

Interactive Functions of Kaně (کنه) in Ordinary Pashto Conversation

¹Sultan Muhammad

²Dr. Salma Khatoon (Corresponding Author)

³Prof. Dr. Ayesha Sohail

¹Assistant Professor, Department of English, Hazara University, Mansehra

²Lecturer, Department of English, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat

³Professor, Department of English, University of Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Muzaffarabad

Abstract

In recent years, there has been a considerable interest in the analysis of various linguistic and interactional devices that speakers use during ordinary conversation. Very few studies have explored the use of interactional devices during ordinary conversation by speakers of Urdu and other local languages in Pakistan, except Pashto. This paper presents results of the study that explored different interactive functions of kaně (کنه) in ordinary Pashto conversation. It shows that kaně has different functions and meanings in different contexts. It argues that it is not the position of kaně in the Turn-Constructional Unit (TCU) that contributes to its different functions but the kind of sequential environment or the specific context in which kaně occurs changes its function. The audio-recorded data for this study consisted of 11 selected fragments out of the total 17 fragments with a total running time of 74 minutes and 37 seconds. Using Conversational Analysis (CA) methodology, analysis of the interactional data indicated that kaně serves the following three functions: (1) it is used, when attached to the end of declarative statements; as a tag question or tag-like turn-final question for confirmation, (2) when attached at the end of imperative statements to make some request, it serves as a word for expressing emphasis, and (3) when kaně occurs at the end of an utterance which is produced with louder pitch than other words in the surrounding environment and the final vowel of kaně at the end of the utterance is elongated, it expresses strong insistence.

Keywords: CA, Interactive functions, kaně, Pashto, ordinary conversation, interactional devices, TCU

Introduction

Talk or ordinary conversations in which human beings engage with each other almost everyday are the “primordial” sites of “social life”, “social organization”, and “actions” (Schegloff, 1996, p. 4). With this view of ordinary human interactions, it is not surprising to see that Conversation Analysis (CA) has the naturally-occurring ordinary spoken interaction as its primary object of analysis. CA studies the organization and order of social action in all forms of talk-in-interaction. It not only demonstrates the types of understandings conversationalists display to each other but also the ways they do so with reference to the interactional organization. This shows that the main interest of the CA analyst is in uncovering the underlying machinery which enables interactants to achieve this organization and order (Seedhouse, 2005, p. 166). It is through the turn-taking system that participants in conversation achieve this organization and order and it is this organization of taking turns to talk which is fundamental to conversation (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974, p. 696).

Speakers construct turns from unit-types and design utterances in turns using structural units which are describable. These units-types may consist of lexical items, phrases, clauses, and sentences and they constitute, what Sacks et al. (1974, pp. 701-702) call; “turn-constructional units” (TCUs). Speakers deploy, monitor, manipulate, and interpret a variety of resources during interaction, including grammatical structures which are partially

shaped by interactional considerations (Schegloff, 1996; Schegloff, Koshik, Jacoby, & Olsher, 2002, p. 15) because aspects of language structures are designed for conversational use (Sacks et al., 1974). This shows that participants in conversation use many different linguistic resources and devices for interactional purposes in order to make talk-in-interaction meaningful. The interactants use these resources within and at the end of TCUs to mark transition relevance places (TRPs), manage turns, and coordinate order and overall organization. These resources and conversational devices show verbal choices and conversational behaviors of speakers of different languages. The present study, exploring various interactive functions of the Pashto word or particle kanë; is also an attempt to highlight conversational behaviors and verbal choices of Pashto speakers in ordinary Pashto conversation as far as the use of the word kanë is concerned.

Research questions

This study had the following two research questions:

1. What are the different interactive functions of kanë in ordinary Pashto Conversation?
2. How kanë serves different functions and conveys different meanings in ordinary Pashto Conversation in different sequential environments?

