

'SHOULD YOU BE UNFORTUNATE?': EMOTIONAL IDENTITY IN NIGERIAN ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRES

Simeon Ajiboye

Bowen University, Iwo, Nigeria

Abstract

Emotional language is central to identity construction in any adjudication setting, which essentially a negotiated process compared to a courtroom is setting. Previous studies have focused on the use of lexical items to construct identity in the courtroom, neglecting the construction of emotional identity in adjudicative encounters, especially in Nigerian university law clinics, a popular site for dispute resolution. Therefore, this study investigated the construction of emotional identity and the pragmatic strategies used in adjudicative encounters, drawing on aspects of Interpersonal Pragmatics, Conversation Analysis, and Social Constructionist theories. Three universities: University of Ibadan (UI), Adekunle Ajasin University (AAU) and Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU), where adjudication is practised in southwestern Nigeria, were purposively selected. Data comprised purposively selected taped hearing sessions and documented cases between 2010 and 2017: UI-20 sessions; AAU-one session and 10 documented cases; and OOU-20 documented cases. Three categories of emotional identities characterised the Southwestern Nigerian adjudicative encounter: furist, pugilist, and recalcitrant identities. Furist identity manifested as excessive anger; pugilist identity was divided into bellicosity and obstreperousness; and recalcitrant identity manifested as Obduracy and rigidity. Furist identity was created through the evocation of evidential sentiment, the evocation of experiential reality, and the construction of profanity; pugilist identity was generated through the construction of an enquiry proposition, the evocation of experiential reality, and the evocation of evidential sentiment. Recalcitrant identity was constructed through the construction of asseveration, biblical allusion and evocation of evidential sentiment. The study concludes that emotional identity negotiated

through context-driven pragmatic resources characterised Nigerian adjudicative encounters. This indicates a relationship between language and identity and establishes the impact of their discourse on the restoration of societal peace in Nigeria.

Keywords: Dispute resolution; identity; furist identity; excessive anger; experiential reality.

Background to the Study

Discourses of conflict and conflict resolution have attracted increased attention in both the academic world and the public domain; however, there is no generally accepted definition of conflict due to different perceptions among scholars across fields. Differences in opinions, perceptions, and ideas among people in society lead to conflict (Ajiboye 2018, 2024, 2025). This makes conflict a universal phenomenon in human society. In fact, conflict has been considered an inevitable part of human existence and interaction, resulting from incompatible intentions and goals (Katz and McNulty, 1994; Fetse, 2014; Odori, 2004; Adebisi, 2014). The presence of a conflict in any interaction or society indicates that the relationship between the parties involved is threatened and that there is an urgent need for resolution. Consequently, several methods for resolving the conflict, both in institutional and non-institutional settings, have been devised by society, ranging from litigation to negotiation (Katz and McNulty, 1994; Adebisi, 2014; Ajiboye, 2018;), which in the legal domain is termed alternative dispute resolution (ADR). This corroborates Feste's (2014) view that the essence of the drama of conflict is its resolution; it is not the conflict as such that makes the drama, but the resolution of the conflict as a meaningful process through time.

One salient issue in the activities that culminate in conflict and the processes of resolving conflict is the construction of identities through language. This not only shows the centrality of language in human interaction (Hudson, 1996; Haugen, 1996; Coulmas, 1997; Akindele and Adegbite, 2000; Holmes, 2004; Gumperz, 2006; Ajiboye, 2014, 2018), but also the symbiotic relationship between language and identity. It is obvious, therefore, that language and identity do not only connect, but that identity is usually occasioned or constructed in different contexts of human interaction or discourse, including

conflictive discourse, which is domiciled in legal discourse, the focus of this study.

Studies on identity in legal discourse (Bogoch, 1999; Sala, 2010; Mazzi, 2010; Whittaker, 2010; Maclean, 2010; Bajcic, 2010; Allori, 2010; Prrite, 2010; Maryns, 2013; Chen, 2017; Chaemsaitong, 2018) have focused on litigation and law articles with an emphasis on lexical items and voices as tools for identity construction, neglecting their construction in adjudicative encounters. This neglect underscores the need to examine how language is discursively used to construct emotional identity in the alternative dispute resolution context, especially in Nigeria, where scholarship on the discursive construction of identity in legal discourse is scarce, except for Ajiboye (2021), who considers the discursive construction of gender identity in alternative dispute resolution. This study differs from Ajiboye (2021), in that it will reveal how different emotional identities are discursively constructed in adjudicative encounters and the various pragmatic mechanisms used to construct such identities. Therefore, this study examines categories of emotional identity and the various pragmatic mechanisms employed in constructing identity in alternative dispute centres, which are popular sites for adjudication in Nigeria, within the framework of social constructionist and Interpersonal pragmatic theories. In Section 2 below, I present an overview of the relationship between language and emotion; Section 3 provides theoretical anchorage; Section 4 considers methodology; Section 5 considers analysis and findings; and Section 6 provides the conclusion.

Language and Emotion

Language is a mechanism for conveying conceptual and emotional information, serving as a cognitive and communicative means for representing the world and internal feelings (Zhu, 2015:120). Lindquist, Gendron, and Satpute (2015:2) define language as "the words that people use to describe emotional states such as anger, disgust, fear, joy, contentment, pride, etc." Emotion refers to an inborn, non-adaptive mechanism of internal sensors that measure vital body parameters, such as blood pressure and body temperature (Zhu, 2016). Lindquist, Gendron and Satpute (2015:2) define emotion as "psychological states that are experienced as coordinated patterns of physiology, behaviour and thoughts that occur within certain types of situations, and which are described

with certain emotion category words." In Odebunmi's (2012:123) words, emotion is perceived to be a "socio-cognitive state that works on the rapport between physical activities and [a] psychological rousing".

Bamberg (1997) views the relationship between language and emotion from two angles. First, language is considered to be performed emotively. People have emotions, and being emotional takes place extralinguistically (facial expressions, hand gestures, body postures among others), in terms of suprasegmental and prosodic features, and in terms of linguistic forms. This view focuses on the expression of emotions and on the nature of emotions and their functioning in private and public settings. Language and emotion are parallel systems in use, and their relationship lies in the fact that one (emotion) affects the performance of the other (language). They both serve a functional role in the communicative process between people.

The other view begins with the assumption that language reflects objects in the world, among which emotions are one. Emotional terms are part of languages, and people worldwide discuss emotions, though they differ by tribe and race. Hence, language is a means of making sense of emotions and a starting point for exploring the world of emotions across different languages. These two views are integral to this study, as emotion is not only perceived as constructed within communicative engagement but also reveals the capacity of language to reflect emotion categories in any interactional engagement.

In a similar study, Foolen (2012) treats language and emotion as concepts closely related to cognition. He believes that the workings of human cognition shape the structure of human language, and that language, in turn, influences human cognition. Hence, he identifies four ways to view the relationship between language and emotion. These include the following:

- There is no direct connection between language and emotion: cognition stands as an intermediate between them (emotion is conceptualized in cognition and cognition is reflected in language, for example, in the lexical differentiation between emotions),
- Language has a direct connection to emotion (emotion can be expressed directly in verbal utterances),
- Language has both a direct and an indirect link to emotion (language

reflects the conceptualization of emotion and expresses emotion),

- The relationship between language and emotion varies depending on the type of emotion. For example, a belief-dependent emotion like surprise is typically expressed in language, whereas anger or fear is conceptualized in language but expressed nonverbally (Foolen, 2012: 349).

