

**An Evaluation of Adjacency Pairs in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again*
and *The gods Are Not to Blame*.**

Akamagwuna Ike Femi¹ & Usman Muhammed Bello^{1*}

¹*Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Abuja, Abuja, Nigeria*

Correspondence: Akamagwuna Ike Femi, Department of English, Faculty of Art, University of Abuja, Abuja, Nigeria.

Email: ikechukwufemi64@gmail.com

***Mentor:** Usman Muhammed Bello, Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Abuja, Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract

This study seeks to explore the use of adjacency pairs in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*. A secondary data was used to analyse this study. A purposive sampling method was used to collect the instances of types of adjacency pairs, toners and insertion sequences used in the aforementioned texts. The collection and analysis of data in both texts create a gap for this research work. A qualitative descriptive research design was used to collect and analyse the derived data of this study. This research work is anchored on MAK Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and it is drawn from Conversation Analysis (CA) approach. The finding of the study reveals the effective and consistent use of adjacency pairs such as *question-answer*, *summon-answer*, *request-acceptance*, *question-refusal*, *announcement-declaration*, *assumption-clarification* and *request-refusal* in the in-talk-interactions that occur among the characters in both texts. These types of adjacency pairs are used by the characters in various parts of both texts in order to ensure the proper exchange of ideas and thoughts are communicated and rationally expressed as revealed in the texts. The finding of the study also shows the use of uptoners, downtoners and insertion sequences in both texts.

Keywords: Adjacency pairs, Conversation analysis, Toners, Insertion sequences, Pre-sequences.

Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

Discourse Analysis evaluates spoken and written interactions that occur among interlocutors. It usually analyses or evaluates interpersonal communications that occur among discourse participants on a subject matter. Discourse Analysis (DA) creates an avenue for spoken and written texts to be evaluated and interpreted by conversationalists in a communication. According to Brown and Yule (1983) cited in Abochol (2021, p.6), Discourse Analysis can be defined as "language in use". This entails that DA analyses a language based on context. Osoba and Sobola (2023, p.201) suggest that discourse can be partitioned into two structures viz: "micro and macro". Both scholars submit that the micro structure makes "smaller bits of language to make up the word, the phrase, the clause and the sentence." On the other hand, they suggest that the macro structure of discourse tends to analyse a conversation beyond the way it is being represented in a sentence. Discourse Analysis mainly places its focus on the use of language based on context (Osoba & Sobola, 2023). Discourse Analysis has basic features. Some of them include: current speaker, next speaker, discourse participants, elicitation in speech and adjacency pairs. However, the subject that interests the researcher is "adjacency pairs."

Adjacency pairs focus on how the first and second pair parts are being connected so as to form as "a pair type" in a discourse (Alexiou, 2020). Adjacency pairs allow speakers to easily exchange meaning and act based on what they infer from a communication. In the same vein, Schegloff (2007, p.3) cited in (Iswara 2019, p. 11) reports that "adjacency pair is a sequential shift produced by the speakers." This implies that adjacency pairs enable conversationalists to exchange meanings and communicate their thoughts. For instance, when the current speaker speaks, the hearer listens and vice versa. Prior to now, numerous researchers had investigated the use of adjacency pairs in different areas such as TV shows, interviews and texts. However, none has investigated the adjacency pairs used in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*. Therefore, this research seeks to evaluate the use of adjacency pairs in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Previous investigations had been carried out by some notable scholars on the use of adjacency pairs in text. Some of them include: Listiyanti's (2017) "Adjacency Pairs in Drama Script " *Teen Angel* by D.M Larson" and Qodriani and Wijana's (2021) " The New Adjacency Pairs in Online Learning: Categories and Practices." The researcher has observed that no investigation has been carried out on the evaluation of the adjacency pairs used in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*. Based on this, the researcher intends to use this research work to fill the gap of this study.

1.3 Aim and Objectives

This study seeks to examine the use of adjacency pairs in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*. Specifically, the objectives of the study are as follows:

- I. To identify and analyse the adjacency pairs used in both texts.
- II. To examine the toners used in both texts.
- III. To evaluate the insertion sequences used in both texts.

2.0 Review of Related Literature

2.1 This section of the study seeks to do a thematic review of the relevant literature and the theory this study is built on.

