RESEARCH ARTICLE

European Journal of Language and Culture Studies
www.ej-lang.org

A Sociolinguistic Explorative Study of Interactional Discourse in Dagbani and Ewe

Iddrisu A. Sibdow, Sampson L. K. Yekple, Florence Dorleku,
and Mohammed A.-R. Immorrow

ABSTRACT

This study explores greetings among the Dagbamba of Northern Ghana and the Ewe of Southern Volta, Ghana. The work investigates the time-of-day greetings as the sociocultural interactional functions and value of the people. The research is a qualitative type, which uses ethnography as its design. The primary data was solicited from information from observation, interviews, and participation in events in the research communities. Secondary data has been solicited from existing literature. Researchers participated in daily routines with the people in the research communities in Xavi Traditional Area and Tolon in Dagbon state. The data was descriptively analyzed. It was discovered that greetings in the two languages are culturally categorized with reference to the time of day, interlocutors, and specific events or occurrences. We demonstrate that the types of greetings associated to the Dagbani and the Ewe culture are important as they demarcate timelines and the phenomenal periods, in which these greetings must be cast. Apart from the time-of-day greetings, we demonstrate some referential greetings that are applicable in the languages in relation to specific events. It was further confirmed that greetings among the people encode politeness strategies fostering unity and healthy cohesion. The greetings are categorized as informal and formal or ceremonial. The investigations also reveal that there are social factors such as modernization and religious practices that contribute to changes in greetings, hence influencing society.

Keywords: communicative phenomenon, education, greeting, interlocutor, time.

Published Online: November 18, 2022

ISSN: 2796-0064

DOI: 10.24018/ejlang.2022.1.6.41

I. A. Sibdow
Department of Languages, Tamale College of Education, Ghana.
(e-mail iasibdow@gmail.com)
S. L. K. Yekple*
Department of Languages, St. Teresa's College of Education, Ghana.
(e-mail: syekple@gmail.com)
F. Dorleku
Department of Languages, St. Teresa's College of Education, Ghana.
(e-mail: fdorleku@gmail.com)
M. A.-R. Immorrow
Department of Languages, Tamale College of Education, Ghana.
(e-mail: coach8740@gmail.com)

Corresponding Author

I. Introduction

In this paper, we examine greetings in the Dagbon and Avenor speech communities as a means of communicative strategy for promoting social relationships. The dynamics of communicative strategies that may promote good relations is the focus of the work. These dynamics may include verbal and non-verbal speech acts. The speech acts in greetings that have the social value and functions of demonstrating polite behavior and solidarity includes sighting, attention calling, handshake, and waving of the hand. Others are removal of hat/sandals, squatting, kneeling, clapping, snapping of fingers, ringing bicycle bell, tooting car and motor bike horn and salute. In this work, we demonstrate how this manifest in the type of greetings in Dagbon and Avenor.

We see greeting as a speech act that constitutes a universal communicative phenomenon among humans. A communicative tool that serves to open relations and close-up ties to mark the beginning of a conversation between two parties or groups of people. This, when done well, bridges the long existing gap between aggrieved parties. Dzameshie (2002, p. 381) explains that every human being has some relationship with some other human beings. The relationship may be cordial or strained, intimate or distant, ephemeral or enduring etc. He maintains that to keep the relationship warm, cordial, intimate or enduring; there are certain social courtesies that people must extend to each other; these are opposite civilities that serve to oil social relationships. One such important relation building socio-cultural civility among the Dagbamba of Northern Ghana and the Avenor people of Volta Ghana, is greeting. Though greetings seem to be a universal sociolinguistic behavior, it is argued by some scholars to have cultural and language specific dimensions. This work investigates an essential aspect of the communicative competence in Dagbani and Ewe speakers. Quite often, in investigating spoken interaction, researchers focus attention on the creative aspect of verbal behavior to the neglect of linguistic routine, which are part of what Canale (1983) calls sociolinguistic competence. This competence is crucial to someone who is learning greetings and responses in culturally appropriate ways (Hymes, 1968).

Greetings and acts of greeting as a communicative element of language in different speech communities are worthy of study. Greetings constitute a good example of what has been described *phatic communion* in

which the mere use of words seems to create or enhance ties of social union (Malinowski 1972). Greetings has attracted the attention of various scholars in the fields of pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and anthropological studies. They consider greetings as universal (but with cross-cultural variations) sociolinguistic behavior that serves important sociological functions (Firth, 1972; Goody, 1972; Naden, 1980; Brown, 1980; Coulmas, 1981; Egblewogbe,1990; Ameka, 1991; Coupland *et al*., 1992; Yahya-Othman, 1995). More specifically, pragmaticians perceive greetings as a means of creating or promoting social relationships: they may be used either in maintaining social ties or in making an initial contact with someone whom one intends to engage in a longer social interaction with. Thus, while these scholars appreciate the routine nature of greetings as phatic communion, they also recognize the important social functions they perform (Ameka, 1991). Nantogmah (2010) examined signaling politeness, power, and solidarity through terms of address in Dagbon. Mohammed (2010) investigated address terms in Dagbani. Salifu (2011) examined speaking with the chief and in politics. These works failed to describe holistically other types of greetings among the Dagbamba. Dagbon as a society has a system of greetings; these greetings have not been systematically investigated as to the strategies employed by the Dagbamba in casting each of the greetings to show communicative competence, a gap requiring scholarly attention. This study aims to investigate the socio-cultural values of greetings to the Dagbamba and the Avenor Ewe. It also intends to find out the cultural significance of greetings. It would further examine how greetings inform communicative competence. This work intends to achieve the following objectives:

