often tend to speak loud in order to be heard and "it is very common for one of the two to raise his hand to attack the other physically" (Tannen 1984:60), and I might add verbally.

Makanyaga and Juma are the key speakers in this section that deal with the effects of alcohol on men. Juma, who having listened to Makanyaga’s partial narratives, interjects his narration by claiming that he too has a story-to-tell that reflects the unexplained issues of alcohol. In fact, Juma’s story is just as personal as Makanyaga’s.

Juma: Ngojea niwambieni  
(Wait, let me tell you)  
Siku moja [fighting for the stage]  
(One day)  
Nakwambia  
(am telling you)

Makanyaga: Aah, I don’t know how nimevua nguo  
(aah, I don’t know how I undressed)

Judy: [to George] The guy is complaining that you took off his clothes at night.

George: No.

Juma: No! Kuna jamaa bwana [laughter]  
(No! There is this guy)  
Nisipowadanganya no  
(without lying to you, no)

George: Again! [overlap and an inside joke]
Referring to the previous discussion of Makanyaga’s incident addressed previously, we note in lines 1 through 8 Juma’s attempt to tell his story, but with very little success. In line 1, Juma keys his tale with an opening formulae that is always used by most storytellers. The opening formulae, as discussed by Bauman, is very familiar to English-speaking audiences. It is usually marked by expressions such as "Once upon a time" or "Did you hear the one about" to introduce a joke. According to Bauman, "Such formulae are, in effect, markers of specific genres, and insofar as these genres are conventionally performed in a community, the formulae may serve as keys to performance" (Bauman 1977:21). Juma prefaces his narrative with the opening formula in lines 1 and 2:

"Ngojea niwambieni"  
(Wait, let me tell you)  
"Siku moja"  
(One day)...
drawn from Makanyaga’s narrative. Although Makanyaga’s narrative is not a joke to him per se. However, those individuals who justified it made it a humorous joke. Thus it sets the frame upon which the other narratives are to be based or examined. This opening formula is metanarrational since it makes reference to the "narrative discourse about narrative discourse" (Babcock 1977:62).

The other issue that is explicitly apparent in Juma’s opening phrase is the idea that he identifies himself as a speaker and "we" his audience. This notion is derived from:

_Ngojea niwambieni_
_(Wait, let me tell you)_

The subject prefix in the Swahili phrase "Ni" or "me" refers to the speaker himself as the performer or the addressee while the -wa- inserted between the subject prefix and the verb itself refers to the audience as the addressee. The phrase "Siku moja" or "One day" is equivalent to what Goffman refers to as the reported form of a past event, or a key to set-off or to make a distinction between a narrated event from speech event in Babcock’s terms (1977:65). The narrative we note will be narrated in a reported form since it attempts to recount some past events. The reported form or a replay of a past event means more than just merely reporting. Goffman extrapolates that a reported event is a "statement launched from the personal perspective of an actual or potential participant who is located so that some temporal, dramatic development of the reported event precedes from the starting
point (Goffman 1986:504).

Regardless of all the trouble and the enthusiasm that Juma displayed in looking for permission to tell us his tale, we note in line 4 that Makanyaga is still talking about his pants. Therefore, Juma is deliberately denied the go-ahead to tell us his story. Instead, Makanyaga states "I do not know how I undressed." In line 5, I addressed George, who the previous night had slept very close to Makanyaga, by saying "The guy is complaining that you took off his clothes at night." This was supposed to be a joke and we all laughed about it because Makanyaga did not seem to want to let the issue go. In line 6, George gives his response as an emphatic "No!" Once again, in line 7, Juma wants to be given permission to tell us his tale. I might suggest here that Juma was not being very aggressive in being recognized as a potential speaker. In fact, nobody paid any attention to him until very much later in the process of the storytelling. In an effort to make us believe that whatever story or joke he wanted to tell was "true," he states "Nisipowadanganya" (Without lying to you!), and I might complete the statement for him by saying that "I am going to tell you something that really happened." According to this group, its ideal for the narrator to persuade his audience that the information they are receiving is true. As such, the narrator is obliged to use any means possible to accredit his story. Therefore, truthfulness is essential in this context. It is very important in storytelling to validate your own accounts as being true or not true. The idea of a "believable" or and "unbelievable" account plays a very significant
part in whatever we communicate to others. To prove the validity of his narrative as a true account is very critical to Juma because he really wants to have a "face" among his friends. He does not want to be labeled as a liar and that is why he states that "Nisipowandangaya" (Without lying to you). This dichotomy of "true" versus "false" as suggested by Bauman (1986) is an issue that folklorists have relied heavily on classifying oral narrative forms. However, the determination of whether a narrative is "true" or "not true" can be circumscribed through the recontextualization of both the explicit and the implicit messages of each narrative event. The objective truth of an account to one person, in reference to the subject matter, is that the quality and the quantity of subjective truth may be perceived by another as irrelevant and vice versa. Citing Linda Degh and Andrew Vazsonyi, Bauman suggests that the preliminary step towards formulating an empirical basis for investigating the problematics of truth, value, and believability factors should be focused on legends (1986:11). To my understanding, legends may be representing true or false accounts, but they always bear a grain of truth in them although the truth is always exaggerated. Or more accurately, in the context of the telling someone a legend, the teller or someone in the audience believes there is at least a grain of wheat in what is being told. Belief or disbelief is a necessary element of the context and interpretation. The fundamental dichotomy of truth can be strictly based on the empirical notions of objectivity versus subjectivity; whereby one's "objective truth" is another person's "subjective truth."
Alternatively, what one person perceives to be true may not be true to the other person.

In Juma's account, he juxtaposes his personal narrative (experiences) with a high level of exaggerated accounts. What becomes apparent from his tale is the truth interposed by lying. The true aspect of his narrative is that he was drinking; however, the unusual and almost impossible mishaps of his narrative are revealed in the unexplained pellets in the bucket. In reference to Bauman, Juma's account illustrates "the unusual, but not impossible, events of the former transformed into the exaggerated implausible events" of the personal narrative (Bauman 1986:20).

At this point, I thought that Juma would not be able to even tell us his story because he did not seem to embrace what I will refer to as the group-solidarity-motto which involves aggressive verbal behavior to speak. To be able to acquire the group-solidarity-motto, Juma must change his verbal strategy to acquire people's attention. In lines 9, 10, 11, and 12, Juma drastically reverts his strategy from keying his narrative in a formulaic manner to addressing people by their proper names. In lines 9 and 10, Juma calls Makanyaga by name, and on both occasions, it seems that Makanyaga does not respond, neither does he seem to be paying him any kind of attention. I would assert that Makanyaga was very busy enjoying his fame as a result of the previous night's mishap that he knew it would take Juma a long time to get the audience on his side. The verbal constraints here can be said to occur due to the different conversational style between the two speakers.
Whereas Juma is a person whose conversational style is fast and somewhat high-pitched, he failed to impress those who were involved in the narrative. I might add that Beto, Makanyaga, George and I were all people from Columbus, thus we shared some inner jokes that Juma (who stays in Urbana) did not know. For instance, when George said "Again" all those people from Columbus understood that George had a tendency of saying this to indicate that a person was becoming redundant in his speaking. At the same time, "Again" implies that that person is re-doing or re-performing the same act over and over; it also connotes that that was not the first time for him to do that.

Juma, in lines 9, 10, 11, and 12, changed his strategy for acquiring the stage to participate in the storytelling event. He, in fact, decided to call on Makanyaga by name as a way of getting his attention, and at the same time, forcing him to terminate his story. This method actually worked because Juma received the results he wanted, an opportunity to tell his story.

**Juma: Narrative I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juma:</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was a day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was with my girlfriend in Bukura</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na tulikunywa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(And we drank)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No question about that</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We drank a lot</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulifika nyumbani tukalala</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(When we arrived at home we slept)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the morning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulikuwa kuna hii ndoo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(There was this bucket)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndani kulikuwa na vishonde viwili</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inside there were two pellets of shit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A significant point to note regarding Juma’s narrative style is that once he gets the stage to tell us his story, his style is so fast that he does not allow us or the audience to interrupt him lest we take control of the stage. The opening line of his narrative is as formulaic as his original opening line when he tried to get the permission to speak. In lines 1 and 2 of the previous section (see page 102), we noted a similarity in his narrative strategy. He clearly indicates from line 13 that he is going to recount to us a narrative of his past experience with his girlfriend regarding the mishaps that people encounter while they are inebriated. As case in point, his narrative in essence is supposed to make the one told by Makanyaga worthless or not as good as Juma’s.

Going back to Makanyaga’s narrative, Beto had tried to rationalize the fact that Makanyaga found himself naked in the morning by stating that "sometimes when we sleep, we often tend to undress ourselves unconsciously whenever our bodies become overly warm." However, in the case of Juma, there is no logical explanation as to why he or his girlfriend were not able to go to the bathroom instead of using the bucket. The bizarre nature of the narratives at hand brings into
picture the unexplained issues of those events people do without realizing that they are doing them. We can indeed assume that Juma’s tale is more outrageous than Makanyaga’s. Whether the story is true or not, we are forced to believe it as having happened based on two assumptions. The first assumption that we can base the argument on that Juma’s narrative is true is mentioned in line 8 (previous transcript): "Nisipowadanganya" (without lying to you) attempts to make known that his story is true. Secondly, the way he situates or frames his tale makes it believable: in line 3 he states that "I was with my girlfriend in Bukura." The mentioning of his girlfriend makes us "suppose" he is telling the truth, but the outcome of the story itself is so far-fetched that the determining variables (characteristics) of a true account are almost non-existent. It is absolutely hard to imagine how a grown-up person can use a bucket as a bathroom while there is a bathroom around the corner. The most central issue here is "who can narrate the most unbelievable narrative among all these participants?"

As I mentioned earlier, Juma took control of the stage and he did not let anybody else say anything even after he had narrated his story. He failed to offer the required clues that are necessary in letting other people know that it is time for them to tell their story. According to Wardhaugh, the basic signal to yield a turn during a conversation is to gaze at the person who you would like to speak. "A gaze is important for signaling when you are prepared to give up your turn in a conversation" (1999:84-85). He further illustrates
later in the book that "having taken a turn in conversation, you can signal that you are coming to the end of what you want to say by using one of a variety of devices. You can draw out the last syllable or two of what you are saying by pronouncing them extra slowly and exaggerating the final associated pitch change. Such a signal indicates completion, and someone else can take up the topic or you deliberately pause after you have said something without providing any additional change in tempo or pitch" (Wardhaugh 1985:148-149).

Therefore, Juma did not signal his other participants because he was trying to make up for what Makanyaga had done for him (i.e. denying him permission to speak). Instead, Juma comes up with another narrative with the same motif of drunkenness, but this time in a more obscure fashion than the original narrative. He, in fact, makes it so complex that we are all curious to know what happened. This is a strategy he employs for holding the floor by denying other people's participation.

**Justification of Juma's Narrative I:**

As previously discussed, the justification process attempts to make the far-fetched story to be true. In the discussion that followed after this narrative, Beto and Juma give rational arguments/cause of action that Juma should have taken. According to Beto, Juma should have talked to his girlfriend to determine whether she was responsible for the two pellets of shit found in the bucket. Juma’s response was a reluctant "No!" Well, Beto states "Because you can’t differentiate,"
at this point I was not sure whether Beto was suggesting that you
cannot differentiate the pellets of shit or whether he was referring to
something else. Juma’s concluding remarks are:

No! That lady was drunk.  
That lady was drunk,  
and I was also very drunk.  
So I don’t know the origin of  
whatever of that stuff.  
Until now I have never known it,  
and I have never bothered to find out  
because I know it was one of us.  
Maybe it was me and maybe it’s she.  
I do not know.