2.2 Thematic Review

There are five (5) items reviewed in this section of the study. These are Discourse Analysis, adjacency pairs, insertion sequences, pre-sequences and toners.

2.2.1 Discourse Analysis

Stubbs (1983, as cited in Okon, 2004) defines Discourse Analysis as the "linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected spoken or written discourse." This shows that discourse analysis examines all forms of interactions that take place formally or informally. Discourse Analysis is a branch of linguistics that analyses texts, sentences and utterances used in disseminating information or sharing ideas and thoughts at a particular time.

2.2.2 Adjacency Pairs

Rum (2021, p.196) views an adjacency pair as "a pair of conversational turns by two different speakers such that the production of the first turn (called a first-pair-part) makes a response (a second-pair-part) of a particular kind relevant." In other words, adjacency pairs allow in-talk interaction to occur between conversationalists in a discourse. Through the use of adjacency pairs, exchange of thoughts occurs in a communication. Also, through the use of APs, a first pair part and a second-pair-part in a discourse called be used in order to allow a flow of communication to occur between the discourse participants. Mayasari (2018) posits that adjacency pairs take place when speakers exchange meaning to each other. That is to say, when one person (speaker) finishes speaking, the other person (hearer) takes over. Exchange and turn-taking are eminent in in-talk interactions.

2.2.3 Insertion Sequences

According to Alshaibani (2010), insertion sequence instigates an intervention in a discourse between the speaker and hearer in a discourse. In Discourse Analysis, insertion sequence occurs when the hearer chooses not to accept the request of the speaker but seeks to have more information about what is asked or spoken about before an adequate response is given.

This can be exemplified below:

Sam: I would be in church tomorrow and I would like you to follow me.

Tomi: Is it far from here?

Sam: No, it is just a minute walk from here.

The interlocution above shows the use of insertion sequence since Tomi chooses not to accept the offer of Sam directly but also needs a clarification on how distant his church is.

2.2.4 Pre-sequence

A pre-sequence allows a new pair type to be introduced in a discourse. It prepares the ground for a new utterance to be introduced in a discourse (Cutting, 2002 cited in Hadiyat, 2019). Alshaibani (2020) opines that a pre-sequence takes the form of a pre-invitation, pre-offer and pre-announcement in an interlocution. With pre-invitation, discourse participants demand to meet in a particular place, pre-offer occurs when a question arises from an offer which leads to a new discourse and pre-announcement centres on asking questions through the use of "wh-questions."

2.2.5 Toners

Toners are types of repairs that ensure the correctness of speech errors. Williams (1984, p.66) suggests that toners allow "adjustment in the force or strength of an utterance." Toners can be partitioned into two viz: uptoners and downtoners. Uptoners express aggressive utterances while downtoners express utterances in a soft manner which the message communicated to the hearer would not be offensive and harsh.

2.3 Theoretical Domain

This study is anchored on MAK Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics but the approach to this research work is drawn from Conversation Analysis (CA). The former stands as the basis for our data analysis while the latter creates an avenue for a critical analysis to be done on the in-talk-interactions among the characters in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*. According to Almurashi (2016), SFL shows the function language performs in a discourse. The theory is related to this study because it shows how meaning is derived from interactions based on contexts, tenor, mode and aspect. Systemic Functional Linguistics portrays the function language performs and the meaning generated from the in-talk-interactions of the characters in Ola Rotimi's texts as pointed out in this study. The theory shows how language performs different functions based on the exchange of ideas and thoughts among the characters in the texts.

Conversation Analysis is the approach adopted for this study. Mazeland (2016, p.1) defines Conversation Analysis as the "practices and structures of language use in-talk-interaction forms of human social action." This implies that Conversation Analysis evaluates the discussions that occur between interactants which can be spoken or written. This approach is related to this study because it shows how ideas, feelings and thoughts are communicated by the characters through the use of adjacency pairs, insertion sequences, and toners in Ola Rotimi's texts.

3.0 Materials and Methods

This research uses a content and conversation analysis. A content analysis is used to reveal and analyse instances of adjacency pairs, insertion sequences and toners captured in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*. This research work is also conversational because it discusses the language use and interprets the meaning of the types of adjacency pairs, insertion sequences, and toners generated from both texts. A qualitative research design alongside a secondary data is used to collect and analyse the types of adjacency pairs, insertion sequences and toners generated from both texts. A purposive sampling method is adopted in collecting the relevant data needed for the study.