Foolen, in his previous works, had proposed that cognition serves as an intermediate between language and emotion. People can conceptualize emotions. They not only conceptualize their own emotions but also those of others. However, a speaker can also express their own emotions directly through language, resulting in expressive language, also known as "emotive or affective language". Foolen also differentiates between conceptualization and expression, taking this as a point of departure. He argues that both the conceptualization and expression of emotion are natural functions of language. Summarily speaking, Odebunmi (2012) sees language as a vehicle for "expressing emotion" and that "languages have built-in emotional capacities, and their speakers discuss the emotion" (Odebunmi 2012:123). In this study, both Bamberg's (1997) perspectives on the relationship between language and emotion, as well as Foolen's (2012) conceptualization and expression of emotion, will be pragmatically accessed as markers of identity in the discourse of conflict and conflict resolution.

Theoretical Anchorage

Social Constructionist Theory (SCT) is considered appropriate for unpacking different emotional identity types in encounters. It considers identity a dynamic phenomenon that changes with the context of interaction. Social constructionism concerns how selves are created or constructed in different contexts. In social constructionist theory, identity is perceived as an interactional issue (He, 1995) that is not static but flexible and dynamic. The theory emphasizes that identity is jointly constructed in interaction and in a continually ongoing process (Halford and Leonard, 2006). This shows that interlocutors jointly and discursively construct identity in any interactive event. This means that SCT investigates how interactants construct and negotiate their own and one another's identity in and through talk, and how they portray themselves as particular people in their discourse.

The theory recognizes the principles of dynamism, discursive and multifacetedness, upon which identity construction is built. This paper draws on these principles to examine the categories of emotional identity in Nigerian adjudicative encounters. These resources are used in combination with Locher and Graham's 2010 Interpersonal Pragmatics and Conversational Analysis (the pattern of contribution, the structured stages of contribution, and sequential patterns of interaction, with special consideration to pauses, interruptions, increments, and overlaps, amongst others).

The paper uses the relational aspect of language, which is a hinge principle of interpersonal pragmatics. It examines how interactants use language to create relationships and how those relationships shape language use. Specifically, the interpersonal, attitudinal/emotive, and evaluative aspects of language use in interpersonal pragmatics provide the principles upon which the pragmatic mechanisms underlying the construction of identity hinge. The relational aspect explicates interpersonal relations and captures mutual social connections among people, mediated by interaction, including power, intimacy, roles, rights, and obligations (Haugh and Karder, 2013). Interpersonal attitude encompasses 'perspective usually-value-laden and emotionally charged' interaction. Interpersonal emotion deals with "embodied feelings or state of mind often characterized by participants as irrational and subjective, unconsciously better than deliberate and genuine rather than artificial" (Edward, 1999:273), while interpersonal evaluation is about the assessment of a person or such person's relationship with another person(s) which ultimately affect our perspectives or worldview about the person(s). The choice of theories is informed by their evocation of experiences situated within and outside interactions, and by their capacity to unpack the pragmatic mechanisms used in adjudicative encounters.

Methodology

This study is based on 21 audio-taped hearing sessions and 30 documented cases from three universities in southwestern Nigeria where adjudication was practised between 2010 and 2017. The three universities (University of Ibadan, Adekunle Ajasin University and Olabisi Onabanjo University) were purposively selected. From these universities, a total of 21 hearing sessions were tape-recorded from 2015 to 2017, while 30 documented cases from 2010 to

2015 were purposively obtained. All conversations between the parties were recorded, irrespective of the language used (English, including Nigerian English, Pidgin, and indigenous Nigerian languages). The conversation was transcribed using Gail Jefferson's (2004) CA notation. Central to the analysis was a combination of SCT, Locher and Graham's Interpersonal Pragmatics and Conversation Analysis. These theories were selected because they address the discursive construction of identity, the sequencing and situatedness of discourse, and participants' negotiated language use.

Analysis and Findings

Adjudicative interactions in Nigeria, especially in southwestern Nigeria, are characterized by furist, pugilist, and recalcitrant identities as subcategories of emotional identity, expressed either as a display of displeasure or as a means of asserting and establishing one's trampled authority in the course of dispute resolution. These identities are discursively constructed through the construction of asseveration, evocations of evidential, affective, and experiential sentiment, biblical allusion, and traditional values.

Furist identity

The furist identity in the context of this study is expressed when participants, in the course of resolving a dispute, display an intense, excessive, and unrestrained anger, usually indicated or punctuated by table hitting, finger tapping, hot-temperedness, tearing of valuable items, raising of voices, tenacious holding of the floor of talk, excessive interruptions, amongst other exhibited emotional behaviours. It is mostly constructed when a position is challenged or questioned, or when a party in the interaction feels cheated or marginalised. Furist identity is usually characterised by excessive anger, aggressive outbursts, and voice-raising during interactions. It also involves the display of emotional discharge, which may include attempts to beat up the other party; it could be caused by perceived irresponsibility on the part of the male gender or perceived lack of submission of the female gender, as evident in the excerpt below:

Background

The woman in the excerpt is angry because her husband's irresponsibility forces her to shoulder many responsibilities at home, including caring for the children. The excessive anger is seen in the incessant pacifying utterances of the mediator

and the woman's continual holding of the floor as she affectively evokes her experience in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 1

1. A: Mrs, mrs, mrs, no [no no no]
2. C: There is nothing I can [do]
3. A: Mama XYZ xxx
4. C: >leave everything (.)
5. < > I'm the one paying the children's school fees
6. The children's feeding
7. The children's clothing []
8. A: No, listen, you don't need to []
9. C: No! No!! No!!
10. See (.) daddy I came here (.)
11. I came here to tell you
12. that the children's school fees=
13. =the children's feeding and their clothing (.)
14. since I gave birth to the children, you know(0.3)=
15. =aside Christmas day=
16. =how children are wearing clothing?
17. Is it the one you gave me when I was pregnant?=
18. =Is it that money, I should use to buy baby things=
19. =is it the money you gave me then=
20. = that's the money you gave me till this moment?
21. Those are the clothes the children are wearing"
22. no, I'm asking?
23. You don't know whether the children are drinking tea or bourvita.
24. You don't even ask me.
25. I bought it myself see (.)
26. that's why I'm working
27. he doesn't even want me to work.
28. So, he knows why we cannot stay together
29. he knows.
30. It's his mother that is behind all these
31. things that is happening,
32. > it's the mother<.