Literature Review

A large body of research in CA has demonstrated regularities in the ways speakers construct turn units. A very good example of such regularities, as discussed by Goodwin (1981); is in projecting the ends of turns and in extending a turn beyond the TRPs. TRPs are points of intonational completion, syntactic completion, and pragmatic completion (Ford & Thompson, 1996). This means that speaker has different choices and resources to end a turn. One of the interactional devices that speakers use to mark the ends of turns or TRPs is tag questions or tag-like question particles. As the analysis and discussion of the interactional data for the present study will show later, one of the major functions of kanë in ordinary Pashto conversation, which is similar in meaning to Urdu turn-final 'na'; is that of a tag or tag-like turn-final question particle for requesting confirmation.

The use of tag questions in English or tag-like turn-final question particles in other languages have received much attention. According to Sacks et al. (1974), tag question is an "exit technique" to turn taking (p. 718). Tag questions or tag-like turn-final questions are a type of polar questions which are classified into polar interrogatives and declarative questions. Tag question is a type of declarative questions (Englert, 2010; Stivers, 2010). Tag questions have social meaning and they are used for constructing stances (Moore & Poodesva, 2009). According to Stivers (2010), tag questions are used to request confirmation. While exploring the question-response sequences in American English, she found that polar questions made 70%, Q-word questions 27%, and alternative questions 3% of the total data. In addition, she also found that repair initiation, requests for confirmation, and offers or request for information were the types of social actions achieved through these question types along with repetitional answers or yes-no token as response types. Investigating the ways Dutch interactants formulate their utterances to make them recognizable as doing questioning and the options they rely on to respond to these questions, Englert (2010) found that Dutch speakers used six different markers to mark an utterance turn-finally as a tag question.

Analyzing a collection of 419 question/response sequences in Tzeltal, Brown (2010) found that Tzeltal speakers made much more use of polar than of content questions to confirm answers to the polar questions like many others. Tzeltal has two lexical markers, depending on which slot they occur in the clause: the interrogative particle 'bal' (second

slot), and the turn-final tag-like question-marking particle ‘bi’ (final slot). In his study of the question–response system in Japanese, Hayashi (2010) found polar questions making 85% , Q-word 15%, and alternative less than 1% of the total data—350 question–response pairs. Tag questions made 30% of the polar question types. In addition, he found that the tag-like sentence final expressions, such as ‘janai’ and its variants, the modal ‘deshoo’ or ‘[declarative sentence]+ deshoo according to Shigemitsu (2014), and sentence-final particles ‘yo’ and ‘ne’; were used for seeking agreement or confirmation to the proposition in the preceding part of the sentence. In her study of the question-response system of Danish, Heinemann (2010) found that Danish speakers used more interrogatively and negatively formatted questions as compared to speakers of languages that have the same grammatical options. In addition, Danish speakers use a higher number of questions for making suggestions, offers and requests. They do not use repetition to answer a question as often as other languages. Tags in Danish either consist of the turn-final adverbs like ‘ikk’ or ‘vel’ or full sentential tags.

With the exception of Sohail’s (2011) study and a term paper on interactive function of ‘na’ in Urdu conversation by Bukhari (n.d), no other published research study was found on tag questions or tag-like questions in ordinary conversations in Urdu or Pashto and other local languages in Pakistan. According to Sohail (2011, p. 36), declarative questions are the most common question types that speakers use in Urdu conversation and the questions formatted with Urdu ‘na’ has the following two functions: (1) an agreement seeking particle and (2) a kind of insistence requesting the listener to accede to the request. Bukhari (n.d) found that ‘na’ is a meaningful and important part of ordinary Urdu conversation and it is used to express confirmation, insistence, suggestion, and request depending on the context in which it occurs.

This review of the previous scholarly literature related to the conversational behaviors and the use of interactional resources and devices for the organization of ordinary conversation in different languages of the world except Pashto shows a wide gap in research. The present study attempted to fill in this gap by investigating different interactive functions and uses of kaně in ordinary Pashto conversation and the specific sequential environments in which it occurs with different meanings.