4.0 Discussions/Results

4.1 Introduction

This section of the study shows the instances of the types of adjacency pairs posited in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*.

4.2 Distribution of Adjacency Pairs in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*

Instances of adjacency pairs are visible in the texts used for this study. These types of adjacency pairs are: *question-answer*, *summon-answer*, *request-acceptance*, *request-refusal*, *question-refusal*, *assumption-clarification* and *announcement-declaration*.

4.2.1 Summon-Answer Type of Adjacency Pairs

Some of the instances of summon-answer type of adjacency pairs extracted from the text are expressed as thus:

- i) Mama Rashida: Who is it?
Mustafa: It is me. Alhaji Mustafa.
(Rotimi, 1999, p.16)
- ii). Lejoka: Madman, where you going?
Polycarp: I dey go buy toilet paper sah
(Rotimi, 31)
- iii) Okonkwo: Are you hungry?
Polycarp: Hungry? No.
(Rotimi, 1999, p.38)

As revealed above, the extracts portray the use of summon-answer type of adjacency pairs in the conversation of the characters. As posited above, a speaker asks a question while the hearer

answers. In (i), Mama Rashida uses the interrogative pronoun (who) to ask of the person within their vicinity. In an attempt to answer the question, Mustafa answers or indicates that he is the one by providing his title alongside his name after making use of the object pronoun "me" to refer to himself. He does so because he notices the use of "me" does not justify the referent in the above context. Hence, he avoids the use of vagueness by mentioning his title together with his name (Mustafa). The responds of the speaker (Mustafa) makes the hearer (Mama Rashida) to be aware of Mustafa's presence at the time the question is asked.

In (ii), the above illustration demonstrates the use of question-answer type of adjacency pair by Lejoka and his boy Polycarp as revealed above. Lejoka uses the interrogative pronoun "where" alongside the interrogative fragment/mark (?) to ask Polycarp where he intends to be going after listening to what Okonkwo says to his boss at the Airport. Polycarp answers his master's question by using the sociolinguistic phenomenon, code-mixing in his utterance. As shown above, elements of pidgin such as "dey" (am) and "sah" (sir) are used together with the lexical items of Standard British English (SBE) such as I, go, buy, toilet and paper. In fact, by a way of translation from Pidgin to SBE, Polycarp's response means "I am going to buy toilet paper, sir." So, "I dey go buy toilet paper sah" as used in the above context means "I am going to buy toilet paper, sir." Hence, it is evident that the variety of English (SBE) deployed by Lejoka seems different from the variety of English (NPE) deployed by Polycarp. However, there seems to be a type of adjacency pair known as question-answer since the master asks his servant a question and he answers rationally or correspondingly.

In (iii), as revealed above, Okonkwo asks his friend Lejoka Brown a question in order to confirm if he wants to eat. However, Brown tries to affirm if he clearly hears what Okonkwo says. Based on this, he stresses the adjective "hungry" to express surprise of experiencing hunger at that moment. In order to answer the question, he uses the negator-NO to show that he is not hungry at that time. Here, the style of response/answer provided by the speaker seems different since he only uses a negator "NO" to provide a response to the question his master, Lejoka Brown asks.

On the other hand, the following are the instances of the question-answer type of adjacency pairs generated from Ola Rotimi's *The gods Are Not to Blame*. These include:

- iv) Odewale: Who is your neighbour?
Ajanu: My neighbour? Ayilara, the palm wine tapper, my lord.
(Rotimi, 1971, p.14)
- v) Odewale: The news from Orunmila, is it good or bad?
Aderopo: It is good, your highness.
(Rotimi, 1971, p.18)
- vi) Odewale: Very well. This man... the cursed one... what did he do, what offence?
Aderopo: The man has killed another man.
(Rotimi, 1971, p.20)

As revealed in (iv), An interrogative simple sentence (alongside wh-question) is deployed by Odewale in order to ascertain the neighbour that is being referred to in the context since the NP "neighbour" is vague. Ajanu answers the question appropriately by mentioning the name of the neighbour. In order to provide more information about the referent, Ajanu uses an apposition to provide more information about Ayilara. He achieves this by stating the occupation of Ayilara which he uses as a description as demonstrated above.