33. B: For me o:::I can't spoil life for anybody (.)
34. because the time we are paying together (0.2)
35. she is the one who buy clothes for the children
36. And take care of them
37. A: mama XYZ []
38. C: they should leave me (.)
39. will take care of MY children <.
40. A: are you ready to listen to us?
41. C: >That is it!
42. That's my own (.) final decision (0.2)
43. He has parents in the village<<
44. I'm calling my uncle now (0.1)
45. The network is bad []
46. A: Mama XYZ Mama XYZ []
47. D: Experience of a woman (0.3)
48. You know women have that []
49. A: Mama XYZ , Mama XYZ
50. D: They have that umbilical cord, so (.)
51. they can shout =
52. A: =Mama XYZ, Mama XYZ []
53. D: So, I understand []
54. A: Mama XYZ Mama XYZ []
55. C: >Sir Daddy<
56. D: @ Mama XYZ @
57. C: > I am woman<
58. > and all my children are girls<
59. D: =So
60. A: Hun un
61. C: And my prayer is that they will surpass me in everything
62. He is not paying the children fees
63. D: It's okay:::
64. B: What are you saying xxx what are you saying? What is wrong with you
65. D: At least you are a man
66. B: >>What are you are saying exactly?<<

The interaction opens with a mediating cue of name-calling in line 1 to calm

speaker C (henceforth woman) down. The woman's response in lines 2 to 7 unearths the reason for her anger, as she is the one shouldering the responsibilities of feeding and clothing the children and sponsoring their education. The exposed reason negatively positioned the man as irresponsible, having neglected his cultural duties. This act of irresponsibility prompts the woman to report him and seek justice at the ADR centre, in a fit of excessive anger that indexes furist identity. The identity is foregrounded in the excerpt through the incessant use of mediating cues, such as name-calling, accentuation, and the expression of dissatisfaction with her husband's neglectful attitude. Through accentuation, the woman discursively and affectively evokes her experience with evidence-based assertions to pour out her emotion about her husband's act of irresponsibility, thereby foregrounding feminist identity. The woman uses her turn in lines 4 to 7 and 10-32 to evoke her previous experience with statements of fact as proofs of annoyance, through a rising tune, to express her displeasure with her husband's act of negligence at a critical time in pregnancy and delivery. In a conflictive situation or interaction, as seen in Excerpt 1, the maxims of relevance, manner, and quality are usually and expectedly flouted, as is evident in every sequence of the woman.

The extent of the woman's anger can be seen in her utterance, with the accentuation foregrounded through rising tune in the sequence 'they should leave me alone. I will take care of my children in lines 38-39, rejecting every pacifying strategy that speaker A (henceforth, the mediator) uses to gain the floor in the interaction. Despite the mediator's mediating tokens in lines 3, 8, 37, 40, 46, 49, 52, and 56, the interactional expectation of calming the woman down was not met because the woman's anger in her responses prevented it. The woman hijacks the interaction through interruptions and any opportunity to vent her anger and displeasure. She holds on to the floor and uses it to vent her dissatisfaction with her husband's attitude, foregrounding her furist identity through evidence-based assertions punctuated by a rising tone. The optimal level of anger is seen in her decision to take full responsibility for her children. The use of the possessive adjective 'MY' indicates that she has taken full responsibility for the children, as the man has failed in his traditional fatherly and husbandly roles. She indirectly draws on cultural roles expected of a father to prove that her husband neglected responsibilities, which negatively positions the husband as a cultural deviant. The sequence also reveals a

paradigm shift in the role of women in society, which the woman sees as an abysmal situation, one that indexes the furist identity.

Similarly, the woman's response to the mediator's intervening token of "Mama XYZ" in line 38 and 42 negates the mediator's expectation not as a threat to the mediator's face or an act of impoliteness but a means of unleashing her excessive anger in an aggressive outburst. A rising tone punctuates this outburst to express her displeasure with her husband's dereliction of duty and her concerns about her children's future due to their father's negligence. It is noted that every attempt by the mediator to pacify the woman proves abortive, as she hijacks the floor of interaction through interruption and overlap at every available opportunity to express her dissatisfaction as well as her fear through evidence-based assertion and experiences

Furist identity is also obvious in the excerpt below:

Background

The man becomes angry as a result of his wife's un-submissive and mendacious character. He perceives the woman's un-submissiveness as a threat to his face and his dignity as a man, which eventually elicits anger that is punctuated with abusive words, accentuations, and an attempt to beat up his wife. The man, through his anger, offers several proofs or evidences to support his claim, but in excessive anger.

Excerpt 2

1. H: Ẹ kà á, judgement wà ní bẸ (0.2)
2PL read it, judgement is there
Read the court ruling (0.2)
- 2 Ẹ ní kó fún yín kẸ
2PL tell should give you should
tell her to give you the court ruling
3. Ẹ kà á
you read it
you can read it
4. M: Ẹ ní sùúrù:::, Ẹ Ẹ rí i:
2PL have patient 2PL Fut see it

4. Be patient::: you see=
 5. H: =Awɛn ɛmɛ wɛn wà níbɛ (.)
 PL child 3PL be there(.)
 the children issue is stated there
 wɛn ní kí n máa fún un eyi kekere ní one thousand five
 losu
 3PL say should ASP TSN give Prep this small it one thousand five
 monthly
 I was told to be given the youngest one thousand five naira monthly
 6. pé mo free láti lɛ kó àwɛn ɛmɛ wɛn níbɛ
 that 1SG free to go take PL child their there
 that I'm free to take the children
 pé èmi ni mo lɛmɛ []
 that 1SLFoc 1SL have+child
 because the children belong to me
 7. M: ɛ ní sùúrù:::
 2PL have patient:::
 Be patient
 8. àní ɛ ní sùúrù:::
 just 2PL have patient:::
 You have to be patient
 9. H: ɛ ka judgement::: yɛn =
 2PL read judgment::: that
 Read that court::: ruling =
 10. M: ɛ wò ó sir, ɛ ní sùúrù:::
 2PL look it sir, 2PL
 You have to be patient
 11. ɛ ní sùúrù
 2PL have patient
 Sir, be patient:::
 17. H: excuse sir [xxxx]
 18. M: ɛ ní sùúrù:::
 2PL have patient
 Be patient:::
 19. H: ɛe lóbɛ sí àdúgbò bá yí

- EMP Foc+ entre 1SG Prep neighbourhood this
 She moved into the neighbourhood
 20. ládùúgbò tí mo ní gbé
 in+neighbourhood that 1SL Asp leave
 where I was leaving
 21. tó ní gbogbo ɛyin ará àdúgbò,<
 that+2PL said all you people neighbourhood
 shouting in the neighbourhood
 22. Pastor, yí ohun tó fi ríran ohun tó fi ríran agbára òkùnkùn ni ní lò>:=
 Pastor this, something that+3SL use see power darkness Foc Ø Asp use
 that <I am using diabolical power in my ministry>=
 23. M: ah ah [ah:::!]
 24. W: Emi (0.3) kǐ í se mi ABC=
 I neg Asp do me ABC
 Myself? (0.3) Not I at all=
 25. H: Abí kò fɛ dǎa fún ɛ ni, mo rò pé ayé ní ɛe [ɛ:::
]
 Q neg want good for you foc, 1SG think that world Asp do you
 26. Should you be unfortunate? I think you are under a spell
 (he stood up in anger to beat up his wife)
 27. M: H! Ha! ɛ jókòó
 H! Ha! 2PL sit
 Sit down
 28. H: xxxx
 29. M: ɛ jókòó:::, ɛ jókòó, ɛ jókòó::: []=
 2PL sit 2PL sit 2PL sit
 > Sit down, take your seat, take your sit<
 30. H: ɛ má jɛ ká fa ɛrɛ lɛ síbikan [mɛ]
 2PL NEG let COMP+2PL drag word to anywhere at all
 Don't let us drag this issue
 31. M: ɛ ní sùúrù:::
 2PL have patient
 Be patient:::
 32. H: ɛ gbɛ bóɛe bá mi sɛrɛ lɛɛkan
 2PL hear COMP+2SL 1SG talk the other time
 Look at the way she was talking to me the other time