1) To investigate the socio-cultural values of greetings to the Dagbamba and Ewe.
2) To categorize Dagbamba and Ewe greetings according to time and event.

A. Theoretical Framework

The study adopts ethnography of speaking propounded by Hymes (1962). The theory assumes that the natural way of sharing knowledge, maintaining social status with roles or social relationships is communication of an ethnic group. The ethnography of speaking is concerned with describing ways of speaking, as they construct and reflect the social life within particular speech communities. Its focus is on the observed patterns of speaking, the symbols and meanings, premises and rules applied to speaking within a given speech community. Attention to the connection between language use and social context in that early work became a starting point for development of the enterprise within a network of scholars from (Hymes 1962, 1972, 1974) has been its programmatic impetus. Before that time, established approaches to linguistic description took the phonology and grammar of a language as the principal framers of reference, an approach which privileged attention to linguistic signs within a closed linguistic A Fundamental premise of the ethnography of speaking is that societies differ as to what communicative resources are available to their members in terms of languages, dialects, registers, routines, genre, and artistic formulae and so forth. They also differ in how these resources are patterned in use, in the work done and through speech and other communicative means, and in the evaluation of speaking as an instrument of social actions. The initial formulation of the ethnography of speaking (Hymes, 1962) included a framework for describing the particularities of ways of speaking in diverse speech communities. It was designed, to provide an emic-etic framework: a contextual format for discovering, describing, and comparing cross-cultural cases and specific cultural realization of communication. We adopt Hymes's (1972) framework of the mnemonic device acronym SPEAKING for this study.

S→(Situation, setting, and scene); this distinguishes between the physical locale and the type of activity.

P→(Participant: speaker/sender, addresser, hearer/receiver/audience, addressee); these terms are related to participant.

E→(Ends: outcomes, goals); this embraces the function and results.

A→(Act sequence: message form and message content); this has to do with the content and form of speech.

K→(Key); This involves tone, mood, or manner, which distinguishes among serious facetious, formal, sarcastic and so on.

I→(Instrumentalities channels, forms of speech); this include (verbal, non-verbal, face-to-face, written) and "code" (the language and/or variety used).

N→(Norms: of interaction and of interpretation); this is about the basic rules that underlie the interaction.

G→(Genres). This is about any one of the speeches acts, greetings, leave-taking, lecture, joke.

From this perspective, we will propose that in ethnography of speaking, speech acts and their meanings are to be discovered in their particular speech communities The researchers contends that this theory will be relevant to ascertain the comparability of cultural speech acts of greetings in Dagbani and Ewe. Brown and Levin

European Journal of Language and Culture Studies
www.ej-lang.org

II. Literature Review

A. The Concept of Greetings

Greetings have attracted the scholarly attention in the study of pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and anthropology where greeting is considered a universal and sociolinguistic behavior with cross-cultural variations that serve important sociological functions (Goody, 1972; Naden, 1980; Brown, 1980; Coulmas, 1981, Egblewogbe, 1990; Ameka, 1991; Coupland *et al*., 1992; Yahya-Othman, 1995). Greetings constitute a good example of what has been described as *phatic communion* in which the mere use of language seems to create and enhance ties of social union (Malinowski, 1972). Thus, while these schools appreciate the routine nature of greeting as phatic communion, they also recognize the important social functions they perform, (Dzameshie, 1992).