In (v), the style of questioning deployed by Odewale seems to be different. Here, Odewale uses the coordinator, or to provide two choices. However, Aderopo's response provides an answer to one of the alternatives which is actually the positive one as demonstrated above. Odewale uses alternative choices to ask his brother, Aderopo a question in order to find out how true the news gotten from Orunmila appears to be. King Odewale uses the alternatives to find out the mind or the position Aderopo takes with respect to the message gotten from Orunmila to the people of Kutuje.

As portrayed above, (vi) depicts the question asked by Odewale, he uses the NP (the cursed one) as an apposition in order to provide more information about the man who has committed an offence. The King uses two wh- questions to make an enquiry about the offence committed by the man as captured in the corpus of the study. Afterwards, Aderopo uses a present perfect tense (The man has killed another man) to show another dreadful act committed by the man. The answer provided by Aderopo explicitly shows that the man is truly guilty of both crimes or offences as alleged.

4.2.2 Summon-Answer Type of Adjacency Pairs

The summon-type of adjacency pairs extracted from both texts include:

vii) Lejoka: All right o, Polycarp!
 Polycarp: Beg to report, sah.
 (Rotimi, 1999, p.42)

viii) Lejoka: Goat!
 Polycarp: Sah!
 (Rotimi, 1999, p. 33)

ix) Lejoka: Sikira!
 Sikira: Sah!
 (Rotimi, 1999, p.6)

As revealed in (vii), a strong interjection (!) is used as a command to seek the presence of Polycarp. Lejoka's boy (Polycarp) uses a military statement (beg to report) to respond to his master's summon. His response shows his availability at the time he is called upon by Lejoka Brown as unraveled in the text.

In (viii), Lejoka uses the word (goat) to summon Polycarp because he perceives him to be inferior and stubborn. Polycarp, being a subordinate to Lejoka has no choice than to answer the summon or call of his master too. Similarly, the statement of each discourse participant has an exclamation mark. So, from the standpoint of the master's summon, he screams and orders Polycarp to come

while Polycarp himself responds to his master's summon by shouting because of the distance between both of them at the time he is summoned by his master.

In (ix), Lejoka authoritatively summons Sikira to come. Sikira, out of fear, responds to the summon of her husband. Here, it is evident that Lejoka Brown, being a retired military personnel always commands people to appear before him; especially those he perceives to be inferior to him.

In Ola Rotimi's *The gods Are Not to Blame*, the following are some of the instances of summon-answer type of adjacency pairs posited in the text. These are expressed as thus:

- x) Odewale: Bokini!~
Bokini: My lord.
(Rotimi, 1971, p.16)
- xi) Odewale: Abero! Ab...
Abero: Here I am, my lord.
(Rotimi, 1971, p.15)
- xii) Odewale: Adewale
Adewale: This is me, my father.
(Rotimi, 1971, p.71)

As portrayed in (x), adjacency pair occurs as Bokini answers Odewale when he is being summoned. As shown above, Odewale applies a strong interjection (!) by summoning or calling the attention of Bokini. We can deduce how high the pitch of his voice is as he calls his servant authoritatively and loudly. The response or answer given by Bokini depicts calmness, servanthood and absolute loyalty.

Another type of summon-answer type of adjacency pair shown in the text is revealed in (xi). The above extract shows absolute loyalty demonstrated by Abero to King Odewale. This is seen when Abero's name is called once. Before the King finishes calling his name the second time, Abero appears instantaneously in his presence. He uses the place deixis, here to notify King Odewale about his present location after being called.

In (xii), Odewale summons his son by calling his name while his son (Adewale) answers his father's by using the simple sentence (This is me) and the NP (my father) as captured in the text. The response provided by Adewale clearly shows that a relationship exists between himself and the King.

4.2.3 Request-Acceptance Type of Adjacency Pairs

The both texts have rare instances of request-acceptance type of adjacency pairs. These include:

- xiii) Polycarp: Make I take her load, abi make I no go?