Juma’s concluding remarks indicate that whatever happened, happened and
he never bothered to establish who did it. He is convinced that either
he or his girlfriend did it.

Juma: Narrative II

Juma: There are times I have gone to my house
Nakuta soki ziko nje viatu viko ndani
(I find socks are outside and the shoes are inside)
How do you explain that?
[rhetorical question to audience]
Socks outside, shoes inside.  

George: Eh  

Judy: Na umelala?  
(And you were asleep?)

Juma: Kume...[did not complete sentence]
(It’s morning...)  
Umeamka asubuhi
(You have woken up in the morning)
but the socks are outside, but the shoes are inside
Unaanzia wapi? [another rhetorical question]  
(Where do you begin)
Hii kitu (this thing)  
That is very normal  
Hii si kitu (This is nothing)

[overlapping and back to Makanyaga's narrative -- nobody is listening to Juma]

Judy: Makanyaga, you were so stiff (overlap)

Juma: Beto, there is a time I went home  
my socks were outside, outside the door  
my shoes were inside the house.  
And I slept inside.  
I thought [pause]  
What happened?  
i couldn't believe it.

Beto: Instead of shoes outside and the socks inside...

Juma: Socks were outside, shoes were inside  
That thing I have never been able to explain.  
Unajua hiki kitu si soup [laughter]  
(You know this thing is not soup)  
[points to the beer on the table])  
Si soup hii bwana [referring to beer]  
(It is not soup, mister)

Beto: Hii ni sumu  
(This is poison.)  
Hii ni sumu baridi  
(This is cold poison.)

Juma's Narrative II presents dilemmas that cannot be easily explained. The nature of this narrative dueling is centered around storytelling complexity. The storytelling complexity can be defined in the realm of the implausibility of the elicited event.Thematically, the more obtrusive and enigmatic a narrative is, the more significant it becomes within this storytelling performance competition. Juma's narrative one is somewhat complex, but yet the second story is more bizarre. In the first narrative, where we learn that the narrator
found two pellets of shit in a bucket, we can assume that either the narrator and his girlfriend unconsciously used the bucket as a toilet without being conscious about it while the second case, the incident, is more obscure. How can one explain the paradox posed by the narrator in lines 1-3?

There are times I have gone to my house,  
Nakuta soksi ziko nje, viatu viko ndani  
(I find socks are outside and the shoes are inside.)  
How do you explain that?

The narrator’s rhetorical question of "How do you explain that?" indicates the odd nature of the event he is describing. I have tried to hypothesize, as a way of attaining a rational explanation to Juma’s paradox, but without achieving any possible explanation. At first, I thought the only rational interpretation to the narrator’s question was that:

a) probably the narrator took off his socks prior to arriving home and upon getting there, he accidentally dropped the socks at the door; or

b) probably the narrator went to the house and suddenly realized that the socks were smelling due to sweaty feet and therefore, forgot about it the following morning.

Whether one can choose any one of the two assumptions suggested above, the underlying message implied by the narrator is that such an incident cannot be explained in logical terms. Apparently the drunken behavior
being discussed is itself not logical.

George, who is one of the audience, offered his response to Juma's dilemma with "Eh" which indicates his disbelief to the fact that one can indeed leave his socks outside and not realize it. I also shared in both Beto and George's response to Juma's story.

Juma's narrative strategy in this story is much different from his first story because here, he encourages the audience's participation by retelling his short episode four times to make us convinced that what he is telling did actually occur. The fact that he tells the story four times, and each time he tells it he stresses the major key points, employs some of the keys of performance discussed in chapter two. In fact, if we closely look at the four sections, we note that the narrator uses parallelism with systematic variation to show that once drunk, it is extremely hard to tell or recall what happened the previous night. The rhetorical question in line 3, "How do you explain that?" is restated in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Unaanza wapi? (Where do you begin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I thought [pause]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>What happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I couldn't believe it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>That thing I have never been able to explain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite Juma's use of parallelism, he constantly uses metacommunicative and metanarrative devices like "that," "what happened," "I couldn't believe," "that thing I have never been able to explain" to heighten the narrative complexity in terms of its structure, plot, and content. "How do you explain that?" is also a metanarrative device since it
makes reference to the audience ("you") and to the narrated event
("that").

To formulaically offer a closure to his narrative, Juma shifts his
attention from his tale to the current events that were taking place.
He directly asserts that alcohol is bad. The attention paid to the
alcohol explains its fatal nature when the narrator calls everybody's
attention to the beer on the table:

Unajua hiki kitu si soup
(You know this thing is not soup.)

In these two lines, Juma draws our attention to what we should consider
as essential for our nourishment. Definitely beer is not it. Beto
suggests that:

Hii ni sumu (This is poison.)
Hii ni sumu baridi (This is cold poison.)

The suggested interpretive frame of alcohol being equivalent to poison
is, therefore, illustrated objectively in this section under the
rationalization of narrative events. Yet there is ambivalence here: a
moral issue is made about drinking, but the stories romanticize
drinking -- a wild and funny behavior, freedom from societal
restraints. The rationalization here occurs when each participant/
audience makes a big effort to make a true account out of a
fictionalized event. It was the consensus of everybody that beer is
harmful. Since we cannot achieve a rational interpretation and
understanding of what it does to our bodies and our mental stability and sensibility, we should avoid it. Beer is a "cold poison" and therefore, we should refrain from drinking it; if we do, it should be in moderation. But, then again, the stories glorify excessive drinking to some extent -- again, the ambivalence of narratives is made apparent.

During this performance event, storytelling about alcohol dominated the narrative content of all events. As a cultural clarification towards people’s attitudes towards any form of alcoholic beverages, we can best understand these attitudes by going back to the religious backgrounds of most participants -- 90% of those people who participated in this study are Muslims. Religiously, alcohol is strongly denounced. Anybody who drank alcohol not only violated religious values, but the cultural norms too were in jeopardy. Therefore, most of the performers are torn between the western civilization and the traditional Islamic upbringing. Talking about the alcohol or telling stories about alcohol is a way of the performer’s conscious awareness that they are breaking the religious and cultural values. In so doing, the performers reconcile or console themselves for doing what is unacceptable while in a far distant place.

Rationalization of Juma’s Narrative II:

Hamisi, who had not spoken for a long time, attempted to interpret what happened when Juma returned home and found his socks outside instead of inside. Hamisi suggests:
Pengine ulitoa soksi
(Maybe you took your socks off)
Halafu vilatu ukaingiza ndani
(and then you put the shoes inside)
Lakini hujui

Hamisi’s argument is very justifiable because it offers a somewhat logical interpretation of the dilemma posed throughout Juma’s narrative. Although Hamisi’s argument is logical, Juma suggests that everything happened because he was too drunk.

Another performer whose contribution to the successive narrative duelling was George. George’s narrative is not as bizarre as Makanyaga’s and Juma’s narrative; but rather, a story told by George allows him to become an active participant in the storytelling events. From observation, George does not attempt, like the other narrators, to outdo anybody. He tells his tale to socially fit in the group. His narrative, like the others previously discussed, follows the same theme of drunkenness:

George: Four of my cousins went out to drink. So the guys came back to the house. So the owner, the guy who had rented the house had the key quite alright. Looking at the key...but he could not open the door. So the other cousin of mine said "Move away; give me the key; you are drunk." So he got it. Try, try, try [to open the door], but he could not get it. The third one said "Give me the key." Two hours went by. Four of them, Judy. [tall-tale exaggeration] They could not open that door. They slept outside till the next morning. Outside, on the lawn, on the grass.
George's narrative is straightforward. The narrator simply told events as they occurred without making a simple story to acquire implausible qualities. [George's story, among all the stories mentioned in this section, appears to me to be the only "believable" narrative.] George's story begins formulaically with an opening formulae and a closure. The progression of events begins systematically and the details are recounted logically. The narrator's four cousins' inability to open the door was due to the fact that they were all drunk. It is interesting to note that, although George's four cousins were drunk to the point that they could not be able to open the door to their apartment, they managed to locate their proper house. One would have guessed that these four guys would not have been able to recall their residential apartment. The concluding remark was that "They slept outside till the next morning. Outside, on the lawn, on the grass."

George coherently narrated the story by embedding other people's speeches through the use of quotation. The narrator mimics his cousins' voices by saying "Move away; give me the key; you are drunk." In so doing, George displays a very high narrative style. As far as being judgmental, George is a more competent storyteller than the other narrators based on the logical coherency of narrative technique.

A significant issue to mention here is that George, in his narrative, makes it a point to address me by name as his audience. In a way, George acknowledges the fact that he was telling me his story for a purpose and he also wanted to be acknowledged as a contributor.
At the same time, he makes it clear that all the stories that were told on this particular day were meant for me despite the presence of the other people in the audience.

Unlike the other narratives discussed, George’s story is the only one that lacks a justification process. I attest that George’s narrative does not require justification because it does not invoke issues that are beyond comprehension. In Makanjaga’s narrative, he poses a paradox of having been stripped naked at night without his conscious knowledge of it. Juma, on the other hand, talks about the implausible events that cannot be rationally determined. Therefore, these two narratives have to somewhat be made credible; or rather made believable.

To conclude, throughout this chapter my basic arguments were centered on the narrators, their interlocutors, their tales, and each teller’s transmission process. Narrators in their complex task of storytelling were concerned with their ability to communicate or convey a message that embodies meaning through the narratives told. As such, they saw the need to offer a justification for each story told. To them and their audience, the justification process was a significant element to each teller in order to make the events described within each narrative believable and credible before the audience. The narrators’ basic motives, as revealed through their stories, were to convince the audience by persuading them that the narratives they heard were true regardless of their gross exaggerations. Thus, the basic goal and theme of conversational narratives (as described above) is not
only to entertain the audience, but to also insist that the stories
told are true to the best of the narrator's knowledge. Additionally,
the rhetoric implications of conversational narratives are achieved
through the frames of each story that reveal each teller's attitudes
and perceptions about the drinking of alcohol.
CHAPTER IV
CODE-SWITCHING AND ITS EFFECT ON THE FRAME
AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF CONVERSATIONAL NARRATIVES

Many scholars who have analyzed issues of code-switching have only been concerned with the language per se, its linguistic aspects, and the social process involved in the interpretation and the construction of reality. Although many disciplines of study, such as ethnomethodology, sociolinguistics, anthropology and social psychology, have discussed certain features of code-switching, its effects, influences and outcomes are yet to be resolved. The unresolved effects to be addressed in this section include the impact of code-switching on oral narratives, an issue that has not been examined in the existing research. It is salient to ascertain that most of the research currently available has taken little or no interest in the effect of code-switching on storytelling. Therefore, using Erica McClure and Malcolm McClure’s approach utilized in their essay "Macro- and Micro-sociolinguistic Dimensions of Code-switching" (1988:25), in conjunction with folkloric theories and concepts, I will investigate how code-switching affects the frame, style, and the meaning of a narrative event. All narratives that will be analyzed will be examined in their respective immediate and social contexts in order to establish the "why," the "when," and the function of code-switching.
Prior to examining the details in the code-switching process, it is imperative to look at the social psychology, sociolinguistic, and ethnographical materials currently available on this subject in order to establish a beginning point for the study of code-switching as a "folkloric" element among bilingual and multilingual speakers.