Furist identity, expressed as excessive anger, is evident at different points and in different ways throughout the interaction. The interaction opens with a sense of dissatisfaction about the woman taking custody of the children despite the court ruling that favours the man. The woman's court disobedience implicitly infuriates the man, as his explanation from lines 1 to 14 shows. Despite repeated intervening cues from the mediator in lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 14 and 15, the man holds on to the floor and uses it to explain the woman's attitude, which he is not pleased with. The level of dissatisfaction that indexes his identity is evident in the accentuation of the man's voice in lines 5 to 9, which implies that he is not happy with his wife's decision to keep the children in her custody.

Similarly, in line 19, furist identity is also explicitly expressed, as the man recounts his experience and how she had disgraced him and alleged that he had used diabolical means in his pastoral calling. This situation places the man in a vulnerable emotional position, given his perceived position in society, which he considers a threat to his face (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The man, in lines 19 to 23, evokes his previous experience of annoyance to reveal what he had suffered, a situation he attributed to his wife's unruly behaviour, which indirectly positions his wife as a stubborn person, and uses the avenue to express his displeasure. The allegation is vehemently opposed by the wife in line 24, though not without the man's visible display of anger, both in the use of abusive and profane utterances in lines 25 and 26, and his attempt to beat up the woman. The woman's disagreement with the man's claims and her sudden interruption in line 24 portray the man as a liar, which annoys him. Seeing that his wife opposes the claim of defamation, the man, in an outburst of profanity in lines 25 and 26, registers his displeasure, coupled with the physiognomy of standing to beat his wife, which shows the magnitude of his anger, which invariably foregrounds furist identity. It should be noted that, in a conflictive discourse such as this, disagreement, complaint, and interruption are intrinsically face-threatening tactics (Brown and Levinson, 1987:65-67). In a bid to defend a cause, participants' faces are threatened, and this usually engenders anger, as is evident in the interaction.

The mediator's response to the man's action in line 31 also portrays an unpleasantly angry situation on the man's part. The man's anger is propelled by

his wife's opposition to the allegation of defamation and by the interruption in line 24, as he references it in lines 34 and 37. This manner of interruption and the way he interprets her responses are construed as an act of insubordination by the woman, which provokes anger in the man.

Pugilist Identity

Pugilist identity in this study captures not only the act of fighting but also the use of abusive words, which is an expected discourse cue in any conflictive discourse. In the context of the study, pugilist identity captures the displayed fighting behaviour of interactants, whether in action or in reaction to a particular a priori or emergent event or situation. This form of identity manifested in the form of bellicosity and obstreperousness.

a. Bellicosity

Bellicosity is a manifestation of pugilist identity that depicts an incessant fighting attitude. It covers someone who is aggressively hostile and quarrelsome. This kind of identity arises from hot-temperedness on the part of the wife or the husband, which eventually leads to a fight due to an unsupportive attitude on the part of either the husband or the wife. It is usually punctuated when the parties involved are both known to be heady, arrogant, and temperamental, as is obvious in excerpt 3.

Background

In this encounter, the mediator condemns the woman's fighting attitude, which he establishes through an enquiry proposition delivered via rhetorical interrogation/examination, though the attitude is propelled by hot-temperedness, as perceived by speaker D.

Excerpt 3

1. A: Mama XYZ
2. you fight with your husband?●
3. D: The two of them
4. we have to work on them
5. A: You fight with your husband.
6. It doesn't pay, when a woman fights her husband●=
7. D: =Please Sir, can I come in sir?●

8. A: Fight ...
 9. D: >He is temperamental and she also(0.3)<
 10.D: I noticed so
 11. E: Both of them []
 12. B: that is why I stop it
 13. that we should go our separate ways

Speaker A (henceforth, the mediator) opens this interaction with the use of rhetorical examination based on his a priori information about the combatant attitude of the woman, which could be attributed to her temperamental nature. This un-faulted sequence throughout the interaction establishes their identity and elucidates the reason for their separation, as expressed in line 9. Speaker D's sequence 'the two of them we have to work on them' in lines 3 and 4 not only confirms the woman's act of fighting but also reveals the temperamental status of both the man and his wife. Noticing that his initial proposition, presented through rhetorical examination, is not faulted, the mediator further constructs the pugilist identity through the same strategy in his intervention, but ends the sequence with the admonishing and chastising expression, 'it doesn't pay, when a woman fights her husband'. The admonishing expression stems from the cultural patriarchal ideology that a woman is expected to submit to the man in any situation, and anything of this sort is against the culture. It is an action perceived to be an abomination which may have consequences, and this idea informs the response, 'it does not pay when a woman fights with her husband'. In this sequence, the mediator speaks from the voice of culture, which he believes the woman also shares, to buttress his assertion. In line 4, Speaker D uses an appealing strategy to gain the floor, a move that reveals the asymmetric power display in the interaction, a feature that usually characterizes legal discourse. The appeal strategy shows that the mediator is the boss, controlling the flow of the interaction. The lexical use of 'Sir' foregrounds the asymmetric power display in the interactional engagement. However, speaker D's observation in lines 6 and 7 shows that both the woman and the man share the constructed identity. The identity constructed provides insight into the reason for their separation, as the husband discursively confirms it in lines 12 and 13.

b. Obstreperousness

This type of identity arises as a consequence of the wife's ungovernable, unruly,

and deviant attitude in the matrimonial home. This unruly attitude is usually interpreted as a negotiation of men's masculinity and a threat to their faces, which usually results in a serious fight with the wife as exemplified in the excerpt below:

Background

The man in the interaction explains his wife's uncontrollable nature as the main reason behind their incessant fight. The wife had earlier reported the man to the clinic for his irresponsible act after their divorce.