One important social function of greetings identified in the literature is the mark of politeness. From this perspective, Lim (1988) sees greetings as a ritualized exchange that communicates politeness by way of encoding social approval. Following Lim (1988) we propose that greetings be seen as an important communicative strategy for polite behavior in social encounters among the Dagbamba and Ewe. They may be considered one way of fulfilling the general obligation to save each other's face (Brown & Levin, 1987; Lim, 1988). Dzameshie (1992, 1993, 1995), proposed that the social significance of using politeness strategies may be viewed from a broader perspective. As a goal-oriented actor, a speaker may use politeness strategies as an expression of his/her desire to present an acceptable persona in order to achieve his/her discourse goal. Positive politeness strategies like greetings serve as oral linguistic strategies for promoting good social relationships. Following the discussions, greetings in African societies and among the Dagbamba and Ewe culture in particular, greeting is considered an indicator of good behavior in society. Sakyi-Baidoo and Korateng (2008) investigated how far the English general greetings as used in the Ghanaian context reflect an attempt to nativize the English Language. Looking at the use of these greetings in formal as well as informal contexts, they assert that whereas there are attempts at the formal level to maintain the structure, use and interpretation of Standard English (hereafter SE) general greetings, there is a remarkable nativization of these greetings at the informal level in structure, use and pragmatics. The situation is recognized to be enhanced by the creation of new greetings and response in English society. In this context, Dagbani greetings maintain their structure, pragmatic meaning, and cultural communicative value. In the same discussion, Sakyi-Baidoo & Koranteng (2008) refers to temporal greetings as those generally used to mark the three main demarcations of the day as morning, afternoon, and the evening. Dzameshie (2002) however address same greetings as time-of-day greetings explaining that they are generally enquiries which answers *how are-you*? In an earlier attempt, Sekyi-Baidoo and Koranteng (2008) refers greetings relating to time zones of the day as valedictory greetings. Akindele (2007) also describes valedictory greetings as *ways of parting or leave-taking strategies*.

Warren-Rothlin (2007) discussed politeness strategies in Biblical Hebrew and West African languages. He posited that most languages have a wide variety of strategies for communicating politeness; however, these are always highly culture-specific and relate closely to broader cultural norms that affect their application. He discussed focus strategies and indirect strategies of which focus strategies include the use of greetings, modal particles, and various forms of participant reference. Typical initial greetings may take the form of wishes or blessings in Biblical Hebrew but questions in West African languages reserving wishes and blessings for leave-taking.

Indirect strategies may be employed in the form of euphemisms or indirect speech acts, the most common form of which in Biblical Hebrew is the rhetorical question, which may have a range of pragmatically defined functions though the forms may differ from those of West African languages.

Warren-Rothlin (2007, p. 56-57) investigated (hbo) and (Is-wa) in Biblical Hebrew and West African languages and argues that greetings may include interjections, explicit, performatives, imperatives, statements, and polar and content questions relating to health. They may be modified by reference to time of day or the addressee's current activity and accompanied by a range of gestures and forms of gift giving. The (Is-wa) cited below is from Ghana Birifor.

> *Agoo!* (Arriving at a house) Anyone in?
> *Yaan yaan! - yaan lɛ* (welcoming) Hello! Hello!
> *Grrr! -lɛ lɛ lɛ!* (Starting a folk story)
> *Adābia o! - puorfo lɛ!* fear (ie, why have you come)
> *N puor fʊ naa! N soo naa!* I greet you-I respond!
> *Yi soo wɛ!- si soo naa!* Respond! We respond!
> *ŋmina ta yɛ!* The sun has reached you!

We argue in this work that, similar to politeness strategies in Biblical Hebrew and West African languages, in the Dagbaŋ and Ewe culture, it is a cultural and moral norm that one must seek permission of

entry into a house. The term for requesting permission verbally or non- verbally is *gaafara* "excuse" the response is *iin garima* (yes come in, permission is granted) for Dagbamba. The equivalence is *Agoo* (request for permission of entry) and *Amee* (grant of permission of entry). This is sometimes extended *Agoo nenɔ afi ma ame age ɖe eme* (Let the request of entry be outside so that the requester can enter). This is more traditional. To affirm this further, the host says this; *A maraaba / Ni a paabu na!* This means you are welcome! The following are some informal ways of attention getters among the Dagbamba of the Northern region; *nuhini kpahibu* "clapping of hands," *hu! /huu! /hoo!* "a shout," whistling, a hit/knock of a hoe or a cutlass at a tree, stone or any hard surface to create/make noise. These acts are always used exclusively in the bush or dark places where it is always difficult to locate one another.

There is a religious perspective that one can use as an attention getter to a premise. *Asalaamu aleikum* and *wa aleikum salaam* or *aleikum salaam* though are religiously standard greetings and response respectively, they are used as attention getters. When this is said and the response is given, it allows the visitor to gain entry to the said premises with ease.

Gaafara / nuhini kpahibu (both means excuse)
Gaafara verbal
Nuhini kpahibu non-verbal (means a handclap)

Ironically, the traditional people recognize these religious greetings and responses as permission requisition and permission granting respectively.

Upon saying the *asalaamu aleikum* and *aleikum salaam* the locals will still cast the normal greetings because it is a borrowed term, and its meaning is still not well comprehended.

Mohammed (2010, p. 11) argues that certain linguistic choices a speaker makes indicates the social relationship that exists between him or her and the listener(s). He further proposes that languages vary considerably in their forms of address. He wrote on the *Tu/Vous* distinction, which is used by languages such as French *Tu/Vous*, Latin *Tu/Vos*, Russian *Ty/Vy*, Italian *Tu/Lei*, and German *Esi/Esis. Tu* is singular "you" and *Vous* is plural "you." The powerful addresses the less powerful with *Tu* and receives *Vous* in return. What is more crucial in Wardhaugh's work to the present study is the description of the various address terms he referred to. Wardhaugh concludes that out of all address forms, title alone (T) is the least intimate form of address, mostly used to designate ranks or occupations devoid of *personal* content. He enumerated the social factors that govern our choice of terms as the particular occasion, the social status or rank of the other, sex, family relations, occupational hierarchy, transactional status (a service or doctor-patient relationship), race (ethnic group) and degree of intimacy. Some general factors that determine the choice of any address term as argued by Wardhaugh have bearing in Dagbani and Ewe greetings. In addition, in this study, the relative age of the interlocutors in any communicative event is a major factor in the choice of an address term in Dagbani.