Materials and Methods

As the main focus of this study was to explore and analyze the interactive functions of kaně and how it serves different functions depending on the contexts and sequential environments in which it occurs, CA methodology was used to collect and analyze data and report the results.

Participants

The participants, both male and female; of this study were native speakers of Pashto, coming from various regions of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. They were speaking different regional varieties of Pashto. Ten friends and colleagues were contacted initially and requested for the recording of their telephonic conversations with either family members or friends or colleagues. They were told about the general nature and broader purpose of the study i.e., the study tries to find out the conversational and interactional techniques that Pashto speakers use and the ways Pashto-speaking people talk to each other. They were told that the data would be anonymous and unnamed. They were ensured that no one’s actual names (either their names or names of person/places who/which they refer to) would be used; instead the



researchers would assign factious names. After seeking their consent, they were told about the deadline by which the researchers would need the recordings.

Data collection procedures

The data of the present study consist of a total 17 audio recordings of ordinary telephone conversations, recorded using audio recorder of the cell phones. As already stated, ten friends who were requested to participate in the study and who agreed provided the recorded data via emails. Most of the calls were recorded by the researchers while talking to those friends and colleagues.

Data analysis procedures

All the 17 audio recordings, with a total running time of 74 minutes and 37 seconds; were transcribed into Pashto, using Pashto orthography to see striking features in ordinary Pashto conversations. Kaně was found to be one of the striking features in the conversations. However, not all recorded conversations had kaně. Only 11 recorded conversation contained instances of kaně. The selected 11 fragments of ordinary telephone conversations (audio-recorded with a total running time of 51 minutes and 47 seconds) in Pashto were again transcribed. McGregor's (1992) transliteration conventions were used for the transcription of the data. Some transcription notation symbols devised by Jefferson (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) were also employed in the transcription, where necessary and as required to mark overlap, rising intonation contour, and stressed pitch etc. The turns where instances of kaně occur have been indicated in bold letters. Capital letters have not been used in transcription, except for names and some transcription notation or symbol to mark louder pitch. Only two punctuation marks (i.e., comma and question mark) have been used in the transcribed fragments. As far the translation of Pashto into English in the analysis is concerned, the required punctuation marks were used. In turns where English words were used by the participants, those words have been italicized. Utterances referred to in the analysis have been marked with arrow. Another most important point to be highlighted here regarding the data is that not all eleven selected and analyzed fragments have been presented in the analysis section of this study. Only few selected fragments have been used that clearly show different uses and meanings of kaně as examples to illustrate various functions of kaně.

Results and Discussion

This section presents results of the analysis of the few selected fragments from the interactional data, followed by discussion of the results. As the analysis in the following sections shows, Pashto speakers use kaně in ordinary conversation to convey different meanings and carry out different functions depending on the context and the sequential environment in which it occurs. As emerged from the analysis of the interactional data, the various functions and meanings of kaně are reported and discussed turn by turn in the following paragraphs.

1. Use of kaně as a tag question or tag-like question particle

As pointed out earlier, tag questions or tag-like turn-final questions are a sub-type of polar questions. Polar interrogatives and declarative questions are the two major types of polar questions. Tag questions fall within the category of declarative questions. As highlighted in the introduction section of this paper, tag questions are mostly used by speakers for confirmation. The following fragment exemplifies two instances of the tag question or tag-like turn-final question particle kaně in ordinary Pashto conversation.