Code-switching has been defined by many scholars as "the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation" (Sachdev and Bourhis 1988:293) or "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems," to use John Gumperz's definition of code-switching in Discourse Strategies (1982:59). Gumperz further ascertains that "the items in question form part of the same minimal speech act, and message elements are tied by syntactic and semantic relations equivalent to those that join passages in a single language" (1982:61) while critics like Nkonko Mudipany Kamwangamalu in "Code-mixing and Modernization" use the term "code-mixing" in reference to code-switching. According to Kamwangamalu, "linguistically, code-mixing is the intrasentential use of linguistic units (e.g. words, phrases, clauses) from two distinct languages or varieties of the same language by a bilingual individual within the same speech situation" (Kamwangamalu 1989:321). Regardless of the term applied, be it code-switching or code-mixing, the sudden change of a language by a speaker within the same speech event calls for evaluation. The switch, within a performance centered approach to folklore, is a stylistic move by the speaker for communicative purposes.
Along with code-switching, bilingual individuals also practice a style shift for communicative purposes. Style-shifting unlike code-switching refers to a change in language varieties which involves changing the code markers. The variables associated with code markers involve the social and cultural discussions such as age, sex, social class, and the relationships between the speakers.

In examining code-switching from a folkloristic perspective, it is essential to look at the social setting, environment, and the complete context that precipitates the switch, the relationship between the speakers involved in the speech event and the significance of the switch within that particular speech event; all must be taken into consideration. (Specific details of this issue will be discussed later.)

According to M.H. Abdulazizi Mkilifi in his essay "Triglossia and swahili-English Bilingualism in Tanzania," there are three related and overlapping factors that seem to influence the mode of language maintenance as well as the code-switching among bilinguals. These three factors are "the sociological context of language acquisition (the sociocultural settings in which the language have been acquired), the communicative function of each language and communicative capacity of each of the languages involved (Mkilifi 1972:198). In addition, the storytelling context, performed for entertainment purposes, the audience and the performer seem to influence the language usage along with the time and place of the storytelling event."
The ethnography of communication as a field of study examines the norms of communicative conduct in different communities, and methods of studying these norms appropriately serves as an ideal introduction to the study of code-switching. This field of study looks at the problem that exists between language and society, and how social relationships act as intervening variables between linguistic structures and their realization in speech (Saville-Troike 1982). Notable to the language analyzed in context is the speaker's selection of a semantic, grammatical and phonological permissible alternative which occur in conversation sequences in natural groups patterned and predicted on the basis of certain specific features of the local social system.

The social psychology approach to code-switching, unlike the ethnographic methods, is empowered "to integrate micro-individual aspects with the macro-collective levels of bilingual and multilingual communication" (Sachdev and Bourhis 1990:293). Sachdev and Bourhis in "Bilinguality and Multilingualism" examine three different forms of code-switching. These forms are situational switching metaphorical, and style shifting. J.P. Blom and J. Gumperz (1972:407-434) view situational switching as "rooted in social separation activities and associated role relationships each of which is conventionally linked to the use of one language or varieties in the community linguistic repertoire. Monica Heller defines metaphoric code-switching as those elements with a speech event that "refers to meanings associated with the variety in situations where other frames of reference are not operative" (1988:5). According to Carol M. Scotton and W. Ury the
situational and metaphorical classifications are useful because they describe how and when code-switching occurs. But to know that a code-switch signals change in topic or lends emphasis to a topic still does not tell why a speaker code-switches. To decipher the "why" of code-switching means to explain the switch as an extension of the speaker. It means also to elucidate the relationships between the subject of discourse and the participants of an interaction and the societal norms which give a language choice a meaning" (Scotton and Ury 1977:13). One point that I differ from Scotton and Ury’s assertion is that a code-switch signals change in topic or lends emphasis to a topic still does not tell ‘why’ a speaker code-switches. An examination of the data collected on July 28, 1991 in Urbana/Champaign among Kenya, Tanzania, and Cameroon bilingual speakers indicated the "why" aspect of code-switching. The aspect can be explained in two specific ways:

(a) to accommodate one of the participants that did not speak Swahili. His unmarked language choice of communication was English, where the unmarked language involves the negotiation of rights as Scotton suggests that "the markedness model most crucially consists of a negotiation principle and a set of maxims which participants in a conversation use to calculate conversational implicatures about the balance of rights and obligations which the speaker proposes for the present event" (1988:160). Thus the "marked" language choice refers to a language used under certain circumstances in a
conventionalized exchange purpose geared to exclude others;

(b) to give the punch line of the oral narratives told in English. The hypothesis here is centered around speakers of Swahili and English. Swahili is a second language for most participants, and also their unmarked language choice for communication close to their ethnic language. The punch line or the meaning of the narrative was effectively understood if told in Swahili. Beto, one of the participants asserted that "I tell the punch line of the story better in Swahili than in English. Therefore I deliberately used Swahili for my closure and English to narrate some of the stories." Scotton and Ury, in an attempt to explain why speakers switch, extrapolate that people switch from one language to another in order to (i) redefine the interaction as appropriate to different social arenas and (ii) to avoid, through continual code-switching, defining the interaction in terms of any social arena. Patrick McConvell in "Mix-Im-Up: Aboriginal Code-Switching, Old and New," unlike Scotton and Ury, suggests "bilingual speakers may not only use conscious strategies of code-switching to a particular goal, but may also be unconsciously influenced by his viewpoint towards the social arena." McConvell establishes that "the explicit reasons for switches cannot always be elicited from participants."

(McConvell 1988:103)
Besides the situational and the metaphorical forms of code-switching, Sachdev and Bourhis take their research one step further to illustrate the determinant factors of code-switching as are subsumed under three major factors:

(i) Normative factors: includes the situational taxonomies of speech norms defined by traditional sociolinguistics (Ref. Gumperz 1982: discourse strategies).

The center-most function affecting the normative factor of code-switching is the linguistic medium in which bilingual or multilingual communication takes place just as much as the verbal content of the communication in understanding the language behavior (Sachdev and Bourhis 1990:294). The linguistic medium allows the speaker to choose whether to use one language as an unmarked choice of communication or marked language, depending on the purpose of the switch.

(ii) Motivational factors: include "speech accommodation and social categorization effects" (Ref. Giles and Powersland 1975: Speech Style and Social Evaluation).

As previously mentioned, the speech accommodation factor, in my data, played a significant role in the speech event by allowing the speakers who were not full members of the Swahili/English Emic group to
be co-participants in the storytelling event. With regard to the social categorization effects, most participants were people belonging to almost the same age group with one exception. Ngere, one of the participants was older than the other participants; all participants, but one, were male. Regardless of the sex and age differences among the participants, all individuals were regarded as members belonging to the same social category and shared similar African backgrounds.

(iii) Sociostuctural factors: includes the relative vitalities of language groups in terms of group numbers, group power and group status.

Although all the participants in this project belonged to different social groups, they all came together under one umbrella of commonality. They all explicitly showed their language competence which unified them as members of one social group regardless of their academic ranks.

Having examined the "why" aspect of code-switch, it is also vital to discuss briefly "when" code-switching occurs. Sachdev and Bourhis indicated that code-switching occurs:

(a) "when bilingual speakers are discussing emotional issues" (1990:294).

(b) "when talking about topics relevant to the cultural contexts in which they lived" (1990:294). Therefore, when speakers
talk about events that they have experienced, they often tend to speak with a lot of intimacy and in so doing, in a way they relive the experience. Such an event cannot be effectively explained in any other language other than that which the speaker can relate to intimately. As a matter of fact, they narrate the events as if they were taking place at that particular time; which is one of the talents most good storytellers possess in common. For sure, these speakers visually and mentally relive these past events while they tell stories in a fresh, brand new situation.

(c) Social solidarity: social solidarity is associated with linguistic medium in which the verbal communication is taking place. Also, social solidarity is maintained if speakers share the same language competence to the effect that they all know each speaker's inadequacies. If, for instance, a speaker does not impress the desired competence, that speaker can either be ridiculed or ostracized from the group.

In the case of the group solidarity among my informants, only one participant failed to meet the required criteria of an insider. He was an outsider since he did not speak Swahili; however, uniformity was achieved through code-switching that incorporated and allowed him, and even encouraged him, to participate in all events that were taking place. Further, the language choice used during every narrated event was determined by the negotiation rights and
obligations among speakers (Scotton 1986:403-415).

Therefore, with these preliminaries in mind, let us now see how code-switching among the young East African students affect the mode and the style of a narrated event. In this respect, Erica McClure and Malcolm McClure’s method described in their article "Macro- and Micro-sociolinguistic Dimensions of Code-switching in Vingard" will be utilized. In this article, these authors discussed the relationship between the macro-sociolinguistic context of code-switching and the formal linguistic and functional (or micro-sociolinguistic parameters of code-switching) in a multilingual Saxon community in Romania and then compared this situation with that existing in other communities (1988:31). Unlike McClure and McClure, whose research is not restricted to one specific community, my research examines the issues of code-switching among a restricted group of ten East African students studying abroad. All these students come from different parts of East Africa, and therefore have their own ethnic language. However, being students from East Africa, they all speak Swahili, a language that is predominantly used by people from East and Central Africa. An important factor to be mentioned here is that from among the ten participants, only one of the students comes from Cameroon, a country in West Africa in which Swahili is not used. In Cameroon there are a lot of ethnic languages; however, French and English are used as common languages for communication depending on whether one comes from the French or the English speaking Cameroon. Despite the differences
between the two projects, I still view McClure and McClure’s proposed method worth examination since it deals with a conversational form of code-switching. Most of the narratives to be analyzed here are in a conversation form.

As a frame for their analysis, McClure and McClure utilized the following categories for examining code-switching from Saxon to Romanian and Saxon to German:

1) Quotations 7) Parenthesis
2) Interjections 8) Emphasis
3) Addressee specification 9) Contrast
4) Reiteration 10) Narration
5) Message qualification 11) Preformulation
6) Personalized v.s. objectivization 12) Gaps

All these categories are essential in discussing the issue of code-switching; however, only those that are applicable to this study will be used.

Although all these categories were utilized in a conversational code-switching, from a sociolinguistic approach, it is apparent that they can also be used in analyzing code-switching within a narrative text (a narrative text here refers to a story told in more than one language). Most scholars who have evaluated issues of code-switching have been concerned with its linguistic factor. In this study, the focus goes beyond the linguistic boundaries by including its impact on
the performance technique. It is vital to note that not all of these frames listed by McClure and McClure are applicable to the kind of code-switching that occurred among my participants. The difference here is that I examine code-switching from English to Swahili only while McClure and McClure examined code-switching from Saxon to Romanian, Saxon to German. In addition, some of the frames listed above are equivalent to those used by many folklorists. A good example here is Richard Bauman’s text *Verbal Art as Performance*. In this book, Bauman takes a performance centered approach to folklore, and in so doing, lists frames that are significant in examining an oral narrative. These frames include:

(a) insinuation  
(b) joking  
(c) translation  
(d) quotation  
(e) repetition

These frames, in conjunction with those identified by McClure and McClure, are all useful in examining narratives which are narrated in more than one language. The most common element between the two methodologies is the use of quotations in both conversational narratives and narrated texts.

As has been examined in oral storytelling, the use of quotations in a performance event plays a very significant role. Quoted scripts refer to "the words spoken that are to be interpreted as the words of someone other than the speaker" (Bauman 1977:10). Discussing the same
concept, Erving Goffman uses the "word brackets" to discuss the issue of quotations. Goffman states that "when a speaker employs conventional brackets to warn us that what he is saying is meant to be taken in jest, or as mere repeating of words said by someone else, then it is clear that he means to stand in a relation of reduced personal responsibility for what he is saying" (Goffman 1974:512). In a performance sense, quoting is also used for dramatic purposes recreating the narrated event in the present; in literary terms, establishing a scene rather than a summary. In this respect, the speaker does not want to take blame for the outcomes of the spoken words. With reference to McClure and McClure quotations are employed in a "parenthetical remark" (McClure and McClure 1988:35). In other words, the use of words spoken by another person and giving credit to the original emitter of the words. Specifically, all these scholars are talking about one and the same thing but using different ways to expound upon it.