Excerpt 4

1. Because when she packed out (0.2) my family had to meet that
2. *mi ò gbẸdẸ ní nẸkan sẸ pẸlú Ẹ mẸ(.) kí*
 I SG neg should have anything do with her again
 I should not have anything to do with her
3. *ki n má se nẸkankan pẸlú Ẹ*
 Should ASP neg do anything with her
 I should not have anything to do with her
4. *Eléyí náà wa lára wẸn nígbà yẸn*
 This Det be part 3PL when then
 This person is one of them that time
5. *mo se mú un dání.(0.3)*
 I SG do take it hold
 That is the reason I came with him (0.3)
6. *So, a sá à settle() a n jo gbé.*
 So, 3PL EmpADV settle() 3PL ASP together leave.
 We then settle the issue. We were leaving together
7. *Gbígbe tá n jẸ gbé náà ìjà tún bẸrẸ, the same problem*
 Leaving that ASP together leave Det fight again start
 Our leaving together was fraught with incessant fighting.
8. *A lẸ gba ibikan*
 3PL go take somewhere
 We rented an apartment
9. *Ẹ lẸrun rán mí lẸwẸ, mo locate àwẸn ibikan*
 God help me hand, I SG locate PL somewhere
 With God's help, I located some places
10. *A gba flat*

- 3PL take flat
We rented a flat
11. a kó lẹ́ ibẹ́, picture ilé yẹ́n ni.
3PL park go there, Picture house that
We moved into the apartment. This is the picture of the house.
12. Lágbájá and Tàmẹ̀dò (.) ẹ̀mẹ́ táa bí nígbà yẹ́n àbúrò rẹ́=
Lagbaja and Tamedo (.) child COM+3PL birth when then younger
you=
13. This is Lágbájá and Tàmẹ̀dò his younger one.
14. C: This is their picture.
15. the third child was then in the pregnancy stage.
16. That is Lágbájá, Tàmẹ̀dò and she.
17. This is the house we rented that time, she is also a witness.
18. So nítorí gbogbo nẹ́kan yẹ́n wà nínú ìtàn. >
So because all something that be inside history >
All these are going into history
19. so ìyà n jẹ́ wá nígbà yẹ́n o:::<<
so sufferring eating us then o <<
we are sufferring at that time
20. wàhálà yẹ́n sàà pẹ́, a tún kúrò níbẹ́ with the same problem.
Problem that Adv many 3PL Adv leave there
the problem was just too much, we left the place
21. A ní látí kó wá sí ẹ̀bẹ́dí (0.2) ìgbà táa tún kó
kúrò ní ẹ̀bẹ́dí
3PL have Prep pack come Prep Ebedi (0.2) when Comp+3PL Adv
pack leave Prep Edebi
22. yẹ́n (.) ìjà ní a tún fin kúrò
Det (.) fight Foc 3PL Adv use pack leave
23. níbẹ́. Igbà tá a kúrò ní ẹ̀bẹ́dí yẹ́n ni a se birthday fún Lágbájá.
there. When Comp +3PL leave Prep Edebi that Foc 3PL do birthday
Prep Lagbaja
24. We relocated and left ẹ̀bẹ́dí as a result of our fight. It was when we left
ẹ̀bẹ́dí
25. that we celebrated Lágbájá birthday.
26. Àwẹ́n church yẹ́n ni. Nígbà tá a kó dé ẹ̀bẹ́dí, Lágbájá was four,
Tàmẹ̀dò was two years

- Those church Det said when Comp+3PL pack arrive Ebedi Lagbaja
was four. Tamedo was two years
27. nígbà yẹ́n. ìgbà tí wàhálà yíi ò sàà stop, ba xxx, sé ẹ́ rí
àwò? n pastor yíi they
time Det. When Comp suffering Det Neg Adv stop, xxx Q 2PL see
pastor det, they
28. are still alive, ìjà ní a fí túká kúrò ní church yíi <Ijà
gidi gan-an ni o>,
are still alive, fight Foc 3PL use sepearte leave Perp church Det <fight
serious Adv Foc o>
29. tí a n lè kò mẹ́ra wa ní àdúgbò gan-an::: =
Comp 3PL Asp throw stone at+body 2PL Perp neighbourhood Adv
30. When we were in ẹ̀bẹ́dí (0.2) Samuel was four years old, Iyanu was two
years old.
31. We left the church we were attending consequent to our fighting; those
pastors are
32. still alive. It was a serious fight a fight that we were stoning each other
=.
33. A: kílóde?
Q+Foc+3SG+arrive=
34. Why?=
35. C: Ah! Kò ní gbẹ́ ni:::, kò ní gbẹ́ ni::: nígbà tó bá ẹ́::: mää lù ú,
mää lù ú::: gidi
Ah Neg Foc hear Adv Neg Foc hear Adv when Comp+3SG Adv Asp
beat 3SG Adv
Adv
36. gan- an ni oo.
37. Igbà tó dé stage kan (.) a ní látí kúrò ní àdúgbò yẹ́n lẹ́
When Comp+3SG get stage certain (.) 3PL Foc Prep leave Perp
neighbourhood Det go
38. sí IITA... Ijà ní a fí kúrò
Perp IITA. Fight Foc 2PL use depart
39. níbẹ́ yẹ́n. Ojẹ́ tí mää kúrò, bag asẹ́ ní mo mú kúrò
níbẹ́..èpè ní n
Prep+ there Det. Day Copm Fut leave, bag cloth Foc 1SG take deaprt
there curse Foc Asp

40. sẸ́ fún mí bí mo se ń lẹ́: àlẹ́ rámi rámi là árí...
èpè yẸ́n sǐ jà
do Perp 1SG Comp 1SG do Asp go going forever Foc+3PL Fut+see
curse Det Adv fight
41. mí fún odidi Ẹ́dún mẸ́ta.
1SG Prep three years
42. Ah! She won't listen to me (0.2) she won't listen. It usually got to the
stage that I
43. would beat her seriously. > We relocated from that area to XYZ but we
left XYZ.
44. because of our fight. <The day I will leave XZY (0.2) she was cursing
me
45. seriously and I battled those curses for three years.

The interaction provides insights through speaker H's (henceforth man or husband) explanation of their unavoidable relocation of the family from one environment to another due to their combative attitude. The interaction is a kind of monologue, with little use of clarifying questions by the mediator, as the man uses his turn to affectively and experientially elucidate his act of fighting, which he attributes to his wife's unruly behaviour. The words 'fight', 'curse', 'stoning', 'relocate' and 'problem' are variously and contextually used in the interaction to index the pugilist identity. Lines 1 to 7 of the interaction suggest a separated family and the man's effort to locate and reconcile with his family after his wife had packed out of her matrimonial home, despite his family's disapproval of such action. In lines 6, 7 and 20, the man expresses the pugilist identity in the interaction even after their reconciliation in lines 6 and 7 in the sequence: 'We settled the issue. We were leaving together. Our leaving together was fraught with incessant fighting'. This implies, on the one hand, that the act of fighting is both exhibited by the man and his wife, and on the other hand, their separation was consequent upon the same attitude. The fighting attitude led them to leave the environment where they were living for another place he had located. Still, they left the new place for yet another environment due to their incessant fights. The man, in lines 11, 12, and 13, provides pictorial evidence to support his explanation and, for reference, details the different places they have relocated to due to their pugilist character. The sequence 'This

is their picture, the third child was then in the pregnancy stage. That is Lagbaja, Tamedo and She.' 'This is the house we rented that time; she was also a witness' shows that their union is blessed with two children, with a third on the way; nevertheless, this does not quell their fights. The increment 'she was also a witness' implies that she not only bears witness to their domestic migration but also to the expressed pugilist identity, which is constructed through both experiential and evidential sentiments.