There is a bulk of research, which investigates the importance of speech act of greeting and its rituals in different cultures. Firth (1972) proposes that greetings are rituals, which consist of verbal and non-verbal forms. Verbal forms may be one of three linguistic units: question (How do you do?), interjection (Hello) or affirmation (Good morning). Laver (1981) proposed that greeting exchanges have three components: formulaic phrase address forms, and phatic communion. Laver (1981) views greeting exchanges as a whole as routine rituals, which serve to preserve, face. Ibrahim *et al.* (1976) researched into greetings in northern African communities, Dzameshie (2002), Ameka (1991), Egblewogbe (1990) studied Ewe greetings. Akindele (2007) studied Sesotho greetings pointing out that greetings are extremely important strategies for the negotiation and control of social identity and social relationships. Emery (2000) investigated the phenomenon of greeting, congratulating, and commiserating in Omani Arabic. He holds that greetings are used to establish identity and affirm solidarity. Greetings comprise of an indispensable phase on the direction to interpersonal access where information is sought and shared. For Akindele (2007) the various forms of greetings are extremely important strategies for the negotiation and control of social identity and social relationships between participants in a conversation. There are three kinds of greetings: temporal greetings which Dzameshie (2002) calls *Time-of-day* greetings; Inquiries about health, which he calls "How-are-you greetings"; and the valedictory greetings, which Akindele (2007) refers to "Ways of Parting/Leave-taking." Earlier researchers including Searle see greetings as semantically or propositionally empty and frozen or formulaic routine items.

B. The Social Functions of Greetings

Greetings and acts of greeting constitute an important element in the sociocultural communicative set up of a speech community. To enhance good social life within a speech community, this communicative instrument must be used more competently to drive home its positive effects. Therefore, the functions of greetings cannot be underscored in any sociocultural speech community.

Akindele (2007, p. 2) explains greetings to constitute an integral part of the Basotho etiquette which imposes on each member an obligation on how to conduct oneself in a particular way toward others. Greeting is informed by rules of conduct and is an inevitable part of everyday conversation. It regularizes patterns of reciprocal behavior among group members. It facilitates predictability and stability in interpersonal relationships. In effect, it minimizes negative feelings or general misunderstanding among members of a speech community. We shall later argue that among the Dagbamba and Ewe that, greeting is considered an aid to peaceful social relations because it is very much a part of the daily experience of the social group members. It functions, among others, to keep up good open communication among the members of the sociolinguistic community; bringing a sense of pride to the society and keeps unity among them (Geertz, 1972). It helps to establish a healthy rapport or comfort with another person; to recognize his/her presence and to show friendliness. Thus, in every context or situation, greetings are expected: when a person enters a house; he/she is expected to greet people in the house; on the street people are expected to greet each other. Traditionally, one is expected to greet everyone who is met in the street. One does not greet only the people one knows but any member of society.

The trend is, however, changing in modern times, especially in urban areas where people are only concerned about those who are close to them. This is a result of the contact with western culture. In the Dagbamba and Ewe culture, greetings is a demonstration of appreciation of another person, good relations among members and it also shows concern about the well-being of the people, as if to say *you are your brother/sister's keeper* (Akindele, 2007, p. 2). The Dagomba think it extremely rude not to greet as found similarly in the Ewe culture. It means that you do not see them; you are not acknowledging their dignity and humanity. In addition, if you cannot see the person next to you, why should they see you?

In an African context, interpersonal intimacy is achieved not through the elimination of social conventions but through the effective integration of as many social formalities as possible. With greetings, at least two lines of exchange, and indeed a bond is formed in the interim. Linguistic routines are determined by the formality of the setting, the nature of the relationship between the participants, social variables, and their communicative goals. Linguistic routines are therefore context bound and socio-culturally oriented. To be able to combine the verbal and social messages effectively, one must know and understand the rules of ethnographic communication (Agyekum, 2010, p. 79). Another important social function of greetings identifiable in the literature is that of encoding politeness. From this perspective, Lim (1988) sees greeting as a ritualized exchange that communicates politeness by way of encoding social approval. In her study on Swahili greetings, Yahya-Othman (1995, p. 211) also perceives greetings as a manifestation of polite behaviour Following Lim (1998) and Yahya-Othman (1995), we propose that greeting must be recognized as an important magnetic communication strategy for polite behavior in social encounters. It is magnetic because it is a social communicative tool which when applied or used appropriately brings the interlocutors closer or permits social interaction. It is important to observe that no matter how a person is engaged, an appropriate greeting draws his/her attention. It should be considered that greetings are one way of fulfilling the general obligation to save each other's face (Lim, 1988). Similar conclusions would be made for the social importance of greetings in the socio-cultural and linguistic communities of the Ewe and Dagbamba.