Kaně XI

1. S. → **khīr dy šukar dy Hasebē tē room ky 'y kaně?**



2. H.→ av *room* ky ĩiem
3. S.→ ĩarē ĩav kar ũkē dē ma valē *table* kum nē dy
4. H. am̄
5. S.→ tē daghaltē lag ũksē ĩav *charger* pruvt dy?
6. H. am̄
7. S. štē ĩav *charger*?
8. H. ũdrīgē
9. S. štē? lag drūnd *ghundy* dy
10. H.→ barē dy puv? av dē ĩav pruvt khuv dy lakē haghē::white colour manz ky 'y tar taly dy
11. S. av daghē:: py *scotch tape* py štē?
12. H. a bilkul av
13. S.→ **drūnd dy kanē?(.) heavy ghundy ky dy kanē?**
14. H.→ av av *heavy* dy bilkul
15. S. šē zē bas thīk dē sayi dē(.) nuvr?
16. H. bilkul khīr dy sarē thīk thak

This extract has been taken from the telephone conversation between two roommates Sameer (S) and Hasseeb (H). Prior to the selected fragment, they have been exchanging the ‘how life is going on?’ types of opening statements, called pre-sequences which are typical of telephone conversation openings. The fragment begins with the routine response (*khīr* dy *šukar* dy—I’m alright/everything is alright. Thanks) of the caller to a ‘how are you?’ type of pre-sequence by the recipient in the prior turn. This is immediately followed by a tag question or tag-like inquiry of the caller to confirm recipient’s presence in the room (Haseebē tē *room* ky ‘y kanē?—Haseeb you are in room, aren’t you?). The recipient responds to it in turn 2 first with a minimal positive response ‘av’—yes and then confirmatory response (*room* ky ĩiem—I’m in room), which is an upgrade on ‘av’ in the same turn. The caller tells the reason for call in turns 3 and 5, requesting the recipient to do him a favor (*ĩarē ĩav kar ũkē dē ma valē table* kum nē dy) and see whether or not there is a charger on his table in the room (*tē daghaltē lag ũksē ĩav charger* pruvt dy?). In turn 10, the recipient confirms by telling him about the charger there on the table (...av dē ĩav pruvt *khuv* dy...). The caller asks again by using tag questions in turn 13 to confirm whether or not it is heavy (*drūnd dy kanē?(.)heavy ghundy* ky dy kanē?—it’s heavy, isn’t it?). The recipient positively responds to it, using again a repeated minimal response ‘av av’ and upgrade on it with the following confirmatory response (av av *heavy* dy bilkul—yes, yes it is heavy exactly).

The two instances of kanē show that it occurs at the end of the TCUs in both turns (1 and 13) and that both the statements are declarative statements with kanē at the end, functioning as a tag or tag-like turn-final question. The speaker uses the tag questions with kanē in both turns for confirmation—first checking with his roommate whether or not he is in room and second whether or not it is the same heavy like charger.

The next fragment exemplifies another instance of the use of kanē (in bold) as a tag or tag-like turn-final question for the same purpose—confirmation.

Kanē VII

1. K.→ **dē multipurp multipurpose nē dē senate hall a cabīany khū tē sarē vy kanē? Cheif Proctor sarē bē vy makhky kanē?**
2. H.→ av ma sarē dy
3. K.→ aus aum štē aikhtīar ky dy?
4. H. av



5. K.→ khě jumarat pë ūraz bandy bē *multipurpose hall* muvng tē pakar vy
dē:: daghě senate hall
6. H.→ jumarat pë ūraz?
7. K.→ av jumarat pë ūraz bandy(.)aṭha'īs tarīkh bandy

This fragment has been taken from a telephone conversation between two colleagues Hanif (H) and Kamran (K) who are talking about the Senate Hall and its keys and availability on specific date. The selected fragment begins with a tag or tag-like question of the caller (dē *multipurp multipurpose* nē dē *senate hall* a cabīany khu tē sarē vy kanē? *Chief Proctor* sarē bē vy makhky kanē?—You have the keys of the of the multipurp, not multipurpose, the senate hall, right? The Chief Proctor would have them before, right?). The recipient responds to this inquiry with double confirmatory responses ‘av’—English yes and ‘ma sarē dy —I have them). The later is an upgrade on minimal positive response ‘av’. This shows that Pashto speakers prefer to say more than just a minimal positive response to give confirmation and respond to tag questions. It is this tag-like particle kanē that makes it a tag or tag-like question when used at the end of the TCU. Through the use of this tag question, the caller seems to be doing the following two things: (1) confirming that he has the keys, though the caller knows that the Chief Proctor would have keys of the senate hall in the past and perhaps he has the halls under his control now and (2) minimizing the chances of a dispreferred response. It seems as if, through the use of the tag question; the caller is trying to get a particular answer and preferred response, i.e., yes I do have the keys and you will have the hall. This is apparent from the response of the recipient in turn 2 and later turns where the recipient ensures him about the availability of the hall to the caller as requested.