Mama Rashida: Go, go, go...
(Rotimi, 1999, p.19)

- xiv) Lejoka: Make you help take Freedom comot from under the bed.
Polycarp: Yes, sah.
(Rotimi, 1999, p.42)

In (xiii), Polycarp requests to render assistance to Liza who just arrives in Nigeria. The request made by Polycarp as revealed above is optional which makes it subject to the approval of his master's wife-Mama Rashida. In the same vein, Mama Rashida accepts the request of Polycarp by granting him permission to go help Liza carry her load as demonstrated above. The repetition of the finite verb "go" depicts an anxious action Madam Rashida wants Polycarp to take as demonstrated in the corpus of the study.

In (xiv), Polycarp accepts the request made by his Boss by saying " Yes, sah." As depicted in the text, he accepts the request of Brown and does what he is expected to do. As indicated in the corpus of the study, Lejoka presents his request to Polycarp in order to make the bedroom convenient for Liza who is scared of Freedom (a snake). As exhibited above, the exchange which occurs between both interactants portrays the use of code-switching and code-mixing (Pidgin and SBE lexical items).

In contrast, the instances of request-acceptance type of adjacency pairs in Ola Rotimi's *The gods Are Not to Blame* include:

- xv) Aderopo: My lord, may I go now to bring Baba Fakunle from Oyo?
First Chief: Go quickly.
(Rotimi, 1971, p. 22)

In (xv), Aderopo uses the modal auxiliary verb "may" and the interrogative fragment (question mark?) to politely make a request to the First Chief. The First Chief, in return, uses the verb "go" and the adverb of manner "quickly" to answer or grant the request of Aderopo. The above discourse shows that the one (First Chief) who gives the approval has what it takes to do so.

4.2.4 Question-Refusal Type of Adjacency Pairs

The following are the instances of question-answer type of adjacency pairs extracted from Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad again and The gods are Not to Blam*

- xvi) Liza: Fight! Fight who?
Brown: That is not for me to know and not an outsider to find out.
(Rotimi, 1999, p.73)

- xvii) Sikira: Polycarp said you got a cablegram. I hope it is nothing bad?
Lejoka: Thanks for your concern!
(Rotimi, 1999, pp. 9-10)

As revealed in (xvi), Liza asks a question in order to be clarified about a conflict situation.

However, the choice of words (diction) and the manner of expression portrayed by Brown show that he indirectly refuses to answer the question Liza asks him because he seems to be furious at the time his wife asks the question. On that note, he refuses to answer her question directly even if he has a profound knowledge of the topic of discussion. The response given by Brown shows that he does not want his wife to know the person he is having a conflict with as revealed in the above interlocution.

In (xvii), Lejoka Brown refuses to answer Sikira's question. Sikira asks a question in an attempt to confirm the quality of the cablegram Brown buys. Lejoka Brown refuses to answer Sikira's question by tendering an appreciation instead of providing a rational answer to the question asked by Sikira about the quality of the cablegram Polycarp tells her Brown buys.

In contrast, the question-refusal type of adjacency pair identified in Ola Rotimi's *The gods are Not to Blame* is represented below:

- xviii) 2nd Child: Why was father fighting?
Ojuola: You never mind that: just don't make father angry.

In (xviii), Queen Ojuola's refuses to provide a direct answer to the question his son asks. Her response shows that King Odewale is angry at the moment. Hence, the child should do everything possible to avoid his anger. Queen Ojuola feels that King Odewale would possibly transfer aggression on anyone who annoys him. With this, Ojuola advises her child to avoid anything that would trigger the King's anger.

4.2.5 Request-Refusal Type of Adjacency Pairs

This section showcases the request-refusal type of adjacency pairs captured in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again*.

- xix) Liza: Get that snake out of my room, will you please?
Sikira: Me! Without the master telling me to? Kla*nol
(Rotimi, 1999, p.23)

- xx) Madam Rashida: Open that door.
Sikira: I no be your slave.
(Rotimi, 1999, p.71)

As represented in (xix), request-refusal type of adjacency pair is demonstrated above. Liza, in her first statement (the first clause) appears to be authoritative in her request by commanding Sikira to take Freedom away from her room. However, in the second clause (will you please?), she seems to be polite in making her request known to Sikira. She responds to Sikira by saying "me" already shows her disapproval/refusal of Liza's request. This is so because she (Sikira) feels she can only do that if the master (Lejoka Brown) instructs her to do so. Her refusal of Liza's request shows that she is only answerable to the bread-winner of the house-Lejoka Brown.