As suggested by Duranti (1997, p. 63) there is growing evidence that greeting is an important part of the communicative competence necessary for being a member of any speech community. They are often one of the first verbal routines learned by children and certainly one of the first topics introduced in foreign language classes. They are also of great interest to analysts of social interaction, who see them as establishing the conditions for encounters. It is not surprising, then, to find out that there are a considerable number of ethological, linguistic, sociological, and ethnographic studies of greetings.

Duranti (1992, p. 658) says anthropologists and sociolinguists interested in everyday interaction have tended to discuss greetings not only in terms of their contexts of use but also in terms of their functions. In a similar vein, Firth (1972, p. 1) sees greetings as the sociocultural acceptance of an encounter with another person. For him, the primary function of greetings is the social acceptance of the other person as a social entity, personal element in a common social situation (Firth, 1972, p. 2).

Greetings provide a way of showing that a relationship is still what it was at the termination of the previous co-participation, and typical, that this relationship involves sufficient suppression of hostility for the participants temporarily to drop the guards and talk. Goody (1972) stresses the importance of greetings in starting a social exchange and identifying the participants- their frequent role in defining rank would explain their complexity in stratified societies like the Gonja and their simplicity in egalitarian societies like the LoDagaa. She also focused on another important dimension, the role that greetings have in the exploitation of status differentiation for personal gain.

C. Politeness/Polite Behavior

Fraser (1990) identifies four major conceptions of politeness: a) The social norm, b) The conversational maxim, c) The face-saving and d) The conversational- contract views. Fraser further contends that acting politely is virtually the same as using language appropriately and referred to this aspect of linguistic activity

as *deference*. Greetings fall within the social norm and the conversational-contract views for it is a social obligation for a person to greet. Similarly, an Akan speaker who employs greetings as pre-sequence in any social interaction is judged communicatively competent and aware of the social contract view of politeness. This person is presented as a cultured person and is thus highly respected. The most common form of politeness formulae in most languages and societies are involved with greetings because greetings are part of the positive politeness that foster sociocultural relationship and solidarity (Dzameshie, 2002).

Agyekum (2008, p. 493) argues that greetings are one of the most frequent linguistic interactional routines among the Akan **s** of Ghana. He investigated the functions, situations, and the major forms of Akan greetings. He explains the functions of greetings such as the creation of social relationship, commitment to one another in social encounters and manifestation of an individual's communicative competence. In addition, he examined the taxonomy of Akan greetings in terms of simple and complex, formality, periods, events, and activities and above all greetings in modern Akan society. Greetings are expressive speech acts performed in relation to the socio-cultural norms of the society where the performative verb *kyea* ("greet") triggers a sequence of interactional performance, both verbal and non-verbal that convey social meanings. Greetings are part of Akan norms of interaction that are conventionalized, predictable, communally owned, and shared commutative daily activities that use certain linguistic items and performances in reutilized encounters. The manifestation of greetings according to Agyekum (2008, p. 495) suggests a phenomenon that has been described by conversational analysts such as turn taking, adjacency pair format, pre-sequences, overlapping and repair. Akan greetings are used as ritualized pre-sequences that come before the actual message in a lot of communicative interactions. They serve as signals, attention getter and preparatory grounds for the possible openings of conversations, discussions, and public speeches. It is also noted that the use of interpersonal verbal routines such as greetings and thanks is examined as a universal phenomenon of human languages. However, the way the routines are employed and structured may differ from language to language, but their functions may be identical. Agyekum (2010, p. 78) examined the sociolinguistics of thanking in Akan. He addressed the language of thanking in Akan under expressive speech acts and linguistic routines. He presented ethnographic situations and communicative events for thanking which included: (1) Thanking after childbirth; (2) Thanking in joyful occasions: marriage and wedding; survival from accidents, achievements, promotions, bequeathing of properties, (3) Funeral activities, (4) Thanking after arbitration, (5) Ironical thanking (indirect thanking), and (6) Thanking at the shrine. In his analysis, he considered sociocultural functions and the current state of thanking in Akan society. He further noted that linguistic routines refer to the sequential organizations beyond the sentence as either activities of one person or the interaction of two or more. These include gestures, paralinguistic features, topics, and rituals in everyday interaction. He posited that, among the Akan**,** the most outstanding ones are *greetings, apology, request, gratitude/thanking,* and the *recounting of one's mission* because they are encountered daily. These are very important aspects of the Akan that the society expects members to perform with the highest degree of communicative competence. They form part of the children's upbringing and socialization. Every child must be conversant with these linguistic routines and those who observe them in communicative interactions are communicatively competent, or vice versa. Communicative activities are carried out daily in a speech community and the activities involve certain linguistic items accompanied by performance. These routines fall under performatives and speech acts and are performed in relation to the socio-cultural norms and networks of society. The linguistic routines are communally owned and predictable, and interlocutors are expected to follow certain accepted societal and cultural formulaic and conventions.