As argued by Heinemann (2010) and Moore and Poodesva (2009), it is the very nature of tag questions that they are strongly biased towards a particular answer and used as a means of conducting particular points of view and this example confirms these findings. After the pre-sequences in turns 1 and 3, the caller indicates the reason for call and requests the recipient for the senate hall on Thursday in turns 5 and (khě jumarat pë ūraz bandy bē *multipurpose hall* muvng tē pakar vy dē:: daghě senate hall —Ok. On Thursday, we will need multipurpose hall, the senate hall). The recipient asks to confirms the day, perhaps trying to know which Thursday; by repeating the first two words of the request statement of the caller in turn 5 (jumarat pë ūraz?—On Thursday?). The caller responds to this inquiry by repeating the day and adding minimal confirmatory response token ‘av’ (yes) to upgrade on the request in turn 5 (av jumarat pë ūraz bandy —Yes, on Thursday), followed by a pause; along with the date in the final TCU (aṭha'īs tarīkh bandy—On 28). In the remaining part of the conversation the recipient asks the caller that he or someone else should remind him so that he may check the booking list.

These instances of kanē indicate that Pashto speakers form tag questions or tag-like turn-final questions by attaching the word or particle kanē at the end of a declarative sentence in which confirmation about something is requested. It is in this specific context and sequential environment that kanē functions as a tag or tag-like question for confirmation.

2. Use of kanē for Expressing Emphasis

The following selected fragment exemplifies three occurrences of kanē, where the first occurrence shows that the caller asks the recipient with emphasis to do something that he explains in turn 27 and the other two instances show that the caller uses kanē to emphasize on doing something on his own.

Kanē I



16. W.→ haghě khuv dě jy haghě līkal khuv dy khamakha jy
 17. S.→ hum(.)nuv bīa?(0.1)**tě dasy ūkě kaně**
 18. W. jy
 19. S. *paper* bē saba sē ṭa'm khatmīgy stasuv?
 20. W. barē bajy jy
 21. S. barē bajy bē khatmīgy?
 22. W. av jy
 23. S.→ za zē maskhuvtan bīa ta sarē khabary kaūm zē haghě daghě guvram
Khalid guvramē kaně
 24. W. jy
 25. S.→ **kě haghě vy kaně**
 26. W. jy
 27. S.→ haghě tě bē zē auva'm nuv haghě bē talē pīsy raky blē:: ūraz cy bīa zē razam bīa bē varlē zē varkam

Prior to the selected fragment, the caller Sameen (S) and the recipient Wasif (W) have been talking about the reason for the previous call of the recipient that the caller could not receive, the caller's plan of coming home, and buying and bringing practical notebooks for them while coming back home on Friday. In turn 16, the recipient responds to the previous inquiries of the caller in which he has been expressing his concern about delay in preparing and writing practical notebooks till Friday by telling the caller that they definitely have to write practical notebooks (haghě khuv dě jy haghě līkal khuv dy khamakha jy). Turn 17 is important because after a minimal response token, followed by a pause of less than 0.1 second, the caller asks a question asking for alternate option (nuv bīa?) with a following 0.1 second pause, the caller tells the recipient with emphasis to do something as he tells him (hum(.)nuv bīa? (0.1) **tě dasy ūkě kaně**— 'so then. You do like this). It is important to note about the nature of this type of question that is directed to figure out the alternate. After a short pause of 0.1 seconds when the recipient does not respond, the caller presents his own alternate option in turn 27, emphasizing the recipient to go to Khalid and he will give him the money (haghě tě bē zē auva'm nuv haghě bē talē pīsy raky blē:: ūraz cy bīa zē razam bīa bē varlē zē varkam). Kaně also occurs in turns 23 and 25 in which the caller tells the recipient what he is going to do to grant his request (zē haghě daghě guvram Khalid guvramē kaně—I will check Khalid) and (kě haghě vy kaně—If he is there), but these occurrences are not the typical examples of kaně to express emphasis. In its typical function in turn 17, kaně occurs at the end of imperative statement, used for asking/requesting someone for something; where the caller is suggesting the recipient with emphasis to do something the way he wants him to do. It is in this environment of asking or requesting for something and telling what should be done as an alternate that kaně functions to express emphasis.