All the participants in this project had been invited to a social gathering at Rantoul in Urbana. The purpose for the occasion was to party. The goat roasting, beer drinking, and listening to music were some of the special events that took place. The data collected on this occasion occurred in an informal "natural" setting. Most of the informants were aware of the purpose of my being there, however, nobody paid attention to the tape recorder. Most people were interested in eating meat and drinking beer and socializing.
The goat roasting served as the broader context of the event. In addition, there were other smaller contexts for each narrated event. At the onset of the event, there were seven men and two ladies. Although the crowd grew much bigger towards the end of the day, only seven people were active participants in the study. I was a very passive participant since I did not want to interfere with the data at hand. Similarly, my presence was significant as an audience and a participant.

Another important aspect about the narratives collected is that there were multiple layers of communication taking place. All the men who participated in telling the tales chanted, used falsetto breaks, and onomatopoeia as a "show off" in their narrative style to show their command of the style utilized in oral performances.

Participants:

(i) All the participants engaged in this study were male students from East Africa (except George) studying in two United States universities (the University of Illinois and The Ohio State University).

(ii) The participants speak Swahili and English as their common languages. However, it is essential to note that all these people come from different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds and countries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Nationality and City</th>
<th>Languages that they speak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beto: Kenya, Mombasa</td>
<td>English and Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngere: Kenya, Malindi</td>
<td>English and Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George: Cameroon, Kumba (Dikome village)</td>
<td>English, French, Pidgin, Balve Douala and Yoruba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamisi: Zanzibar</td>
<td>English and Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanyaga: Tanzania, Tanga</td>
<td>English and Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy: Kenya, Maragoli</td>
<td>English, Swahili and Logoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juma: Kenya, Machakos</td>
<td>English, Swahili and Kamba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topics:**

The topics discussed during this event were broad and varied from general to specific. They covered the following issues:

(a) music (African vs. American) - general
(b) stereo speakers - specific
(c) women - general (perhaps because there was a woman present)
(d) alcohol and alcoholism - specific
(e) foodway customs - general

These topics will be discussed randomly depending on the subject matter of each text. The significance of this choice is to establish some kind of coherence among the different speech acts along with the
unified broader context of the events - chicken/goat roasting. Therefore, the order in which the narratives will be analyzed does not signify that they occurred in that manner.

**Speech Act A:**

**Topic:** A conversation about stereo speakers.

**Immediate context:** George and Juma are both drinking beer and listening to music. The speakers of the stereo serves as the marker -- or keys -- this speech event (i.e., the micro-context of the narrative).

**Subject matter:**

The subject matter in this speech act referring to speakers is highly technical because it does not allow for an informal kind of interaction between the audience and the performer. In addition, it does not meet the criteria of a narrated event. However, it is used here to illustrate one specific point -- does code-switching occur in formalized conversations?

**Interlocutors:**

Juma is the performer from Kenya, a country that is recognized for its multilingual societies. He speaks Kamba as his first language, in addition, he also speaks English and Swahili. On this occasion, Juma is bragging about the stereo speakers he had invented. The fact that Juma is bragging about the speakers indicates that he is someone
who seeks to attract attention.

George, who is Juma's sole audience, is from Cameroon. These two people have four basic common ties. They are both Africans, they are students, they speak English as a common language, and they also have a strong interest in music. The distinction among them, however, is that they do not have the same ethnic upbringing and therefore do not share the same linguistic background. Although there were other people present when this conversation was taking place, it was directed at George and we, the other audience, only overheard what Juma was saying.

Text:

The text was narrated in English as opposed to Swahili because the only common language that George and Juma can share or use is English. This factor is very significant to remember because the other texts that will be examined are strongly influenced by the use of English and Swahili simultaneously as "unmarked languages" of communication. This speech act also will help us see why code-switching occurred between certain speakers and not others.

Juma: When we are here, Line 1
when we get drunk, 2
I remove them (the speakers) 3
and put them inside immediately 4
and lock them in the bedroom. 5

George: Are they both working? 6

Juma: Yep. 7
They are both, 8
they are both playing. 9
Actually, THOSE are four speakers 10
[pointing to the speakers].
They are only in two boxes. Those are four speakers. Those are four speakers in two boxes. That is why they can play that hard. If, if you increase the volume, you cannot blast these speakers whatever you do. Forget about it. If you supply 350 watts per channel, you are going to blow it. The only way you can blow these speakers is by supplying 350 watts and above. If you go above 350 watts you can blow those speakers.

George: Oh! Is that right?

Juma: Because each of them is 75 watts not that nominal maximum is 150 watts. So you need a nominal of 350 watts for them (speakers) to understand that you are doing something serious. If you go something like 600 watts, then you can start blowing them up. All I am saying is that there are four speakers in two boxes; that is what I am doing. And am just a cross over to be able to have four speakers in one box. Each speaker has six outlets but and I have enough units to catch the outlets because there are four speakers in two. Otherwise, you will need about four of them [pause] to have the right frequency and the right speaker, you need a four prong [music].

Significance and Observations:

As previously indicated this narrative is very significant in determining why code-switching occurs among certain speakers and why it does not occur among others. Refering to the interlocutors, it is vital to note that there is no code-switching in the above speech act because:
(1) the interlocutors have no common language apart from English. Their unmarked language for communicative purpose is English;

(2) the audience is not familiar with Juma’s language and Juma cannot use any other language other than English;

(3) the text is highly formalized because of the subject’s technicality. English is this respect is considered as a language of technicality. George’s interest in the narrative is purely out of curiosity in order to learn more about the capabilities of the stereo speakers and his love for music;

(4) the concept of turn-taking in this incident is restricted since there is a limited participation of the audience and the speaker. The fact that the speaker claims expertise on the subject pertaining to the assembling and the functions of the speakers makes the description highly technical and formal. As such, the audience is inhibited from being an active participant in the events surrounding the conversation. Above all, the audience’s role in the text is to ask probing questions that challenge the speaker’s competence on the subject of stereo speakers. The questions that George asks, such as "Are the speakers working?" and "Is that right?" overemphasize the audience’s lack of knowledge on the subject at hand. At the same time, they offer the speaker a go-ahead with the talk. In fact, the relationship between the speaker and the audience is reduced to a teacher/student relationship.
In this conversation, we can conclude that the speakers are a significant key to the performance. To illustrate the speaker’s expertise on the subject, he uses a lot of repetition with systematic variation to stress the point that he is knowledgeable and that he made the speakers. In lines 10, 11, 12, 13, 32, and 35, the narrator repeats the following phrases:

"Those are four speakers."
"Those are four speakers in two boxes."

The fact that he knows how many watts ought to be supplied to the speakers without causing any harm clearly shows his technical competence which allowed him to succeed in this venture. It is also presumptuous on the narrators part that all his interlocutors are knowledgeable about the subject at hand, or perhaps he wanted to display an expertise that others did not have. His assumption proved false because (as his other audience) had a rough time trying to follow his conversation. Again, in lines 19, 23, 25, 26 and 27, the narrator uses parallelism to show how strong the speakers he made are. Ultimately, his new goal is to magnify his experiment by putting "four speakers in one box." The challenging nature of this project is to make sure that the speakers do not burst.
**Speech Act B:**

Setting: Same as in speech act A.

Topic:  
(i) foodway customs (chapati)  
(ii) gender differences  
(iii) code-switching

Situation: Less formal with reference to speech act A. The events surrounding the telling of the narrative were highly formalized and technical. This second situation is less formal because it addresses a topic that many people can speak to.

**Interlocutors:**

(i) Ngere recounts events that happened when Juma was offered chapatis (bread) made by one of the Kenyan ladies studying at the University of Illinois.

(ii) Juma, who is the victim in the narrative, plays the central role. Both Ngere and Juma retell the narrative twice within the same telling.

(iii) Beto was an active audience and a participant in the framing of the narrative.

(iv) The other people present were Judy, George, Makanyaga and Hamisi responding through laughter.

**Immediate Context:**

We were all sitting under a tree on a hot summer afternoon listening to music, drinking beer, and eating roasted chicken. Juma
was the host in charge of the music and the roasting of the chicken.  
(The traditional aspect of this event was previously discussed in  
Chapter 2.)

TEXT:

Ngere:  Tulikula Chapati *(see appendix C) Line 1  
(We ate chapati)  
Eh  

Juma:  Ngere alikuja hapa  
(Ngere came here)  
Akamuuliza mama mmoja atupikie chapati  
(He asked one lady to cook for us chapati)  
Ngere Bwana  
(Ngere Mister)  

Ngere:  Chapati bwana  
(Chapati Mister)  

Makanyaga:  Na sambusa je?  
(How about Samosa?)  

Juma:  The first day we came  
They cooked chapati  
Mimi nililala bwana  
(I, I slept Mister)  
Nikaamka naambiwa  
(When I woke up I was told)  
Chapati Juma  
(Here are chapatis, Juma)  
Kula chapati [pause & laughter 50 seconds]  
(Eat the chapati)  

Ngere:  Ashaexperience Hamisi nafikiri  
(Hamisi has experienced this, I think)  
Unajua siku hiyo?  
(You know that day?)  

Juma:  Nilimuuliza Ngere chapati  
(I asked Ngere chapati)  
Hii chapati eh!  
(Is this a chapati eh!)  

Beto:  Ulimwona vile jamaa anacheka  
(Do you see how this guy is laughing?)
Juma: Are they supposed to be eaten?  Line 19

Ngere: Juma alikataa bwana  20
(Juma refused [to eat] Mister)
Wenzake wamekula  21
(His friends ate)
Wenzake wote wamekula  22
(All his friends ate)
Sasa unakataa...  23
(Now you are refusing)
Even those people who were eating  24
I could see them struggling  25
Walikuwa wanauma meeno  26
(They were biting their teeth [very hard])
Halafu nobody said anything  27
(and then nobody said anything)
They had [ate] what they could  28
Sasa huyu bingwa  29
(now this expert)
When he wakes up bwana  30

Beto: Eh!  31

Ngere: The first thing he does  32
Please [trying to get the audience’s attention]  33
Namna hii [demonstrating using a paper how he was fanning  34
himself with the chapati]
(Like this)
"Akasema Ngere [laughing]  35
(He said, Ngere)
Hizi chapati it’s too hard"  36
(These chapati it’s too hard)
And I! Eeh! fanya adabu bwana [laughter]  37
(and I [said] eeh! behave Mister)
Not fair  38
Somebody spent the whole afternoon cooking for you  39

Juma: Bwana zile chapati  40
(Mister those chapati)
Ungupepea upepo [laughter] sawa sawa  41
(You could have fanned yourself with them just like an air
conditioner)
Air conditioners, unge fanya papapapa  42
(You could have done papapapa)
Chapati yaani zili...[incomplete sentence]  44
(The chapati I say were...)
Anyway they were not that hard.
Observations:

All the participants involved in this Speech Act B share the same linguistic background. They are all speakers of Swahili (as their first or second language) and English. The subject matter under scrutiny in the above event is very informal as compared to Speech Act A. The informal nature of this event encouraged the audience’s participation as opposed to the first narrative discussed. As mentioned earlier, the speech act reduced the performance to a student/teacher relationship, whereas in this second case, the active listeners are free to interject or add a word or two to the narrative. The informality involved in this narrative technique, depicting the story, also made it possible for the speakers to use both English and Swahili interchangeably.