Greetings are the basic oil of social relations that set the tone and establish the relationship between the interlocutors. It may show the affirmation of equality as in most American societies. It also enacts social inequalities in highly elaborated formal greetings and rituals as seen among the Akan, Ewe, Ga of Ghana, the Wolof of Senegal, the Yoruba of Nigeria, Sesothos of South Africa, etc. (Akindele, 2007; Dzameshie, 2002; Egblewogbe, 1990). Generally, greetings give a cue that the interlocutor is another fellow who needs to be recognized and this depicts politeness in social settings. Each social group has its own set of rules about who should be greeted: who should greet first and what is an appropriate greeting and the form it should take. Greetings have an adjacency pair that indicates commonality; mutuality and reciprocity among the interlocutors (Duranti, 1997; 1992). Adukpo *et al.* (2019) however explains that in the culture of greeting among the Ewe, there are no rigid constraints to who should greet first, but the visitor must initiate the act of greeting. Greetings are used to establish social contact among interlocutors. In most languages, greetings are considered as rituals that are able to appease and bond people together and it has the potential of creating harmony and a peaceful atmosphere during face-to-face encounters. Refusal to greet a member of a society who expects to be greeted implies a sour and cold relationship between the parties and a marker of impolite behavior. The discussion above contributes to the common aspect of greetings in languages and conform to the six principles outlined by Duranti (1992). Similar functions of greetings among the Ewe of southern Ghana have received scholarly attention (Dzameshie, 2002; Adukpo *et al*., 2019). Dzameshie (2002, p. 384) considered Ewe greetings as a normative sociocultural requirement and stated therefore that

greetings when offered preserve the face of the individuals involved in social contact and offers a gesture of good-will toward one another. Finnegan also discussed greetings as a kind of social commitment, acknowledgement, expression of common humanity and an essential social obligation among the Limba people of Sierra Leone. We see greetings as indispensable in social interaction and as part of positive expression of politeness in interactional routines.

D. The Ewe Perspective of Greetings

Ameka (2010, pp. 127-128), examines access rituals in West African communities and that, one can think of access rituals as verbal and nonverbal communicative acts that mark boundaries at the beginning and closing phases of social interaction. He shows that greetings and farewells are parts of, rather than being, the conventional openings and closings of social interactions. In some cultural linguistic groups in West Africa, greetings involve genuine questions that have to be answered. The complexity of openings and closings everywhere depends on several factors, including the period of absence, the status and age of participants and importantly, the type of encounter and associated sociocultural conventions. He, therefore, outlined different types of encounters that may occur between interlocutors in West Africa. Ameka, however, described a particular type of encounter, a social visit drawing out its constitutive factors and elucidating the linguistic routines that may be used in such situations. He focused on a variety of conventional opening acts for negotiating interaction, arguing that "greetings" are but a subcomponent of openings. He further argues that the enactment of well-being inquiries is an avenue for displaying cultural values such as inclusiveness and harmony in West African communities, and further posits that expectations about the questions vary cross-culturally. He finally alluded to changes due to cultural contact and the norms associated with greeting behavior in West Africa and concluded by reflecting on the relationship between access routines and ritual communication (Ameka, 2010, pp. 128-129).

Openings and closings are phases in interaction in which mutual access is negotiated, and they are made up of several act sequences. He further demonstrates that though the boundaries of social encounters are marked through ritual communicative acts, these ritual acts do not have just social (e.g., acknowledgment) and phatic functions. Notwithstanding, the expectations, norms of interaction, cultural ideologies, and values with respect to access rituals and modes of interpreting them in culture characterized greetings.

Dzameshie (2002, pp. 381-385) investigates the forms, function, and social value of greetings among the Ewe and points out that, though scholars appreciate the routine nature of greetings as phatic communion, they also recognized the important social function they perform. He intends to answer certain questions as; what social functions do greetings perform among the Ewe? What types are proffered in Ewe society? What are their pragmatic meanings? What factors influence the types of greetings proffered and how are they offered? And finally, what sociolinguistic rules govern greetings and their performance? He argues that greetings must be seen as an important communicative strategy for polite behavior in social encounters. They may be considered one way of fulfilling the general obligation to save each other's face. He further argues that a speaker may employ a politeness strategy as a powerful sociolinguistic gesture to reinforce an existing relationship or to establish a new one. For instance, positive politeness strategies serve as communicative strategies for promoting good social relationships. This is possible because these strategies, among other things, encode social approval, appreciation or otherwise between the encountering parties. In African societies in general and in Ewe culture in particular, greeting is considered "a mark of proper behavior" (Dzameshie, 2002, p. 183). In the Ewe culture, greeting is such an expected sociolinguistic behavior that failing to greet when the social situation calls for it is seen as a serious social transgression. He again argues that withholding greeting is judged as impolite because the potential recipient feels slighted for having been ignored. The withholder stands the risk of receiving negative social labels such as *dzimakpla* (uncultured), *dadala* or *mínuwɔla* (a proud person) etc. Also, it is deemed a sign of hostility or enmity- the potential recipient may suspect the withholder or refusal to respond to greeting of harboring some malice towards him/her.