Another occurrence in the following fragment (bold letters) illustrates the same function of kaně (i.e., asking or requesting someone to do some kind of favor or something with emphasis) more clearly.

Kaně III

5. S. **tě bē dasy cal ūky kaně**
 6. M. ām
 7. S. tě sahar sē *time* ravikhīgy?
 8. M. ām(.) tě kar vaīa khīr vakhty bē rapasam(.)vly? kē sē zarurat vy nu vaīa



9. S.→ dasy cal dy kaně cy cy ta tē zē **khpal** śanakhaty karđ *number message*
ky līgamě
10. M. ām hām
11. S.→ av bahar Hamid dy sarě *easypaisa::dagħě* dē *facility* dē varsarě
12. M. av
13. S. → dagħě pīsy cy ta sarě kumy paraty dy kaně
14. M. ām hām
15. S.→ nuv dē daghy nē bē panj hazar rupy' Khan Wali īa Kareem lē varky
kaně ma tē *easypaisa* bandy ravulīgy

This fragment has been taken from a telephone conversation between two colleagues. The caller Shamim (S) has called the recipient Mateen (M) to make a request for doing him a favor that he expresses in turns 13 and 15 (*dagħě pīsy cy ta sarě kumy paraty dy kaně. nuv dē daghy nē bē panj hazar rupy' Khan Wali īa Kareem lē varky kaně ma tē easypaisa bandy ravulīgy*—The money that you have. So, give five thousand from that to Khan Wali or Kareem and send me via easypaisa). Prior to the selected fragment of conversation, they have been talking about what is going on in life through the type of questions that are designed by the speakers not so much for seeking information but as preliminary moves, known as pre-requests; which typically occur prior to requests in ordinary conversation. The selected extract begins with the request initiation turn from the caller, in the form of imperative statement; asking the recipient to do something (*tē bē dasy cal ūky kaně*— (I want) you (to) do (something) like this). It is followed by the minimal response (*ām*) of the recipient to show positive alignment, signaling to the caller to continue. The turns 7-15 indicate the ways both the caller and the recipient attempt to figure out the details of when and how the request for transfer of money via easypaisa should be granted, emphasizing important details using *kaně* at the end of TCUs.

The selected instance of *kaně* (in bold letters) indicate one of its functions, i.e., to express emphasize. In this typical function and meaning for expressing emphasis, *kaně* in turn 5 occurs at the end of an imperative statement in which the caller is requesting the recipient with emphasis to do him a favor, expressed in turn 15.

3. Use of *kaně* for expressing insistence

Pashto speakers also use *kaně* for expressing strong insistence. Though the word *kaně* occurs in the following two fragments at different places, it is important to note that in its typical function (i.e., highlighted in bold and capital letters) it expresses strong insistence.