Secondly, issues concerning food preparation, an area that men traditionally have no mastery over, do not know intimately, was discussed. The irony in this incident is that all the male participants knew the proper procedures for making chapatis. This knowledge enabled them to know that the chapatis given to them were so poorly cooked and hard that they could be used as a fan. Therefore, since these men are making fun of women’s cooking, this act of criticism indicates the seriousness attached to the proper preparation of food. In other words, they are hinting at the traditional verses the non-traditional roles of the sexes. Culturally, men are viewed as authoritative judges of women’s cooking.
Significance:

The significance of this narrative is to show that whenever there are people from different parts of East Africa assembled in an informal setting, who speak both Swahili and English, the chances that they will use both languages within the same speech event are very high.

Secondly, I would like to go so far as to surmise that not only is code-switching a common phenomena in traditional African settings, but in various other non-traditional, cultural settings.

Performance:

The performance takes place in a face-to-face situation in which the participants are in such sight and sound of one another as is required for the management of this kind of communication. The performer and the audience are actively involved in the events taking place. For the audience, this particular narrative was their first hearing. Therefore, it is an memorable event. According to Goffman, a memorable event refers to an instance when a replay is provided that is as good as the one that could be later thought up (Goffman 1974).

The narrative at hand was keyed by a special opening formula that sets the mode of the narrative style.

Tulikula chapati                      Line 1
(We ate chapati)                      (We ate chapati)
Eh!                                 2

The narrative style in this text (from the opening lines 1 and 2) indicates that the story is going to be retold in a reported form. It
concerns the food they ate on one special occasion. From the tone of the speaker, it is very easy to detect the sarcasm in his voice from the way he phrases the opening lines. In essence, the narrative is a "parody" of the modern woman’s position in the society whose ability to fulfil the traditional housewife duties are tarnished or quickly diminished due to the many hours she has to spend in school, a reflection of the modern changes within the setting of the society.

The expression "Eh!" in line 2 indicates a kind of disbelief on the part of the narrator that the chapatis they ate, cooked by a woman, were not really chapatis. This expression is intended to alert the audience that the narrative to be told is going to paint a tarnished image of the women folks, to the best of the narrator’s ability.

As a background knowledge, we are informed that Ngere had requested one of the East African ladies to make for them chapatis. She willingly accepted to perform the task. However, the narrator did not know that this lady could not cook chapatis very well. This is what happened according to Juma:

Juma: They cooked chapatis
Mimi nililala bwana
(I slept Mister)
Nikaamka naambiwa chapati Juma
(When I woke up I was told)
Chapati Juma
(here are chapatis Juma)

Juma, the co-narrator and also a witness to this episode, indicates that he was invited to some of the chapatis that had been cooked by the lady. The fact that Juma had slept while the cooking was taking place
indicates that he did not realize the tediousness involved in the process of cooking chapatis. Therefore, he is at liberty to criticize this lady's cooking in whichever way he wants.

We are told that everybody present at this social gathering did not raise any form of criticism about the food, but rather ate the chapatis quietly and threw out what they could not eat. Ngere, the other narrator, states:

Ngere: Juma alikataa bwana
Wenzake wamekula
Wenzake wote wamekula
Sasa unakataa...
Watu wote alikula
Even those who were eating
I could see them struggling
Walikula wanauma Meno
Halafu nobody said anything
They had what they could

Juma refused to eat the chapatis because they were very hard. In fact, he suggested that the chapatis were so hard that they could be used as a fan. He equates the food to the fan. The previous pages suggest only the literary meaning of the "chapati" narrative. In fact, a look at the text can reveal to the reader several things:

(a) The issue of code-switching makes the narrative very interesting. The fact that the narrators can use the two languages interchangeably (English and Swahili) in the telling of a narrated event calls for evaluation.

(b) The issue of turn-taking in the telling of this text is essential to the analysis of the negotiation principle of
storytelling and making the narrative tellable. Through the negotiation principle, both the performers make it a point to include all the details that have occurred during this event. Both the narrators agree that the chapatis were hard, but at the end of the narrative, Juma, who was the biggest critic, attempts to redeem himself by saying "Anyway, they were not that hard." Needless to say, the fact that there is a lengthy discussion of this matter indicates that the men were displeased by the final product they received in a form of food.

And although Juma was trying to be polite at the end of the tale, as a redeeming grace, we can still conclude that his reaction to the food that he was offered indicates a gesture of lack of appreciation. He should have appreciated the effort the lady made in making the chapatis instead of criticizing her.

**Analysis:**

In the telling of the story, the narrators use quotations. According to McClure and McClure, the use of quotation among bilingual speakers is by far the most frequent motivation for conversational code-switching. In this respect, the narrator switches from one language, the language of the narrative frame, in accordance with the language of the original speaker (McClure and McClure 1988:38). The chapati narrative is narrated in a reported form. However, in its
telling, Ngere uses quotations to illustrate what Juma said. For instance:

Ngere: The first thing he does
Please (trying to get the audience’s attention)
Namma hii (demonstrating how he was pulling the chapati)
[He said] "Akasema (Ngere laughing)
Hizi chapati, it’s too hard"
[These chapati, it’s too hard]

The narrator’s choice of quotations in this narrative is to indicate that he was not the one criticizing the food. In fact, he sympathizes with the lady who cooked the food. According to Richard Bauman, a speaker’s use of quotation is a clear indication that the words spoken are to be interpreted as the words of someone other than the speaker (Bauman 1977:10). At the same time, we can conclude that when a speaker uses quotation, he/she employs a parenthetical mode. The use of parenthesis, according to McClure and McClure, occurs in less formal setting as seen in Speech Act B. Parenthesis is a type of code-switch in which the speaker steps out of the role of impersonal narrator to make comments about the code usage itself (1988:38).

In discussing the informal nature of code-switching, Gumperz offers a concise, but yet, generalized view of the macro-sociolinguistic context of code-switching. He asserts that:

Code-switching is most frequently found in the informal speech of those members of cohesive minority groups in modern urbanizing regions who speak the native tongue at home while using the
majority language at work and when dealing with members of groups other than their own. The individuals concerned live in situations of rapid transition where traditional intergroup barriers are breaking and norms of interaction are changing (Gumperz 1982:64).

Gumperz's description of the macro-sociolinguistic context of code-switching precisely characterizes the kind of code-switch that occurred in the chapati narrative. The informality of the subject matter itself, the relationship between the participants, and the context under which the narrative took place makes the use of Swahili and English an easy move for those present, except for George who was the non-Swahili speaker.

Another fact that can be seen when speakers code-switch in a conversation is to indicate their language competence. In fact, it is a kind of game among the participants to see which speaker is better than the other one. According to McClure and McClure, the issue of language comes in when speakers express their language competence through their poetic capabilities. To reveal this concept, these two authors give two songs that show the effect of language through the use of paralinguistic language and a lot of repetition. Although the issue of language play was not so apparent in the data I collected, one cannot fail to see the significance the language choice made by each speaker with reference to the subject matter being discussed. As seen in Speech Act A, the dominant language employed is English. While in Speech Act B both English and Swahili are used.
An issue that needs to be raised in this narrative is: Why does Ngere introduce the narrative in Swahili as opposed to English like in Speech Act A between Juma and George? As earlier indicated, the participants and the audience are people who speak the language very well. Therefore, the use of Swahili as the language of communication is situational since it refers to an African type of food; that makes it easy to use Swahili as our primary language. Ngere introduces the narrative in lines 1 and 2, but then he does not actually give the details of the narrative. Juma, using a high involvement technique of communication, takes the narrative from Ngere and controls it for a lengthy period of time because Ngere is not as an aggressive speaker as he is. Juma takes over from Ngere in line 3-5. In line 6, Ngere makes an effort to continue to narrate his story by saying:

"Chapati bwana" (Chapati Mister).

But he is out-done by Makanyanga who brings another unrelated issue of Sambusa (which is also another type of food equivalent to meat puffs), but he too like Ngere is not given an opportunity to speak. In lines 8-9, Juma, who had been narrating the story in Swahili, switches to English to give little personal details unrelated to the actual "chapati" narrative that makes us understand his naivete regarding the tedious constrains involved in the cooking of chapatis. In these two lines, he talks about their arrival at Urbana and then he switches back to Swahili when he talks about the chapatis that he was offered to eat.
Juma’s language choice in lines 8-9 is a form of divergence in communication in which he attempts to present a "contrastive self-image," to disassociate from the recipients, to change the recipient’s speech behavior, and to define the encounter in intergroup terms. In fact, Juma’s speech style in these lines deviates from a norm which is valued, that is consistent with the speaker’s expectations regarding the recipient’s performance (Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey 1990:315). When Juma switches back to Swahili, he applies what Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey have referred to as the communication convergence. In this respect, Juma makes an effort to acquire the social approval from those people present to portray his high communication efficiency necessary for a shared self or group presentation, and for an appropriate identity definition (1990:315).

Lines 10-12 are narrated in Swahili because Juma is recounting events he experienced. Since he is talking about a topic relevant to the cultural contexts in which he lived, he cannot express this idea well in English. Therefore, he uses Swahili since he wants to identify with what he is saying. Again in lines 14-15, Ngere makes an effort to take the turn to speak, but Juma is persistent. I would suggest that Juma’s persistence indicates a conversationalist’s attempt to maintain a show of rapport and acknowledgement of what he is saying without allowing intrusion from the other participants. His big idea is that the audience must hear what he has to say until he completes it. At the end of line 17, Juma has completed his motive of presenting the chapati narrative to the best of his knowledge. His closure of the
narrative is in a rhetorical form:

Hii chapati eh? (Is this a chapati?)

I don't think that he expected an answer for that rhetorical question. He knew absolutely well that what he had been offered was a chapati poorly cooked and therefore, did not expect an answer. Just as the nature of the narrative has been recounted in Swahili except lines 8-9, the close of Juma's narrative is in Swahili.

Following the end of Juma's narrative, his audience responds through laughter. Ngere, the other narrator who could actually have narrated the story with Juma through bonding or weaving all the details they both knew to make this a successful event, takes over the stage. His purpose here is to complete the story he had began in lines 1 and 2, which he was rudely not allowed to tell. Ngere's narrative style is somewhat different from Juma. He begins in line 13 by acknowledging the fact that one of the participants, Hamisi, had actually experienced the events recounted by Juma. His statement:

"Ashaexperience Hamisi nafikiri" (Hamisi has experienced this.)

I think presents a different kind of code-switching.

The verb "ashaexperience" takes the morphological and the syntactical structure of the Swahili language indicating a past event. In English, the word "experience" would have ended with a "d" --
experienced, to form the past. The "asha" suffix attached to the word "experience" indicates a past experience. Thus in this statement, the Swahili language is still the dominant language of communication regardless of the word "experience."

In lines 20-31, Ngere tells the story as he believes it to have occurred. In fact, his narrative style in these lines is somewhat different from what he had originally started with. In 20, 21, 22, and 23, he starts narrating the story by condemning Juma. The statements can be said to be vindictive of Juma's failure to allow Ngere to recount the story. He emphasizes the fact that Juma refused to eat the chapatis although all those present had eaten the chapatis.

Juma alikataa bwana
(Juma refuse [to eat] Mister) Line 20
Wenzake wamekula
(his friends ate) 21
Wenzake wote wamekula
(all his friends ate) 22

In 21 and 22, Ngere uses parallelism to overemphasize that Juma's reaction was not very legitimate. He should have done what everybody else had done. Ngere's attitude here is more traditional and cultural because it is not polite to talk about one's shortcomings regarding cooking, especially if you are at that person's house. In 25, 26 and 27, he discusses what most people did when they realized that the chapatis were hard:

Walikuwa wanauma meeno
(They were biting their teeth [very hard]) 27
Halafu nobody said anything
(Then nobody said anything) 28
What those people did, Juma’s friends, was an appropriate behavior unlike Juma’s rude remarks. In 28, Ngere indicates that he told Juma to behave and that he should appreciate the efforts made by the cook.