Dzameshie (2002, p. 385) explains that in Ewe society, the length of greetings, their content, and the spirit in which they are offered are all influenced by certain social factors. One such factor is the social value attached to interpersonal relationships. For instance, while friends, close acquaintances or relations normally receive long extended types of greetings, strangers often receive the short forms. Thus, longer greetings encode solidarity and warm, cordial relationships. Other factors that influence greeting are the length of time the interlocutors last met as well as the age of the interlocutors. Dzameshie (200, p. 403) argues that there are certain social norms that direct interactants to use greetings in sociocultural appropriate ways. It may be assumed that these norms are, in fact, social enactments of underlying sociocultural rules or principles that may be considered part of the communicative competence of members of Ewe society.

Egblewogbe (1990, p. 8) investigates the social and psychological aspects of greeting among the Ewe of West Africa. He discusses the various types of greetings used by the Ewe of West Africa and some of the social and psychological factors which influence their use. He argues that greetings and conversations have been recognized as being among socially relevant linguistic categories. They are among the principal types

of sentences and usages we employ in our various social roles. Learning to greet and to converse, therefore, forms part of the socialization process. Through the period of our growth, we are progressively incorporated into our social organization, and the chief condition and means of their incorporation is learning to say what the other fellow expects us to say under the given circumstances. Egblewogbe suggested that knowing the appropriate form of greeting and being able to do it well is, therefore, not only required of every member in society, but is considered a mark of good breeding. He proposes that greeting among the Ewe is thus regarded as a responsibility and a right. It serves to identify the individual with his group and acts as an avenue for expressing solidarity and love as well as showing respect and deference to superiors. He argues that greetings can easily betray ill-feeling and hatred among parties. Refusal to greet a person or respond to his greetings can be hurtful apart from showing that something is amiss. Although the expressions used in these greetings are conventional and almost stereotypic in form and content, they nevertheless have social, cultural, and psychological implications. The people's fears and aspirations, their attitudes to others and to various life situations, concern for one another in society, aspects of social structure as well as sociocultural values are significantly reflected in the greetings. Refusal to greet and greet properly may be interpreted as denial of social recognition, which may cause offence and possibly lead to more serious consequences (Egblewogbe, 1990, p. 17). Following Egblewogbe's discussion, we argue that the Dagbamba use similar greeting terms as the Ewe, which this work set to investigate.

The earlier discussions observed that greetings are ritually used to solidarize with peers or show deference to higher ups on the social ladder, in a cultural milieu. They posit that greetings and exchanges at times of meeting and leave-taking utilize asymmetric salutations to show respect to, and index the status of interlocutors, while symmetric ones aim at showing solidarity between interlocutors. They further argued that the choice of code depends on the occasion, participants, and the nature of the subject under the discourse. They established that greetings are ritualized verbal sessions where people react with each other and show deference to higher ups on the social ladder. The established protocols are observed during these interactions. They observed that, even if visitors are among the audience as observers (and not active participants), every attempt will be made to make them feel at home, hence the jocular atmosphere in which some of the interaction took place. The greetings, as has been observed, serve to remind all participants that they share a certain space and time, a shared cultural identity.

In conventional western discourse, greetings will follow a pattern nearly like what has been discussed, where everyone would like to feel recognized and appreciated. Saying "hi" or "good morning" is a good way to open a discourse, just as "adieu" or "goodbye" can be a coda to an interaction. However, whereas a subordinate may ask a superior, *"How are you?"* in western society it will be most imprudent to do it in African societies.

Mohammed (2010, pp. 88-94), investigates address terms in Dagbani within the purview of sociolinguistics. He identifies and classifies the various categories of address terms in Dagbani. He argues that the types of choices made by speakers when they address interlocutors are determined by the relationship that exists between them. This relationship is social in nature. They include age, social status, and kinship. He also examines the insight into the speakers' perception of the address terms in Dagbani. He further examines the importance of a name to include identification, solidarity, politeness, prosperity, and prestige. He maintains that address terms, which are derogatory, undermines personality and is usually rejected in Dagbani. He further explains that address terms in Dagbani are adaptive to the changing and growing society of the people of Dagbon. The observations made in Abdulai and Ibrahim (2014, pp. 224-236) and Mohammed (2010, pp. 88-94) facilitate the discussion in the current work.