Kaně V

15. G.→ hmm zē **khuv** zē **kh**u dasy **ghu**varē kaūm na **kaně** ma sarē bē **kh**u tē
help ka'y nu bas tḡīk dē tē pē *passive* śuruv' kary dē nu sta *passive* śu
mood dy **khuv** *mood* **khuv** bē hum ma sarē **khuv** bē tē kay' rasarē(.)kē
tē bē y' nē ka'y rasarē?
16. S.→ na kaūm **kh**u bē zē kaūm darsarē **dasy dē cy tē khuv sē ūgurē**
PAKHPALĚ KHUV SĚ ŪGURĚ ↑KANĚ::
17. G. hum
18. S.→ lakē cy *help* vy haghē **kh**u bē zē kaūm darsarē ma **khuv** da nē dy
vely cy zē nē kaūm tē ūgurē lag zan py puy' kē pē *dagħēsīzuvnuv* tuvl
dagħā *article* cy kum dy tuvl *article* ūgurvē

Prior to the selected fragment, taken from the telephone conversation between two classmates (G and S); they have been talking about an article, help, the choice of topics, and



important things to be read in that article. The selected fragment begins with the minimal response token of the recipient ‘hmm’ which seems to be stronger than the minimal response tokens ‘hum’ of the recipient in previous turns, expressing neutral responses. However, in turn 15, the recipient appears to have become more attentive, taking the caller’s offer to be a dispreferred one in the previous turns as she emphatically denies that she is not going to make a choice like that (hmm zě khuv zě kh dasy ghuvarē kaūm na kaně) because she wants him to help her even if it is on modality and mood (ma sarē bē kh tē *help* ka’y nu bas thīk dē tē pē *passive* śuruv kary dē nu sta *passive* śu mood dy kh mood kh bē hum ma sarē kh bē tē kay’ rasarē(.)kē tē bē y’ nē ka’y rasarē?—I want you to help me. It is ok, you have started working on passive so you work on that but as far mood is concerned I want you to help me in that. Won’t you?). The question of the recipient in last TCU after a brief pause within the same turn expresses her concern to which the caller responds positively in turn 16 (na kaūm kh bē zē kaūm darsarē—I will definitely help you) but insists on the recipient to see/read something on her own (dasy dē cy tē khuv sē ūgurē PAKHPALĚ KHUV SĚ ŪGURĚ ↑KANĚ::). The caller utters the words in the final TCU louder than other words and elongates the last vowel in kaně with a rising intonation contour to express the strong degree of insistence. This shows that kaně here also occurs at the end of the TCU, but the string of words of the TCU in which kaně occurs is produced with louder pitch than other words in the surrounding environment and the word kaně with elongated final vowel.

The following fragment exemplifies another instance of kaně with the same function. The selected fragment has been taken from a telephone conversation between two friends A (the caller) and B (the recipient). They both are talking about data collection and recording of conversations.

Kaně VI (00.05.18)

3. A.→ suvk bē *record* ↑ky?
4. B. sm?
5. A.→ suvk bē *record* ↑ky?
6. B.→ va’y sē sē bē zē *record* kam sē bē zē khpal *friends* tē auvaīm
7. A.→ na nuv dy khuv bē asy aum khbary ka’y ca sarē kē dē sarē *recorder* vy dē sarē pē fuvn bandy [
8. B.→ **VA’Y ZAMAPĚ FUVN KY RECORDER
NIŠTĚ↑KANĚ::]**
9. A. sm va’y zamē fuvn ky *recorder* ništē?
10. B. av

The selected fragment begins with the question of the caller asking her friend (suvk bē *record* ky?—Who will record?, followed by question response of the recipient (sm?—What?), showing her lack of understanding the question of the caller, in response to which the caller repeats the previous query in exactly the same words (suvk bē *record* ky?—Who will record?). The recipient tells her friend that (He) says that he will record some himself and for some he will ask his friends (va’y sē sē bē zē *record* kam sē bē zē khpal *friends* tē auvaīm). In the next turn, the caller seems to be expressing her concern by saying that he (someone who has been asked for recording data) will be definitely talking to someone and he can do it himself if he has recorder on phone (na nuv dy khuv bē asy aum khbary ka’y ca sarē kē dē sarē *recorder* vy dē sarē pē fuvn bandy). The overlap response of the recipient in turn 8 is important. By producing her response with rising intonation contour and elongated final vowel in kaně she tries to dispel her friend’s concern by telling her that she likes that option but tells the caller with strong degree of insistence that he says that he does not have

recorder on phone (VA'Y ZAMAPĚ FUVN KY *RECORDER* NIŠTĚ↑KANĚ:::)) It is this rising intonation contour and elongated final vowel of the word kaně that differentiates its strong insistence function from other two functions and meanings, discussed earlier.