Lines 33, 34 and 35 demonstrate Juma’s disgust of the food. The speaker demonstrates by using a paper how Juma was fanning himself with the chapati to show how hard they were and unfit for human consumption. In fact, Juma does not raise any objection regarding Ngere’s remark. Actually, he comes on stage again in lines 41, 42, 43 and 44 to acknowledge what Ngere had said in the previous lines that he used the chapatis as a fan. As a redeeming factor, he states "anyway, they were not hard." What the case might be is his uncouth behavior was not acceptable according to Ngere, and it cannot erase the humiliation that the lady who had cooked the chapatis encountered.

The details that Ngere gives us in the narrative are those that Juma failed to reveal in the telling of the story. For instance, he does not talk about how he had said that the chapatis were hard to the point that they can be used as a fan. Later, he acknowledges that idea. So what can we learn from these performers? In Juma’s account, he omits important details that would have portrayed him negatively to us. When we are told of those details, we conclude that Juma’s behavior was inappropriate. Regarding Ngere, we question his objectivity in the telling of the story pending on the fact that his wish to speak was strictly blocked by Juma. Was this, therefore, his attempt to castigate him for denying an opportunity to perform?
In conclusion, I assert that speakers code-switch when they are talking about emotional issues, when they want to persuade their audience about what they are saying, when the context of the telling of any event is informal, and when speakers are interacting with people who share the same linguistic backgrounds.

The issues of code-switching, as they have been previously analyzed, considers the linguistic aspects of WHY speakers code-switch and WHEN it occurs within a single setting. Factors such as those described at the beginning of this section, for instance, situational switch for accommodation purposes and metaphorical switch, play a significant role in determining why people switch. Apparently, most bilingual speakers code-switch when they are among groups of people who they know that can effectively speak in more than one language. The central issue here, as has been suggested by Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey is that bilingual speakers code-switch as a way of achieving three different abstract levels in communicative competence. These levels include: (a) the self as a human being, (b) the self as a member of an ingroup/outgroup, and (c) the self as similar or different to other members of the ingroup (1990:315). Precisely, these two authors seem to suggest a well-known phenomena referred to as "group solidarity." The group solidarity allows all the participants or members of a group to acknowledge each other as members of one group and that they can communicate with one another without any inhibition. Therefore, the speakers engaged in Speech Act A and B, all have a form of solidarity among themselves. This achieved solidarity enables the participants to
take into consideration the notion of a communication convergence. The term communication convergence as previously described is a speaker's desire for social approval, for high communication efficiency, for a shared self or group presentation, and for appropriate identity definition (Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey 1990:315). And once the group identity has been achieved, all interlocutors can effectively engage in a constructive dialogue through the use of different languages.

Code-switching among participants analyzed in my research played a different role than that of most conversational analysts would suggest. I attest that code-switching among my informants becomes a very powerful tool for them to express the punchline of their narratives. This was the case because the narratives discussed were culturally specific. As such, the use of English to present the punchline of the story would not have been as effective. The use of Swahili as a dominant language also served as a unifying language for these students studying abroad. It enabled them to identify themselves with the homeland. And although one of the participants was not a speaker of Swahili, the use of English served an additional purpose of accommodation. This accommodation allowed these guests an acceptance and visualization of being members of the same ethnic group.
CHAPTER V

RHETORICAL IMPLICATIONS OF CONVERSATIONAL NARRATIVES

Conversational narratives, as it has been demonstrated in the previous chapters, concentrate on the art of communication for persuasive reasons. Salient to the communicative aspect of these narratives is the mode of transmission, how the tale is structured and maintained to achieve the goal of convincing the audience about any given point-of-view. Most oral storytellers or performers in their face-to-face performed events usually have both explicit and implicit agendas to fulfill. One of the major facets of performed events or casual conversational narratives is to pass time and to entertain the audience. Since the performer is always under the strain to be the best he can be, under such situations, the performer is usually engaged in a struggle of structuring his performance in a precise manner to capture his audience's attention. Ultimately, the performer is compelled to implicitly, if not explicitly, suggest the major objectives of his spontaneously narrated story, and at the same time render his direct opinion that he wishes to pass across to his audience. In this endeavour, performers are obliged to be very selective by choosing the kind of language that can appeal to the audience and also trigger their emotional involvement in the events taking place.
Conversational narratives, just like other genres of storytelling, are captivating and interesting. It is the narrator's duty to appeal to the audience by using an enchanting voice to affect the transmission of his narrative. The performer has a great task to demonstrate his/her storytelling competence to his audience by maintaining their interest in the narrated events through his/her narrative delivery. Coherency in this respect helps the performer to realistically convince his audience to agree to the message he hopes to convey.

In this section, my major goal is to re-evaluate some of the narratives utilized in the previous section in order to determine whether conversational narratives should be considered as rhetorical in nature. Due to the persuasive implications that encompass conversational narratives, I can suggest that when a performer employs such a mode of transmission he affects the audience's attitudes towards a given point-of-view. To achieve this goal as Corbett suggests, the performer has to persuade his audience by three means: 1) appeal to their reason, 2) appeal to their emotion, and 3) by the appeal to the audience through the speaker's personality and character (Corbett 1991:23). Perhaps the central issue is not just how the performer argues his point of view, but rather, a focus on issues of rhetorical structures that work for conversational narratives. To address the issues suggested above, I will do a contextual analysis of two different texts -- a dialogue and a conversation narrative -- to discern the internal and the external issues that affect the mode of production and the transmission of any elicited event (i.e., How does
a performer argue his point-of-view?). To actualize these goals, the performer adopts some of the following rhetorical strategies:

(a) the use of a register shift in his tonal voice in order to capture the audience's attention;
(b) makes reference to current issues that the audience can identify with through the use of synonyms to describe the events;
(c) use of historical facts as a point of reference to make the narrative or testimony credible;
(d) employ paradoxical expressions and questions that trigger the audience's mental engagement in the events taking place.

These rhetorical strategies are most often utilized by many people in their conversations in order to communicate their points to the audience. The last aspect mentioned in (d) is used by many people in their day-to-day conversations in order to attain a form of feedback from the audience. Sometimes, the audience may not be required to give any response.

The above strategies differ from those employed in formal conversations. Formal conversations as opposed to informal talks differ in reference to their transmission process. A formalized conversation is very rigid and less interesting. It lacks an opening and a closing formulae that most informal conversations (narratives) have. Formalized talks also lack genre specifications that most
informal conversational narratives use to indicate to the audience how to classify that particular story. Facts are more important than hasty generalizations that occur in informal situations. Formalized talks restrict the speaker’s use of "ahs," "OKs," and "you knows" since they have to employ a standard language in their talks. Participants in such instances acquire a turn to talk through a show of hand as opposed to interrupting a speaker’s presentation. The emphasis in formalized talks is on eloquence, coherence, facts, clarity, and maintenance of appropriate behavioral conduct.

Informal conversations, synonymous to the conversations I have analyzed here, are not standardized, they are less rigid and repetition is part of the game for emphatic reasons. Factual information is not necessary, but it helps to make a speaker credible before his audience as will be seen later. Lying and fabrication of information plays a major role in informal talks as has been discussed in Chapter 3. Lying and fabrication of information helps the participants to maintain their talks for entertainment purposes. Participants are encouraged to participate in the discussions taking place without using a show of a hand to acquire a turn to talk. In fact, intrusion and interruption of a speaker’s conversation is based on each individual’s communicative competence and aggressiveness.

To develop a concrete examination of the rhetorical structures of conversational narratives, I will consider the style and the language employed by the performer in order to determine the basic arguments a performer utilizes to dissuade an audience’s opinion by making him/her
view the performer's sentiments as ideal. In the final analysis, the relationship between the audience and the performer will be viewed as a central element in how the persuasive element is achieved through the transmission process.

Conversational narratives are rhetorical in nature. These narratives are effectively employed to induce certain conjectures in the minds of the audience. To define the term "rhetoric," Edward P.J. Corbett suggests that "rhetoric is the art or the discipline that deals with the use of discourse, either spoken or written, to inform the audience whether that audience is made up of one person or a group of persons" (Corbett 1990:3). Rhetoric, just like folklore, deals with the subject matter and the study of the subject. However, conversation unlike rhetoric is not always informational as suggested in Corbett's definition of rhetoric. This definition of rhetoric does not adequately fit the functional aspect of oral storytelling or conversational narratives. Most performers are always compelled to present their arguments or suggestions in whatever form of narratives that they elicit. What is salient in the transmission of a narrative, a point-of-view, or an argument, in order to achieve the goal of motivating and enlightening the audience, is the establishment of the base for the argument or the context of the narrative. In so doing, the performer is in a better position to persuade the audience that the conjectures being presented are logical, rational, and justified as good and are therefore, worthy of pursuit by the audience.
Therefore, if we examine the following dialectic argument presented by Juma and George, we note the performers' motive as being to convince the audience that African musicians are better than American musicians. Although this particular example has very little to do with the transmission of values as examined in Chapter 2 and 3, it sets a base for my argument that conversations are designed to affect the audience's ideas and perceptions and are indexical of social change. The following dialogue portrays the performer's urgency to convince the audience of his views regarding American singers. In this respect, the performer's choice of using African music that the audience can intimately relate to gives him a strong ground to bias the audience's views. In this speech event, Juma employs some of the rhetorical structures discussed previously.

George: African music is very good.

Juma: It is the best.

George: I know.

Juma: And you see African musicians play their instruments. Here in America you just, you just punch a button and you get the background; so you are not playing music. There is no skill.

George: You know about Milli Vanilli. You heard they were not singing.

Juma: They were just, they were just lip-synching.

George: Yeah, they were lip-synching.

Juma: Yes, there is a commercial.

George: Yeah, how long will it last?
Juma: Yeah.

George: Before this lady.

Juma: Until these two will start singing to each other?

George: They were lip-synching, and the recording started cracking, Kwark Kwark [paralinguistic sounds] Arrrrrrr. You know when [overlap]

Juma: In the 1983. In 1983 when Franco came over here and Tabuley. They came at the same time. These guys [referring to Americans] saw music being played. Not just music. Music being played by the people themselves. Arrrrrr [background noise] It was being played by the people. Everybody went crazy in Houston, Texas. Houston; people went crazy. These guys were playing it, you know, they just, other people just came and use papapapa [imitating sounds produced by American musicians] These guys were playing the whole thing. Background, the whole thing was being played by human beings. Here (in America) you just put in the computer, and when you push just one button, you get the background music because you just see and hear them play around and they put everything together. They replace this button and all the others follow. But these guys (Franco and Tabuley) were playing the guitars and everything on their own. They came here, this man Maa, Mafumo. You know, Mafumo. They were singing. Mafumo plays like a small man at home, but people here went crazy when he played. Those guys were playing [pause] and the thing is if the man does not actually play as good as we expect, I mean, he is just a band. I mean, but here they were seeing people playing. People personally [stressing] playing the instruments, not just pressing buttons because the other guys that have come they were just ninininininini [imitating American singing].
In Juma and George’s face-to-face discussions regarding African versus American music, they both targeted the African audience present, i.e. preaching to those who are almost converted. Both these two performers are concerned with the effectiveness of African music on those who listen to it. The basic arguments extrapolated by both performers accredit the African music as good while the American music is bad. To arrive at the conclusion of the assumption suggested above, it is essential to evaluate the kind of arguments presented by Juma. Prior to looking at how he rationally justifies his arguments, it is important to note that the assertions that he suggests may not be the dominant impressions of all those present.