The extract in (xx) shows the request made by Madam Rashida and the response (refusal) given by

Sikira. As posited above, Mama Rashida's request seems imperative since she does not deploy courtesy while making her request. With this, Sikira bluntly turns down her request by refusing to accept the request made by Mama Rashida. As indicated in the corpus of the study, Sikira refuses the request of Mama Rashida in order to make her know that both of them are Lejoka Brown's wives. Hence, none is more superior than the other.

On the other hand, Ola Rotimi's *The gods Are Not to Blame* has a deficiency in the use of request-answer type of adjacency pairs.

4.2.6 Announcement-Declaration Type of Adjacency Pairs

Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* lacks the use of announcement-declaration type of adjacency pairs. However, this is captured in *The gods Are Not to Blame*. The instance of announcement-declaration posited in the text is expressed as follows:

- xxi) Townspeople: We are suffering, my lord, we are.
 Odewale: Yes, I know.
 (Rotimi, 1999, p.12)

In (xxi), the townspeople announce or publicize the hardship they currently face in the land, King Odewale uses the main clause "I know" to indicate his awareness of the suffering the people of Kutuje pass through. As shown above, the townspeople repeat the sentence "we are".to notify the King about the hardship every villager faces.

4.2.7 Assumption-Clarification Type of Adjacency Pairs

The assumption-clarification type of adjacency pairs is posited in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* but is not portrayed in *The gods are Not to Blame*. Therefore, the assumption-clarification adjacency pair in *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* is revealed as thus:

- xxii) Okonkwo: Oh, I thought you said.
 Brown: She is my second wife.
 (Rotimi, 1999, p. 8)

In (xxii), a presuppositional failure occurs between Okonkwo and Lejoka Bown. At the onset, Lejoka Brown assumes that Okonkwo has a brackground knowledge of the position Liza occupies in his home prior to then whereas Okonkwo does not. In order to clarify him, he uses a simple sentence to formally intoude Liza as his second wife. The above discourse also portrays an interruption on Okonkwo's utterance when he tries to share his assumption. However, Lejoka Brown brings clarifies him by stating the position Liza occupies in his house. He does this in order to avoid vagueness.

4.3 Toners in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*.

This section of the study shows the uptoners and downtoners captured in both texts.

4.3.1 Uptoners

The instances of uptoners in both texts include:

xxiii) Mama Rashida: Whenever he goes to campaign, master takes Freedom with him round his arm like a gold bangle.

Liza: Most--- spectacular! But--- please, do me a favour--- get it out of my room.

(Rotimi, 1999, p.22)

xxiv) Brown: I want you to meet my--- are you there---come over here, you rascal.

(Rotimi, 1999, p.34)

In (xxiii), the utterance of Liza shows the use of an uptoner which is a type of repair. First, she says: "please, do me a favour", soon afterwards, she uses an "uptoner" by issuing a command to Mama Rashida. She uses a shift in her utterance which can be seen at the level of changing a request to a command statement.

In (xxiv), an uptoner type of repair is visible in Brown's utterance. Initially, he wants to make a statement. Later, he shifts to a question after which he makes an order.

On the other hand, the instances of uptoners in *The gods Are not to Blame* include:

xxv) First Chief: Enough! People of our land! People of our---King stands before you in greeting.
(Rotimi, 1971, p. 9)

xxvi) Odewale: You---trying to. Your intrigues, and blackmail and--- oh! Take your time child, if you rise too early, the dew of life will soak you.

(Rotimi, 1971, p.35)

In (xxv), the First Chief wants to address the people of Kutuje because of how melancholic they appear to be after losing their loved ones. At the appearance of the King, the First Chief instigates a shift from addressing the people to notifying them about the King's arrival. The statement made by the First Chief is an example of an uptoner. This can be seen based on the force and shift deployed in the utterance of the First Chief while addressing the people of Kutuje.

In (xxvi), Odewale keeps shifting from one statement to another. An uptoner type of repair is displayed in the way he advises the child.

4.3.2 Downtoners

The instances of downtoners in the texts include:

xxvii) Liza: Who and who and when then do you mean by everybody?

Lejoka: You mean?

Liza: Don't you know what I mean?