Conclusion and Implications

The analysis of the results indicate that Pashto speakers use kaně in turn-final position as (1) a tag question or tag-like turn-final question particle with declarative statements for confirmation, (2) a turn-final word with imperative statements, showing request; for expressing emphasis, and (3) a word with rising intonation contour and final elongated vowel in as shown here (↑KANĚ:::) at the end of utterances with louder pitch than the words in its surrounding environment for expressing strong insistence either on doing or not doing something. Moreover, as the results reveal; these three different functions and meanings of kaně are highly dependent on the context and specific sequential environments in which it occurs. Results indicate that Pashto speakers formulate tag questions or tag-like turn-final questions by attaching the particle or word kaně at the end of a declarative sentence and use tag question in ordinary conversation for confirmation mainly. What differentiates this meaning and function of kaně from the other uses of kaně, especially the use of kaně for emphasis; is that kaně occurs at the end of a declarative statement in which confirmation about something is requested. When kaně is used with an imperative sentence at the end of the turn, it functions as a word for emphasis and in that context (requesting for something or some kind of favor) it conveys the meaning of emphasis on doing something or on some important information and details related to granting the request. As far the third function of kaně is concerned, i.e., to show or express strong insistence; analysis of the results indicate that it is the louder pitch of the strings of words in the utterance or TCU in which kaně occurs at the end and rising intonation contour with elongated final vowel sound that very clearly distinguishes its 'strong insistence' function and meaning from the other two functions and meanings of kaně.

Further research studies need to be conducted (1) to see whether or not kaně has more functions and meanings in ordinary Pashto conversation (2) to examine the sequential environment and the responses to the turns in which kaně occurs to figure out the precise nature of kaně and its functions and meanings as it also appears to be functioning as a turn management unit.



References

- Brown, P. (2010). Questions and their responses in Tzeltal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2627–2648.
- Bukhari, Z. (n.d). Interactive functions ‘na’ in Urdu conversation. Retrieved from <http://www.academia.edu>
- Englert, C. (2010). Questions and responses in Dutch conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2666–2684.
- Ford, C. E., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp.134- 184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational Organization: Interaction between hearers and speakers*. Academic Press: New York. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/publication/238751771_Conversational_organization_interaction_between_speakers_and_hearers
- Hayashi, M. (2010). An overview of the question-response system in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2685–2702.
- Heinemann, T. (2010). Question-response system of Danish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2703– 2725.
- McGregor, R. S. (1992). *Urdu study materials: For use with outline of Hindi grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moore, E., & Poodesva, R. (2009). Style, indexicality, and the social meaning of tag questions. *Language in Society*, 38(04), 447-485.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Issues of relevance for discourse analysis: Contingency in action, interaction and co-participant context. In E. H. Hovy & D. R. Scott (Eds.), *computational and conversational discourse: burning issues—an interdisciplinary account* (pp.3-35). New York: Springer.
- Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S. & Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22, 3–31
- Seedhouse, P. (2005). Conversation analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38(4), 165-187.
- Shigemitsu, Y. (2014). Offering opinions in tag-like questions in authentic conversation in English and Japanese. Retrieved from <https://www.t-kougei.ac.jp/research/pdf/vol37-2-04.pdf> pp.32-40.
- Sohail, A. (2011). *Repetition: A method for affiliation and agreement in Urdu conversation*. UK: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing AG & CO KG.
- Stivers, T. (2010). An overview of the question-response system in American English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 2772–2781.



@ 2022 by the author. Licensee University of Chitral, Journal of Linguistics & Literature, Pakistan. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).