In the same manner, the increment 'We were suffering as at that time...' and the accelerated way of saying it not only provides insight into the sacrifices they both made for the marriage to work, but also into the family's economic status, which the man rapidly adds for information's sake. This means that they should have channelled their energy into fighting against poverty rather than fighting each other. Also, the elongation of the time indicates the intensity of the suffering. The increment is rapidly provided as a token to be noted about the family before switching to relocation due to their fighting. The attitude not only results in a change of abode but also in a change of place of worship.

Pugilist identity is also articulated in the sequence: 'It was a serious fight, a fight that we were stoning each other'. This means that both the man and his wife jointly express the identity. The extent of the fight between the two informs the mediator's use of the enquiry strategy in lines 32 and 33, in line with the interactional expectation of probing into the possible cause(s) of the conflict. The man's affiliative response in lines 34 and 38 presents un-submissiveness, stubbornness, and difficulty controlling the wife as reasons for the fight. The affiliative sequence is said with affirmation and emphasis, and this shows that the man is operating from his patriarchal orientation, which he perceives his wife questions through her stubbornness. This stubborn, out-of-control attitude is construed as a negotiation of his masculinity that he is not ready to accept. The increment sequence: 'It usually got to the stage that I would beat her seriously', in lines 38 and 39, shows an unmarked situation when a man and a woman are fighting, especially in Africa. The sequence in lines 39 and 40 indicates the relocation to another place of abode as a result of the expressed identity.

Recalcitrant Identity

The recalcitrant identity concerns the exhibited character of unwillingness to obey orders or authority. Interactants construct or are cast into a recalcitrant identity when they determine, without reservation to anybody, to do what they want, and are very unwilling to change their position or mind. This form of identity is constructed when an interactant is obstinately defiant, adamant in their way(s), and determined not to change their mind about something. It usually manifests in the form of a displayed obdurate and rigid attitude as exemplified below:

a.Obduracy

Obduracy is a manifestation of the recalcitrant identity that is characterized by an extreme determination not to change one's opinion about something or a stubborn resistance to an issue despite persuasion. This form of recalcitrant identity is usually induced by the maltreatment suffered by wives in their marital homes, as it happens in this study. The excerpt below elucidates this identity:

Background

This is an interaction between a separated husband and his wife. Through past events, the wife was able to establish her unwillingness to settle the squabble with her husband, despite her family members' vigorous attempts. Her recalcitrant attitude is evident when the mediator attempts to verify the truthfulness of her actions.

Excerpt 5

1. W: I'm not the one stopping him from being around his children =
2. M: =Ehu, but you packed out of the matrimonial home=
3. W: =I packed out. He drove,...we (.) daddy ABC told me him (.) that e::: wà lEdE

2PL be Prep+ stay

4. I should stay
5. mummy BBB tEkàn wEn á fi balE
Copm+heart 3pl Fut Adv settle
6. with Mummy BBB till he will calm down []
7. M: E hùn-ùn, sEkàn wo? n ò dE tí i balE ni?

8. Ehmm, has he not clam down till now?
9. W: Nígba Ekàn wEn ò bá balE
10. When he didn't calm down
11. [how many years? Nígba tEkàn, nígbà tEkàn wEn ò dE balE]
12. for how long? When he didn't calm down
13. My uncle and brother came to settle the issue, I told him vividly I told them
14. mo ní mi ò (.) Ee E rémi, èmi ò mí ò... let me just go and rest... pé E tE settle E báyi []
15. I said, as for me, I need to take a rest, that you want to settle it
16. M: <Your brother (0.2) your uncle>
17. W: [BEE ni my immediate brother]
YES
18. B: >They came to settle the matter and you told them<]
19. H: >Ask him, ask him, ask him of what she said <
20. >[I didn't deny anything it, I didn't deny it]<
21. H: [She ignored them] =
22. M: Huhhm
(the mediator; sighed)
23. H: E mE nEkan tó EE now
24. do you know what happened? []
25. M: E ní sùúrù.
26. Be patient
27. H: NíjE yEn, EjE yEn, EjE yEn, Ee E understand?
That day, do you understand
28. M: [E ní sùúrù, E máa sErE] (0.1)
Be patient, you will talk
29. W: Nígba () I told them, I told them, I told them vividly wí pé èmi ò for
30. now (.02) let me just, let one just, they want to ... they want to come and beg him me.
30. I told them that as for me for now, let me just, let me just,
31. M: Madam, madam, madam agídí kò sèyàn níre.
32. Madam, madam, madam stubbornness has a negative consequence

The interaction above opens with an insight into the domestic conflict between the man and his wife, which results in a partial separation between the husband

and the wife, with the children in the wife's custody. The response of speaker M (the mediator), in line 2, though irrelevant to speaker W's (the woman) initial sequence in line 1, shows shared knowledge of the situation, which the woman also orients to and triggers her response in line 3. The flouting of the maxim of relevance implies a domestic conflict between the man and his wife, which results in a partial separation between the man and the woman. The affiliative response through the violation of the maxim of quantity 'I packed out, he drove, we daddy ABC told me, that e saa wa lodo mummy Lagbaja token won o fibale' (I packed out! Daady ABC that told me to stay with mummy Lagbaja till he calms down), on the one hand, implies that the conflict does not degenerate to a divorce state but a partial separation. On the other hand, it shows a reminiscence of the crisis's longevity and the woman's family's attempts to settle, which she vehemently opposes. The mediator's inquiry interactive strategy in line 7 exhumes the longevity of the conflict and the efforts of people around them to settle the dispute, which the woman opposes. The vehement opposition to the settlement through emphatic assertion enacts a recalcitrant identity. The mediator's use of the inquiry interactive style of discourse in lines 16 and 18 to establish the woman's assertion, and her self-commitment to it in line 13, further foregrounds the recalcitrant identity. The woman's insertion sequence in line 17 provides insights into the personalities of the people she ignored when they came for settlement. The mediator's use of backchannel 'hummm' enriches the portrayal of the woman's unyielding attitude. The woman further constructs a recalcitrant identity in an explicit, unyielding manner through an asseveration as obvious in the response: 'I DIDN'T DENY IT. I DIDN'T DENY IT'. The emphasis on the affiliative response in lines 13-15 further foregrounds the extent of her recalcitrance.

b. Rigidity

Rigidity is another form of recalcitrant identity. It is an unyielding or unbending opinion or decision despite several appeals. It also covers a state of not compromising one's stand on the decision made. This manifestation of recalcitrant identity occurs as a result of the perceived unfair attitude or bias of the mediator in the course of dispute resolution as obvious in the excerpt below:

Background

After listening to the allegations and counter-allegations from both parties, the

woman comments, and the mediator draws conclusions that do not go well with the man. Despite the pastor's effort to persuade him, the man refuses. This makes the mediator rebuke him for his recalcitrant attitude.