Argument #1:

In offering his first argument regarding African music, Juma structures his points in a very coherent manner. He offers an introduction to his discourse by "attempting to ingratiate himself with his audience, to conciliate his audience that is indifferent or reluctant or hostile" (Corbett 1990:15) to whatever assumptions he is about to make. In making such a move, the performer or Juma’s motive is to put the audience in a receptive frame of mind to "support the cause he is espousing" (Corbett 1990:16) or he is about to espouse. It is important to note that most of Juma’s audience were neither reluctant nor hostile to Juma’s allegations that American music is bad. They were not a sympathetic audience to the American musicians because they seemed to embrace the same sentiments that Juma talked
about. As earlier indicated, Juma's main agenda in the previous
dialogue is to show through the use of specific examples that American
music is bad. The first example articulated by Juma and George is an
understatement derived from the following phrases:

"African music is very good."
"It is the best."

The use of qualifying terms such as "very good" and "the best" is their
first attempt to get the audience in a receptive frame of mind. Having
attested these sentiments, these performers substantiate their argument
by discussing how American musicians produce their music. To promote
his argument, Juma discredits the American musicians by appealing to
his African audience. To win this argument, Juma asserts:

And you see African musicians play their instruments.
Here in America, you just
you just punch a button and you get the background;
so you are not playing music.
There is no skill.

The sentiments expressed by Juma in the above excerpt depicts
American musicians as very inept. These musicians are not only inept,
but they also lack the skills to produce good music. American
musicians' use of synchronized keyboards cannot be equated with the
artistically performed African concerts, whereby the musicians play
every note on their instruments in order to produce harmony in their
music. Juma further indicates that African bands always have
guitarists who produce the background music for their counterparts that
requires a lot of skill as opposed to the adaptation of synchronized keyboards.

**Argument #2:**

To substantiate further the ineptness of American musicians and their absurd artistic know how, Juma uses the example of Milli Vanilli and their scandal of lip-synching. This example is supposed to further convince the audience about the argument already established by the performer. Therefore, using this example, Juma is able to capitalize on one group’s tragedy by making very unfounded assumptions about American musicians. Based on Juma’s argument we can suggest that he creates an inductive fallacy in his argument and conclusion of the Vanilli episode. Ideally, we cannot make a generalization regarding African versus American music based on the example of one musical group. In fact, I suggest that Juma, in this illustration, performs an "unrepresentative sampling" of the data he attempts to use for clarification purposes (Corbett 1991:20). I attest that he should have performed a probability (random) or purposive sampling of American versus African musicians prior to drawing an inductive conclusion that American musicians are unskilled. Apparently, in "normal" conversations there is wide room for hasty generalizations. These generalizations are usually affected in a conversation due to the speaker’s absolute quest to persuade his audience within a very short period of time. Since conversations such as Juma’s are not formalized, the speaker is bound to get away with lots of generalizations. Factual
attitudes are not his major concern as persuasiveness is. Thus, as
Corbett suggests, Juma performs a "hasty generalization" (Corbett
1991:20) to convince his audience of his motive in the discussion of
music.

Although Juma’s arguments can partially be supported by the
tragedy of Milli Vanilli, his adaptation of the chewing gum commercial
that satirizes the Vanilli saga accredits Juma’s claims. Undoubtedly,
the commercial incident alluded to in Juma’s talk is easily convincing
since the audience is already prejudiced about the effectiveness of
American music. Through and through, we note that many people in the
audience agreed with Juma’s assumptions regarding American vs. African
music because they all embrace the same group values. In fact, shared
group values and a common cultural background plays a very significant
role in the strategies of communication. All the participants in this
work share the following group values: (a) they are all African
students studying abroad, (b) they are all in search of companionship,
(c) they are all social drinkers, (d) they like to tell stories about
their experiences with drinking or about their previous friends,
(e) they like to listen to African music, and (f) they enjoy eating
roasted chicken or goat meat. Since all the participants embrace the
same interest and values, it was easy for Juma to communicate and
preach to them the fallacies of American music and American musicians.

Juma, as a performer, utilizes examples known to the audience in
an effort to affect their perceptions in arguments being suggested.
Using the Vanilli episode to illustrate his point, Juma makes the
audience see his logical arguments regardless of the fact that the Vanilli group is just one among the many that exist within the society. The audience objectively accepted his point-of-view since his arguments are founded in factual incidents and he is considered a reliable storyteller. Everybody within the American society knows that the Milli Vanilli lip-synched in order to get the Grammy. Therefore, Juma's example bears a historical fact that cannot be discounted.

**Argument #3:**

In addition to the supporting arguments illustrated above, Juma further uses historical facts to back-up his views regarding American music. He suggests that:

> In 1983, when Franco came over here and Tabuley, They came at the same time. These guys [the American audience] saw music being played. Not just music. Music being played by the people themselves.

Although Juma alludes to a specific year that is supposed to accredit his opinion, his personal prejudices are made very apparent. When he eloquently asserts "These guys saw music being played. Music being played by the people themselves," he implicitly suggests that American singers are not musicians. Despite that the argument is directed at the African audience, one wonders what his argument might have been had there been an American audience. Using the above example, Juma illustrates that before the two African musicians came to the United States, the Americans in Houston, Texas had never witnessed a moving
performance. He stresses the point that the African music is played by the people themselves and not by the touch of a button that synchronizes the music. Due to the kind of logical progression of the arguments, he makes all those present as Juma’s audience appear to be emotionally moved. In response to his eloquent speech, some of the people in the audience could be heard chanting meaningful sounds of "Arrrrrrrr" to encourage him to continue.

**Argument #4:**

The last argument suggested by Juma is technologically-based. Juma clarifies the ineptness of American musicians by making reference to their dominant use of computers or the computerization of music within the music industry. In this example, Juma is still persistant on the use of synchronized buttons used to produce music. In America, he suggests "you just put in the computers and when you push first one button, you get the background music... They replace one button and all the others follow." The dominant theme in the foregoing argument is that American musicians are lazy. The use of computers or computerized buttons or the lip-synching idea indicated before connotes that most of the songs we listen to sung by American musicians is not original; since every detail of its production is machine oriented. Again here, as mentioned earlier, the speaker is making very broad generalizations that are not 100% valid. Although the idea of using push buttons is somewhat true, it requires a lot of skill in order to produce good music. However, based on Juma's arguments, I noticed that
he abhors the modern equipment that has dominated the music industry at
the same time enhancing the production of songs. It is my
understanding that Juma admires any musician who is able to play his
guitar by aligning the melodious tunes of the strings on the
instrument.

Juma uses another example of an African musician less successful
than Franco and Tabuley. However, Mafumo being a less prominent
musician than Franco and Tabuley, the kind of response that he attained
when he sang in Urbana/Champaign makes him a bigger success than Milli
Vanilli. According to the speaker, Mafumo received the same kind of
reception Franco and Tabuley received. As a matter of fact, people
went crazy about his music. Here again, Juma’s argument is the same.

Thus, since we are all faced with human contingencies and
probabilities, Juma’s persuasive argument illustrates that in any given
society, there are a lot of debatable and non-debatable areas of which
music can very well be the subject of contention. Therefore, as long
as one speaker/performer can illustrate to the audience a given point
and convince them about that particular issue, that can be viewed as a
great achievement in the performance; regardless of whether the view
being encouraged is valid or invalid. Regarding music, one can only
attest to its aesthetics since it deals with values and taste. As
such, the question of validity does not arise, but rather whether we
consider it (the American music) to be good or bad, more or less in
terms of perspectives on music, attitudes towards music, and feelings
about events described in the lyrics.
Although the dialogue discussed above is not a narrative, the speaker goes through several examples in an effort to convince the audience that African music is better than American music. Since the major goal of conversational narratives is to instigate or to influence the audience's interest in any given narrative, the performer is at the mercy of his audience and vice-versa. In reference to most of the conversational narratives employed in this work, the performers (under constrain to convince) concentrate on the idea of convincing the audience that alcohol is bad. In so doing, the performers impose on the audience certain values and attitudes that are deemed to be good, vital, or encouraged within any given group or society. Perhaps I should further suggest that the conclusions derived here are true for rhetoric analysis and conversational narratives utilized in this work, but do not apply to all conversation. In most cases when people talk, they are merely exchanging ideas without a specific agenda of persuading or dissuading a participant's opinions or ideas. Ideally, conversation is supposed to be informative (without imposition) and a pass-time activity.

Are Conversational Narratives Indexical of Social Change?

In Chapter 2 and 3, the performers in their narratives displayed the strong views and attitudes toward alcohol. Through a series of interrelated stories and motives we can reach the following conclusions.
1) Although most of the performers drink alcohol, they violate their religious convictions.

2) They all condemn alcohol by attesting the negative implications of drinking.

3) All have a story to tell about something that happened to them or someone they know when alcohol was involved.

4) All participants have been drunk at one point or another.

Rhetorical discourse, as suggested earlier, is the art of "discovering all the available means of persuasion in any given case," and is focused on the means and devices that an orator or performer uses in order to achieve the intellectual and emotional effects on an audience that will persuade the audience to accede to his point-of-view. The greater purpose of persuasive narrative approach is to instruct, persuade, and delight the listeners" (Corbett 1990:3). The above sentiments precisely illustrated by Corbett, no doubt, address those issues that most oral storytellers or performers have usually sought to attain. The dominant achievement of a "good" storyteller or performer is his manipulation of the audience's attention by capitalizing on the use of suspense and persuasive language to attain the audience's interest in what is taking place.

The most intrusive concept in the art of manipulation of the audience's interest in the course of the elicited events is deeply rooted in what Corbett suggests as basic modes of approach to capturing the audience's attention -- i.e., the notion of appealing to the
audience's reason (logos), appeal to their emotions (pathos), and by appealing to their personality or character (ethos) (Corbett 1990:37).

Since the audience plays a significant facet in oral discourse, the performer is compelled to capture their attention at a very early period in the course of the narrated event. Therefore, the performer has to formulate a working hypothesis of his approach to whatever narrative he recapitulates to his audience by employing a logical progression of events, beginning with the introduction, the body or narration, the confirmation or climax, and the conclusion. Significantly, in conversational narratives, just like traditional narratives, the most important part of the performance is the introduction (or the orientation part as indicated in Chapter 3) for capturing the audience's attention and framing the narrative. The introduction not only lays the foundation for the whole text, but it is also the part of the performance in which the performer has to win his/her audience's attention. Corbett suggests that the main function of the introduction is "to inform the audience of the end of the subject of our discourse. In so doing, we are seeking to orient the audience, but even more importantly, we are seeking to convince the audience that the subject of our discourse is worthy of their attention" (Corbett 1990:283). Another scholar, Richard Bauman, sees the introduction of a narrative as intertwined with the genre specification of the text, based on its formulaic markers. It is interesting to note that formal discourse, unlike conversations, means restricted genres since they do not need genre markers as in
conversational discourse. Using the formulaic marker as an antecedent, the audience is inclined to be moved depending on whether he/she can relate to the narrative being presented. Therefore, the introduction is central whether it’s formulaically oriented or not.

There are as many various introductions to narratives as there are variant texts. Using the material utilized in Chapter 3, we will discuss how the use of specific opening formulae or introductions serve a key element to the understanding of the values extrapolated by Juma, Beto, Makanyaga, Hamisi, and Ngere. To preface the argument, I am going to pay close attention to paradoxical introductions that specifically "show that although the points we are trying to establish seem improbable, they must after all be admitted" (Corbett 1990:284). Referring to this kind of introduction, there is no better place to begin than Juma’s narrative addressed in Chapter 3 that discusses the implausible events that happened to him after drinking too much.