Lejoka: Oh, I mean--- emm---people---emmm---dependants-----you know people of the house---emmm-extended family---you know citizens.

(Rotimi, 1999, p. 36)

xxviii) Brown: You---you have come to--- say goodbye? Well what is it?

Liza: Mr. Okonkwo has just told me that---you have been voted out of office by your party?

(Rotimi, 1999, p. 73)

In (xxvii), Lejoka uses "you mean" to facilitate a repair based on what Liza says in the FPP. Later, she asks Brown a question which leads to a speech error being exhibited by Brown. The downtoner is expressed in the second pair part.

In (xxviii), Major Rahman Lejoka Brown and his wife-Liza exhibit the use of a downtoner in their utterances. In Brown`s utterance, he incurs a shift from making a statement to asking a question while Liza does the same (she incurs a shift from a statement to question form).

In contrast, the instance of downtoner in Ola Rotimi's *The gods are Not to Blame* include:

xxix) Iya Aburo: You came too late, my husband. We have---oh, pity we have just finished eating yams in the King`s bathroom. Oh, you want the child? Let`s ----I beg of you, carry her well, do not hurt her fingers.

(Rotimi, 1971, p.16)

As shown above, downtoner is deployed in Iya Aburo`s utterance as she keeps incurring a change/shift in her utterance. She does this by displaying incompleteness of a statement after which she shifts to another in the same utterance. Iya Aburo appropriately posits the use of a downtoner by speaking softly to her husband. The tone of her voice and the diction used by her (Iya Aburo) is an indication of a downtoner.

4.4 Insertion Sequences in Both Texts

The instances of insertion sequences in both texts are revealed below:

xxx) Okonkwo: Send the top women away for the time being.

Lejoka: To where? and what if Sikira's mother finds out that I have kicked her only daughter out of my house, so I can drag in my Ameriko? Chu! Finish! That will be the end of my politics.
(Rotimi, 1999, p.11).

xxx) Liza: Who are you by the way?

Mamma Rashida: Who-me?

Liza: Yes-you?

Mama Rashida: Why? Didn't the master tell you that too?

Liza: Forget the apologies, Mama. Just hand it to me straight!

Mama Rashida: It is well then. By the grace of Allah, the All-Merciful, the All-providing.

Liza: Fire and brimstone!

Mama Rashida: Toh! I am his first wife, o!

(Rotimi, 1999, p. 27)

In (xxx), Lejoka Brown deploys the use of insertion sequence by not just accepting the suggestion of Okonkwo makes. Hence, Brown wants his friend to provide more information about what he has stated before he can provide his own response as well.

In (xxxi), Insertion sequence is evident in the above conversation as Mama Rashida uses it in the FPP by asking "who-me?" and also in the SPP by saying; "Why didn't the master tell you that too?". She uses insertion sequence by not directly answering Liza's question. On this note, she uses insertion sequence to generate more information from Liza which she does intentionally.

On the other hand, the instances of insertion sequence in Ola Rotimi's The gods are not to Blame include:

xxxii) 1st Chief: Which of you knows where Aderopo is?

3rd Citizen: Has the sickness killed him?

(Rotimi, 1971, p.12)

xxxiii) Aderopo: What wrong have I done to you?

Odewale: First, did you, Aderopo or did you not press that I should send for that--- that blind blind bat who calls himself seer?

Aderopo: What was wrong in _____

Odewale: Answer "yes" or "no" young man. Yes or no?

(Ola Rotimi, 1971, p.33).

In (xxxii), The 3rd citizen uses insertion sequence in order to generate ample information about what must have happened to Aderopo. Instead of answering the question clearly, he asks another question so as to have a profound knowledge of Aderopo's condition.

In (xxxiii), In the FPP, Aderopo asks Odewale a question in order to know the offence he has committed. After that, Odewale applies insertion sequence by expecting Aderopo to answer his question first before he would answer that of Aderopo. So, from the First Pair Part (FPP) down to the Second Pair Part (SPP), both characters use insertion sequence in communicating their thoughts.

4.5 Conclusion

From the above analysis, the texts (*Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*) have a high occurrence of question-answer type of adjacency pairs. In the plays, the author creates an avenue for characters to ask questions concurrently and also answer them correspondingly.