Excerpt 6

1. H: Sir, can I make a comment? =
2. M: = Yes =
3. H: = You listened to her (0.2) you didn't even ask if I have anything say =.
4. M: Okay =
5. H: You are only making your submission =
6. P: Sorry sir, =
7. H: But I don't have anything to say, sir (0.2) I'm sorry sir, I have decided (0.2) I'm not saying anything sir. =
8. P: Wait =
9. H: Sir, sorry sir =
10. P: Wait =
11. H: I'm not going to say anything (0.2) but I have seen (.) you are just seeing lapses. =
12. P: It's alright =
13. H: Yes sir (0.2) I'm not saying anything sir (.) It is another platform side thing.
14. P: Listen and listen well sir []
15. M: Èé È rí i sà (0.20) let him not listen. Let him not do what? The Bible
Q 2PL see 3SG sir (0,20) let him not listen. Let him not do what? The Bible
16. You see sir, let him not listen. Let him not do what? The Bible
16. says, by their fruits we shall know them. Let him not listen
17. Ah! The first time tá a kÈkÈ máa ní conversation, níjÈ tí wÈn wá
Ah! The first time Comp+1PL Adv Asp have conversation, prep+day Comp 3pl come
kó àwÈn ÈmÈ
pack PL child
18. The first time we had conversation (0.2) the day they came to pack the children

19. I could deduce certain things from you (0.2) even though, I did not meet you in person.
20. Nípa ÈrÈ (0.3) that is truth. God is my witness, mi o, Perp+effort word (0.3) that is truth. God is my witness, 1SG Neg
21. Through your utterances (0.3) that is the truth. God is my witness
22. Kò sÈni mo mÈ rí nínú yín
Neg be+person 1sg know Adv prep 2pl
I didn't know anyone among you
23. P: Uhn!
24. M: Tà a bá a sÈ wí pé, I'm from OyÈ state, mi ò wá láti Ogun state. Mi ò
Comp+1pl neg Adv say say, I'm from Oyo State, 1sg neg come prep Ogun state. 1sg neg
tan pÈlú Ogun state, on a more serious note.
related prep Ogun state on a more serious note.
25. That will be going to say, I'm from OyÈ state, I'm not from Ogun state and I'm not related to Ogun State on a more serious note(.)
26. Nígba tí ó kó... well, she spoke... Dr XYZ, oun ló sÈrÈ arábinrin
Prep+time Comp +3Sg pack well, she spoke Dr XYZ 3SG Foc
3sg+talk lady
27. yíi fún mi. (0.3)
this Pres ISP
28. That time, it was Dr XYZ that told me about this woman. (0.3)
29. When they came, they did not meet me. But, XYZ kan call mi ní, ah, nn? kan
When they came, they did not meet me. But, XYZ Adv call 1sg Foc, ah, something
30. tó sÈlÈ, tó sÈlÈ ní yíi o.
Comp+1SG happen Comp+1sg happen be Det o
31. XYZ call me and explain their situation to me
32. "Okay, let her come to the clinic."> How my number got to her, honestly, I didn't
33. know<. Dr. XYZ must have given my number to her. She called me through

34. the number when they encountered problem with him.
35. But (.) I'm sorry to say níÈ Yorùbá (0.2) ÈmÈ Yorùbá ní mí.
ÈmÈ Yorùbá dÈ
But (.) I'm sorry to say Pres+land Yoruba(0.2) child Yoruba Foc 1SG.
Child Yoruba Adv
36. ni wá, tóò bá tiÈ respect wife e
Foc 1PL comp+3sg Neg Adv respect wife 2SL
37. But (.) I'm sorry to say (.) we are all Yoruba and in Yoruba land (0.2) if you don't have
38. respect for your wife, you will have for your in-laws not because of today, because of
39. tomorrow.(0.3)
40. AwÈn nnkan wà tó se péyàn mÈ n se tó máa ni
PL something be Comp+1sg do Comp+people Foc do Comp+1sg Asp have
41. there are some certain things that one will do that will have repercussion, far reaching
42. repercussion. You were still insisting on phone that you won't allow them in.

This interaction opens with a request for the floor by the man in line 1. This indicates the asymmetric nature of the interaction and power play which is not novel in any legal discourse, including law clinics where disputes are interactively resolved. The sequence means the mediator controls both the flow and turns of the interaction. The word "Sir" in the sequence indicates recognition of the mediator's power as the one in charge. This is a situation the mediator is also aware of, as he yields the floor to him in the affiliative token "Yes" in line 2. When the man gets the floor to speak, he expresses his dissatisfaction in line 3 about being denied the opportunity to present his side of the event before the mediator begins drawing his submissions on the issue. The man considers the situation unfair to him and, as such, resolves not to say anything further about the issue under discussion, despite his pastor's pleas in lines 6, 8, 9, and 10—the man's blatant refusal to talk indexes recalcitrant identity. The optimal level of obstinacy is seen in his assertion, with emphasis, in the sequence "But I don't have anything to say, sir, I'm sorry sir. I have decided I'm not saying anything sir" in line 7, which

he repeats with emphasis in lines 11 and 13.

Part of the sequence witnesses the speech act of informing of a lack of what to say, which he, however, cancels immediately in the same sequence through the speech act of insisting, expressed through the performative verb "decided". The sequence "I have decided I'm not saying anything, sir" is said with emphasis and an accentuated voice. It is an emphatic declaration made in such a manner that, irrespective of the magnitude of the appeal, he is not ready to change his stance. His displayed recalcitrant attitude prompts the mediator to disclose his prior encounter with the man in a phone conversation in lines 18 and 19, which further foregrounds his recalcitrant self. The mediator, in line 15, hijacks the floor of the interaction through a self-select turn-taking strategy to exert his power over the interaction, and he subtly and implicitly portrays the man as an obstinate person, which he foregrounds through biblical allusion in the sequence, "the Bible says by their fruits you shall know them". The mediator shifts from the voice of the law to that of religion to express his recalcitrant attitude. He supports his claim about the man's recalcitrant identity, in lines 18-30, though, through a violation of the maxim of quantity, as he, with affective, accentuated emphasis, elucidates how he gets involved in their case in lines 18 to 20. He debunks the implicit allegation of taking sides with the woman, as perceived by the man, by citing his state of origin and the woman's state of origin.

In lines 30 and 31, the sequence "Dr XYZ must have given my number to her. She called me through the number when they encountered problems with him" provides prior evidence of the stubborn attitude in the earlier attempt by Dr XYZ to resolve the dispute. The sequence "when they encountered problems with him" indicates the man's recalcitrant attitude displayed in their previous settlement process, which forestalled resolution. In the same manner, the mediator, speaking from the voice of a culture that the man also orients to, corrects the man's displayed dishonouring attitude towards his in-law. He effectively and systematically illuminates and expresses his recalcitrant identity in his explanation of his a priori encounter with a man in a phone conversation, in lines 39 and 40. The sequence "you are still insisting you will not allow them in" shows the level of the man's recalcitrant attitude before coming to the law clinic for resolution.

Conclusion

I have demonstrated in the foregoing that emotional identity, which manifested in the form of furist, recalcitrant, and pugilist identities, is discursively and contextually constructed by participants in adjudicative encounters through various pragmatic strategies. Furist identity manifested as excessive anger, pugilist identity was divided into bellicosity and obstreperousness, while recalcitrant identity manifested as obduracy and rigidity.