Juma: There are times I have gone to my house Line 1
Nakuta soksi ziko nje viatu viko ndani 2
(I find socks are outside and the shoes are inside)
How do you explain that? 3
[rhetorical question to audience]
Socks outside, shoes inside. 4

Juma opens his narrative by offering a paradox that cannot be resolved implausibly by phrasing his narrative in a paradoxical manner, he makes a big effort to ingratiate himself with his audience by engaging them in a mental process to discern how the paradox or dilemma can be resolved. Although there is no possible answer to Juma’s
question, we note the audience's involvement in trying to find a conclusive answer to the question. In so doing, Juma forces his audience to put on their thinking caps. The mental engagement of the audience in the events taking place brings into picture the performer's appeal to the audience's intellectual or reasoning capabilities and their moral qualifications. As suggested earlier, this is one way that a performer can acquire the audience's attention in order to put his point across, as is the case of Juma in this particular narrative.

Although the narrative by itself does not indicate why Juma poses the above dilemma, we can appropriate his basic message by considering the context under which the narrative is told. In Chapter 3, it was established that most performers were concerned or told tales that expressed their views about drinking. Juma, in the preceding text, ponders on a significant incident that occurred to him while he was under the influence of alcohol. In fact, he does not really understand what happened to him on this occasion. Besides, the only thing he remembers is he found his socks outside while his shoes were inside. Both Beto and George are categorically involved in the process of resolving Juma's dilemma expressed in more than one question:

"How do you explain that?"
"Where do you begin?"
"What happened?"

The three questions above are very inquisitive in nature and they enable Juma to inform his audience about the dangers of alcohol indirectly without being offensive:
"Unajua hiki kitu si soup.
(You know this thing is not soup.)
Si soup hii, bwana. [referring to beer]
(It is not soup, mister.)

In the above two lines, Juma directly addresses his audience by drawing their attention to the beer. In fact, he qualifies beer as not soup and Beto concludes for him by suggesting that beer is poison. Juma's direct address to the audience and Beto's retort indicates that he has managed to get his audience's interest in the events being described.

How does Juma achieve his purpose? Juma uses expressions that the audience can emotionally relate to, since most of them have had occasions where they have not been able to understand their actions after drinking. Therefore, Juma is very adamant about his attitudes towards drinking (i.e., "drinking is bad").
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Conversational narratives, both performed and casual, are stories that dominate our everyday life. In many social gatherings or activities, people are always engaged in storytelling events. However, some people are better storytellers than others. Good storytellers are gifted with the talent of being great entertainers while others who are not enjoy listening to a good story told by someone else. Those persons who are gifted as good storytellers are people who have developed a reputation over a period of time as good performers and are therefore acknowledged by everyone. Apparently, in most conversational narratives, the major goal for all parties involved is to pass time and for entertainment purposes. It is the entertainment purpose of these narratives that draw people together to share different views, perceptions, values, and opinions with one another. Obviously, entertainment is one of the many functions - both social and psychological - that drew the East African students together as a group in Urbana/Champaign.

During such occasions, in informal conversations or speech acts, people exchange their opinions with a desire to convince their counterparts that their expressed views are worth being emulated. The speaker's motive to persuade his/her audience regarding his point of
view calls attention to the mode of transmission of the narrative told, that is a backbone to effective performance. The keying devices of each tale sets the frame of each text that can either encourage or discourage the audience’s interest in the events at hand. The opening formulae marks the distinction between a speech act and a narrated event. The successful employment of an appropriate opening formulae indicates a transitional process between ordinary discourse/speech acts to entry into the fictionalized world. It is the speaker’s duty to sustain the audience’s single focus and attention in the story by capitalizing on their vulnerability. In this respect, we cannot disregard the persuasive implications that come as an appendage to performed and casual events/activities. The persuasive implications play a significant factor, as has been indicated above, by allowing listeners to synthesize any kind of information conveyed by the speakers by acknowledging only those views that they deem valid, and disregarding those that are not vital because meaning and message are not always the same. Therefore, this section examines the general characteristics of conversational narratives that emphasize these narratives to be entertainment-based and, at the same time, illustrate moral values esteemed by this particular social group. Indirect confrontation as opposed to direct confrontation in addressing social misbehavior is central in expressing values through conversational narratives.

Conversational narratives are a medium of communication through which people can have an impact on the lives of other people. Through
conversational narratives, speakers can either explicitly or implicitly suggest the values esteemed by any group of people. Most significantly, if we consider the narratives evaluated in this work, the dominant theme of alcohol comes across. Whether the participants are blinded by the act of drinking and a desire to be free in all male circles by glorifying the act of drinking, the view that these speakers cannot condone drinking is clearly illustrated in their stories. This perception is illustrated by the speaker's attempt to disassociate themselves from the characters they talk about. The speakers' condemnation of alcohol indicates the ambivalent nature of the speakers and all participants. The fact that speakers condemn the effects of excessive drinking, they also vicariously enjoy the breaking of taboos, of temporarily losing control, and of inversion of the normal world. Therefore, the strongest message that comes up from all these stories is that drinking is socially bad if taken to an excess, morally dehumanizing if the individual's behavior after drinking is considered as a social disorder, and should be approached with a lot of care.

Issues of language play a very significant role in any social event, particularly among the students in this work. Code-switching, as a language issue, plays a major factor in occasions where bilingual speakers are engaged in informal talks. As suggested in Chapter 4, code-switching marks the frame of a narrative by indicating the boundaries between the speaker and his audience as follows: (a) code-switching enables the speaker to address a specific group of people within a given social event for emphatic reasons, while at the
same time, (b) it excludes those persons who cannot speak the other language. Inasmuch as the switch is boundary-fixed or based, it marks the frame of a conversation or a narrative by revealing the attitudes of the speaker to both speakers and non-speakers of the secondary language. For those people who share the speaker's other language, they become bonded as one group while the others become outcasts and not members of the in-group.

My major thrust in this work has been to evaluate conversational narratives based on sociolinguistic theories defined by scholars like Erving Goffman, Deborah Tannen, Katherine Young, and Richard Bauman. These scholars explicitly extrapolate the process of framing and its functional nature to demarcate conversational narratives from typical speech events that dominate our everyday life. A frame of a narrative, as has been discussed in this work and also as illustrated by Goffman, lays down principles of talk that allow hearers to acquire an understanding of the meanings of experienced events, narrated events as they differ from those defined within the taleworld of a fictionalized story (Young 1987). Goffman's notions of a frame foregrounds the basics for understanding the communicative aspects of conversations in everyday life. The frames of conversational narratives constitute and uncover the limits of a narrative by revealing appropriated and contextuated interpretive boundaries of any conversation narrative. Frames enclave a story in a manner that enables the listener to codify the stories by placing them in their respective genres. Frames also illuminate attitudes towards the narrative that allows the listeners to
draw out the relationship between the speaker and his/her audience; and
the speaker and his/her tale. Since the goal of many speakers in
orally performed events is to communicate, clarity and persuasiveness
are required to affect the audience's attitude towards events narrated.

Frames, both interpretive and metacommunicative, enclave the
meaning of a tale by making apparent the persuasive implications of
conversational narratives. Values and persuasiveness, as expressed by
the speaker's tone and facial expressions, are central to understanding
the entertainment aspect and dominant purpose of tales as exhibited by
the participants studied in this work. Certainly the meaning of any
narrative is attained through an examination of the social context that
illuminates the performer's attitudes as revealed through the
metamessage of the narrative frame.

The interpretive and the metacommunicative aspects of frames played
a big contribution in the previous chapters to evaluate the stories
narrated by different speakers. In orally performed activities, the
speakers are under the constraint to convey a specific message to his
audience. The teller's motive to achieve this goal compels him/her to
employ any possible tools to affect his/her aspirations, even if it
includes using a language that might include or exclude some of his
audience. Additionally, the speakers are compelled to employ other
keys of performance such as: quotations, figurative language,
paralinguistic features, parallelism, and special codes (Bauman 1977)
which might include a language shift to convince the audience that what
they are listening to is well told. In so doing, the tellers unfold a
metacommunicative frame for the audience at the same time disclosing the teller’s attitude which eventually have an impact on the audience.
### APPENDIX A: The Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Active vs Passive Roles Held</th>
<th>Language Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juma</td>
<td>A very active participant.</td>
<td>English &amp; Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominated the talks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Active participant.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not dominate the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beto</td>
<td>A very active participant.</td>
<td>English &amp; Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominated some parts of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Passive participant.</td>
<td>English &amp; Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not contribute any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>narrative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makanyaga</td>
<td>Active participant.</td>
<td>English &amp; Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominated the introductory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sections of the talk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamisi</td>
<td>Passive participant.</td>
<td>English &amp; Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commented on people’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>narratives by attempting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to give justifications for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each tale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngere</td>
<td>Active participant.</td>
<td>English &amp; Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributed very little in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the telling of tales,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>but highly effective in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pointing out the negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aspects of alcohol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: The Turtle and The Hare

The hare and turtle were friends.
Always, the hare is a very proud animal.
He thinks that he can do many things more quickly than the turtle.
So one time, the turtle (told) the hare that 'It doesn’t
matter what you do I will still beat you.'
And the hare said, "How can you beat me? You walk slowly."
What we can do, now uh uh
We want to go to
We want to make a competition and let other people see how we compete.
So people gathered to see who will arrive in the city quicker than the
other one, uh.
So the hare said, "Well, uh, when do we start?"
The turtle said, "We can start now."
So the hare said, "Oh shut up. Why am I wasting my time. Let me go
and rest for some time. Oh you go, you can go ahead."
So the turtle began walking, walking, walking,
and Mr. Hare went to sleep.
He said, "When I wake up, I will just run and win."
So Mr. Hare went and slept and the turtle walked.
So Mr. Hare overslept.
(When he) woke up and the time was almost up,
Mr. Hare said "Oh my God, I have to rush."
And he began running.
At the time he began running, Mr. Turtle is just almost reaching the scene where people are waiting to see who is coming in first.
The hare was about a mile on the other side and turtle was almost, eh eh, just near.
So the hare came running, running, running, (he demonstrated) very tired, very tired.
Turtle won the race.
So Mr. Hare, with his thinking that he can do things quickly, lost the race.
So what does this story tell us?
The story tells us that hurry has no blessing.
Do not judge others.

(These are things they tell kids so they become intelligent. In essence, intelligence is valued in the society.)
APPENDIX C: How Chapatis are Cooked

The following paragraph offers a little background about how chapatis are cooked. First it is essential to point out that the process involved in the cooking of the chapatis is highly tedious. Some people who do not have the patience to cook them often tend to take a short cut by omitting one step. The final product is usually a disaster as in the following narrative. The following are the steps one ought to take when cooking chapati:

Ingredients: flour, salt, water, and vegetable oil.

Step 1: Mix water, flour, a little salt, and vegetable oil in a mixing bowl.

Step 2: Knead the flour till the dough thickens.

Step 3: Cut small pieces of the dough to make a round ball, roll the dough until it flattens equivalent to a pizza crust.

Step 4: Rub a little vegetable oil on one side of the dough covering every section fairly well.

Step 5: Fold the dough making a round ball again; roll until it becomes flat and place on a lightly greased pan.

Step 6: Using medium heat, fry the dough until it turns brown. Turn the other side and fry until it browns.
Therefore, if step 4 is omitted in the process, the bread that is cooked is usually very brittle and hence not good for consumption.

In the aforementioned narrative, the cook failed to include step 4 in the process of making the chapatis. Therefore, the bread that she made was very hard and not suitable for consumption.
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