The gods Are Not to Blame and *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* have a deficiency in the use of request-acceptance types of adjacency pairs.

As shown in the analysis of the study, the request-refusal type of adjacency pair is captured in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* but it does not reflect in *The gods Are Not to Blame*.

The announcement-declaration adjacency pair is posited in Ola Rotimi's *The gods Are Not to Blame* but it is not portrayed in *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again*.

In sum, to some extent, the author portrays the use of up-toners in the text. He unravels this by showcasing a soft utterance made by the characters in a discourse after which a shift occurs in their statements. This is evident in the language use of the characters used in Ola Rotimi's *Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again* and *The gods Are Not to Blame*.

Finally, as revealed in the analysis, insertion sequence is exhibited in both texts.

Acknowledgments

All encomiums go to the Almighty God for making this research a success. To Him alone, be all the glory.

I cannot thank Dr Usman Muhammed Bello enough for his mentorship and thorough supervision during the course of this study. When I thought it was all over with this study, he stood firmly by me, admonishing and prodding me into going ahead in spite of all odds. Today, here is a manifestation of his unequalled support, his consistent contributions and guidance. To you, sir, my appreciation is absolutely given.

To my lovely parents, Comrade George and Deaconess Fola Akamagwuna as well as my siblings (Daddy Theola, Mummy Feyi, Mrs Olusa, Solomon and Victor), thanks a lot for being committed to everything that pertains to my progress, growth and development. I love and celebrate you all. Finally, thanks for your patience and prayers, Janet. You are such a wonder.

References

- Abochol, S. (2021). Discourse & Society (Lecture Notes). Printeverything@gmail.com.
- Alshaibani, J. (2010). Insertion Sequence in English and Arabic Religious Texts : A Contrastive Study. *Journal of Al-Qadisiya University*. 13 (4), 7- 10. <https://www.researchgate.net>
- Alexiou, S. (2020). Conversation Analysis: An Analysis of Turn-Taking amongst University Students. 1-6. DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.22718.84806.
- Almurashi, W. (2016). An Introduction to Halliday`s Systemic Functional Linguistics. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*. 4 (1), 70-72. DOI: 10.5296/jsel.v4i1.9423.
- Hadiyat, Y. (2019). An Analysis on Pre-sequences in Making Invitation Used by Freshmen of English as a Foreign Language: The Pragmatics Perspective. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues*. 2(1), 23-26. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21403/jetli.v2i1.5203>.
- Iswara, J. (2019). The Application of Adjacency Pair Patterns and Communicative Function of Roundtable Discussion with Susi Pudjia Stuti at Stimson Center. *English Teaching Journal*. 10 (1), 11. Lib.unnes. ac.id
- Listiyanti, I. (2017). Adjacency Pairs in Drama Script *Teen Angel* by D.M Larson. Ahmad Dahlan *Journal of English Studies*. 4 (2), 13-14. DOI: 10.26555/adjes.v4i2.6413.
- Mayasari, P. (2018) Adjacency Pairs Analysis of Conversation between the Host (Stephen Colbert) and the Guest (Michelle Obama) in the Late Show CBS`TV. [eprints.ums. ac.id](http://eprints.ums.ac.id)
- Mazeland, H. (2006). Conversation Analysis. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd Ed). 3 (1), 1. DOI:10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00314-X.
- Okon, B. (2004). A Discourse Analysis of Natural Conversations. Accepted 13 January, 2004 from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/gjh/article/download/29352/22543>.
- Qodriani, L.& Wijana, D (2021). The New Adjacency Pairs in Online Learning: Categories and Practices. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*. <https://www.Atlantis-press.com>.2021. 121.
- Rotimi, O. (1971). The gods Are Not to Blame. Oxford University Press, United Kingdom. .2-78.
- Rotimi, O. (1999). Our Husband Has Gone Mad Again. University Press, Nigeria. .5-76.
- Rum, M (2021). Discourse Analysis: Analysing Adjacency Pairs of Teachers and Students [ejournal.iainpalopo. ac.id](http://ejournal.iainpalopo.ac.id).
- Sobola, E. & Osoba, S. (2023). Introduction to Discourse Analysis.
- Williams, J. (1984). Correction Formula for Repairs. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)*. 1 (1), 66-70. <http://repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol1/iss15>.