With theoretical tools designed to unearth events within and outside conversation, I have demonstrated how excessive anger was created through evocation of evidential sentiment, evocation of experiential reality and construction of profanity; bellicosity form of pugilist identity was generated through construction of an enquiry proposition; and how obstreperousness form of pugilist identity was constructed through evocation of experiential reality and evocation of evidential sentiment. Similarly, I have shown how the obdurate form of recalcitrant identity was constructed through the construction of asseveration; and how the rigid form was constructed through biblical allusion and the evocation of evidential sentiment. My analysis has not only shown that emotional language is a marker of identity but also revealed that emotional language is situational and contextually determined, which in turn produces different manifestations of identity. Similarly, exploring emotional identity in adjudicative encounters has further foregrounded the dynamic and discursive nature of identity (He 1995; Halford and Leonard 2006; Hall 2007; Schnur and Zayts 2012) and has also revealed that identity in interaction is both an emergent and an a priori phenomenon.

Transcription Notation

- [] indicating overlap
- ... omission/elipsis
- (.) indicating a brief pause
- (0.2) indicating elapsed time in tenth of seconds
- Xxx indicating inaudibility
- < > talk said more slowly than surrounding
- > < tal said more quickly than surrounding talk

- @ laughter
- ::: prolongation
- ●● high or low pitch
- WORD (upper case) loud sound relative to the surrounding talk
- =no break or gap
- -- indicating a short or untimed interval without talk
- ___ indicating emphasis
- Bold font indicates emphasis.

References

- Adebiyi, B. O. (2014). A Comparative critical appraisal of ADR as a strategy for effective dispute resolution in Nigeria and select jurisdictions: seminar paper. Faculty of Law: University of Ibadan.
- Ajiboye, S (2018) A pragmatic investigation of identity, justice and ideology in University law clinics in South-Western Nigeria. A Thesis in the Department of English Submitted to the Faculty of Arts for the Degree of Philosophy of the University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Ajiboye, S (2021). Construction of Gender Identity in Alternative Dispute Resolution. In: Niyi Osunbade, Foluke Unuabonah, Ayo Osisanwo, Akin Adetunji & Funke Oni (Eds), *Pragmatics, Discourse and Society: A Festschrift for Akin Odebunmi*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publishing pp. 90–109.
- Ajiboye, S. (2024). 'Poisonous caterpillar fire should not burn a person twice': Cultural orientations in Nigerian alternative dispute resolution encounters. *Discourse Studies*, 27(1): 3-25.
- Ajiboye, S. (2025). "We are in African society, women normally soft-pedal": Cultural orientations in the construction of justice in Nigerian adjudicative discourses. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 22(4), 687–713
- Akindele, F and Adegbite, W. (2005) *The sociology and politics of English: an introduction*. Ile-ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press
- Allori, P. E. (2010). *Context as Indicator of Genre Identity: Key Concepts in Sports-Related Arbitral Awards. Discourse, Identities and Roles in Specialized Communication*. Givilianan Garzuna and James Achibald Eds. Berlin: Peter Lang
- Bajcic, M (2010). "Challenges of Translating EU Terminology" In (Eds) Maurizio Gotti & Christopher Williams, *Legal discourse across languages and cultures*, Berlin: Peter Lang, 52-75
- Bamberg, M. (1994). Language, concepts and emotions: the role of language in the construction of emotions. *Language Science* 19 (4), 309-340
- Bogoch, B. (1999). Courtroom discourse and the gendered construction of

- professional identity. *Law and Society Inquiry*. 24,2:329-375
- Brown, Penelope, Levinson, Stephen, 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Chaemsaihong, K. (2019) Deconstructing competing courtroom narratives: representation of social actors, *Social Semiotics*, 29:2, 240-260
- Chen, Xia. 2017. On pragmatic identity construction of prosecutors in criminal courtroom discourse. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*. 124,1040-1044
- Coulmas, F. (2005). *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Coulmas, F. (Ed.). (1997). *The handbook of sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in Narrative, A Study of Immigrant Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing.
- Eckert, P. and Rickford, J. R. 2001. *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, D. (1999). Emotion discourse. *Culture & Psychology*, 5(3), 271–29
- Foolen, A (2012). *The relevance of emotion for language and linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Gotti, Maurizio & Williams, Christopher (eds) (2010) *Legal discourse across languages and cultures*, Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Gumperz, J. J. (2006). Interactional sociolinguistics. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. 5: 724–729
- Halford, S., & Leonard, P. (2006). *Negotiating gendered identities at work: Place, space and time*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Haugen, E. (1996). Dialect, language and nation. *American Anthropologist*. 68(4) 922-93
- He, Agnes. 1995. 'Co-constructing institutional identities: the case of student counselees. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28. (2), 213 – 231.
- Holmes, J. (2005). Power and Discourse at Work: Is Gender Relevant?. In: Lazar, M.M. (eds). *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Holmes, J. (2006). *Gendered talk at work: constructing gender identity through workplace discourse*. Malden MA: Blackwell
<https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedfiles/parce/cmc/Conflict%20Resolution%20NK.pdf>.
- Hudson, R.A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*, 13–31. John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Katz, N. & McNulty, K. (1994). "Conflict Resolution.

- https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/docs/default-source/ektron-files/conflict-resolution-neil-katz-and-kevin-mcnulty.pdf?sfvrsn=4de5d71e_9
- Lindquist, K. A., Satpute, A. B., & Gendron, M. (2015). Does language do more than communicate emotion? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(2), 99–108.
- Locher, M. A., and Graham, S. L. (2010). *Introduction to interpersonal pragmatics*. Locher, M. and Graham, S. Eds. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 1-13.
- Maclean, R. (2010). First-year law students' construction of professional identity through writing. *Discourse Studies* 12,2:174-194.
- Maryns, K. (2013). Disclosure and (re-)performance of gender-based evidence in an interpreter-mediated asylum interview. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 17(5), 661-686.
- Mazzi, D. (2010). The centrality of counterfactual conditionals in House of Lords and US Supreme Court judgments. *Discourse across languages and cultures*. Maurizio, G. Ed. Berlin: Peter Lang. 17:202-263.
- Michael, H., Kádár, D., & Mills, S. (2013). "Interpersonal pragmatics: Issues and debates" *Journal of Pragmatics*, 58: 1-11.
- Oddiri, E. (2004). Alternative dispute resolution. *Proceedings of the Annual Delegate Conference of Nigeria Bar Association*.
- Odebunmi, A (2012). "The baby dey chuk chuk": Language and emotion in patient-doctor interaction". *Pragmatics & Society*. 3(1) 120-147. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Preite, C. and Cacchiani, S.(2010). "Law Dictionaries across Languages: Different Structures, Different Relations between Communities of Practice?" In (Eds) Maurizio Gotti & Christopher Williams, *Legal discourse across languages and cultures*, Berlin: Peter Lang. 110-131.
- Sala, M. (2010). Interrogative forms as professional identity markers in legal research articles. *Discourse, Identities and Roles in Specialized Communication*. Giviliana Garzuna and James Archibald Eds. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Whittaker, S and Roald, J. (2010). "Verbalization in French and Norwegian Legislative Texts: A Contrastive Case Study". In (Eds) Maurizio Gotti & Christopher Williams, *Legal discourse across languages and cultures*, Berlin: Peter Lang. 76-95
- Zhu, L. (2016). Language, emotion and metapragmatics" a theory based typological and evidence. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*. 4(2)119-134.