Nantogma (2010, p. 274) investigates signaling politeness, power, and solidarity through terms of address in Dagbani. He categorizes the key linguistic components in Dagbani address forms: kinship terms, names, and titles and discussed the social and cultural values attached to each. He examined the different ways in which these elements are blended not only for identifying the addressee or referent, but also for communicating other social meanings and attitudes like politeness, power, and solidarity. The proposal Nantogmah (2010, p. 290) makes is that addressing a person with an appropriate address term that befits his or her age or status is one of the norms of speech that makes interaction between speakers acceptable. He observes that it signals the speaker's attitude towards the addressee and defines the relationship that speaker perceives to exist between him or her and the addressee. He argues that concerns for face and the need to build and maintain valued social relations including power and solidarity in face-to-face interactions compel the Dagbamba to use culturally valued linguistic elements like kin terms and titles when addressing or referring to others. He observes that the address forms discussed are generally predictable for people who know one another very well or whose statuses are clearly defined by their age or position. He adds that in situations where these variables are not so clearly defined the choices available to speakers are varied and unpredictable and depend on the speaker's attitude towards the addressee or his or her view of the situation. He posits that the only well-defined relationship that produces unpredictable address forms is the husband-wife relationship. As noted above, a husband in the Dagbamba society has a higher status than his wife, so a wife cannot address her husband by name alone. However, there is no clearly defined term for a

wife to use to address husband. Different women use different terms and the term or terms used by a woman to a man may change over time as they transition from mere acquaintances through the courting stage, to a married couple without children, and to a stage when they have children. At each of these stages, a woman may have a different term to address the man, and different circumstances in their relationship may require different terms of address. For instance, a woman may address her husband with one term and refer to him in the presence of others as 'my child's/children's father'. Following the discussions of Mohammed (2010, pp. 88-94) and Nantogmah (2010, pp. 274-290) on address terms, I find it crucial in this work. This will provide some important information for the successful execution of this work.

III. Methodology

This is qualitative research. Ethnography design has been adopted with observation, interview, and participatory approach as data collection instrument. Data for this work is collected from two sources: the primary and secondary sources. The primary data has been solicited from information from observation, interview, and participation in events in the research communities. Secondary data has been solicited from existing literature. The study took place in the Xavi Traditional Area in Akatsi South District of the Volta Region and the Tolon-Kumbungu district in Dagbon state in Northern region of Ghana. Native speaker availability in the communities is the justification for the selection of the research field. The researchers stayed in the communities for one and half months and participated in daily routines that require greetings. The researchers observed community members perform greetings relating to various seasons and events. They also participated in some of the events and performed the appropriate greetings. The greetings collected have been classified into daily time zones, seasons or events, funerary greetings, birth delivery greetings. They interacted with the people in their social and occupational practices. A chief and a queen mother from each of the two research fields confirmed the applicability of the greetings collected. Native speaker intuitive was used to validate the data.

IV. Results and Findings

We present the results and the findings of greetings from Dagbon and Ewe cultural perspectives. In the discussion, we present analysis of the time-of-day greetings and some referential greetings in accordance with Dell Hymes (1962) theory of SPEAK as highlighted focusing on conversation and pragmatics analysis of speech.

Following this, we define greeting as an interactional discourse organized around at least two participants. One of these participants initiates the interaction and the other responds and these two successive utterances form the basis of verbal interaction, which we refer to as an exchange. It is marked by initiating (I) the move or utterance which predicts a response (R), but the predicted move or utterance does not set up any expectation of a precise response, though a voluntary move can occur following it (Akindele 1990).

A. Routine Greetings

Routine greetings are commonly known in many cultures as greetings that are performed according to time of the day. Among the Dagbamba, greetings are classified according to three-time demarcations of the day as *asiba* (morning), *wuntaŋni* (afternoon), *zaawuni /yuŋ* (evening/night). These demarcations are similar to the English time- of- day as morning, afternoon/midday and evening. As the English have alternative demarcations for afternoon/midday, the Dagbamba also have an alternative demarcation for evening as *zaawuni/yuŋ* which may demand greeting of a sort. However, the time demarcations of the time-of-day greetings in Dagbon do not generally follow the specific demarcations of the day as supposed. The time associations of these greetings are only assumed by the local people as they observe the weather conditions of the day. Whereas the greeting *Dasiba* (Good morning), is known to start from the earliest part of the day, the people may extend it beyond the specific time for greeting good morning because the weather may influence their perception. *Antire* (Good afternoon) and *Aninwula* (Good evening) are also not very specific to time demarcations by the traditional people. It is only the few educated people who are sometimes time specific and greet according to the time demarcation of the day. The *antire* is seen to have low patronage. The speech community is usually actively engaged on their farms in the afternoon.

It is wealthy of note in Dagbon culture that, the response for the greetings in Dagbani are influenced by gender. While the male response is *Naa!,* the female response is *Nnaa!*. This is just probably one of the differences in language caused by gender. Another form of response that is unanimous for male and female is *alaafeei*, *which* is adopted from Hausa and Arabic. The restriction in the response depends on the type of inquiry but not by age or status. There are only specific greetings for the time of the day, but the response

is the same irrespective of the time, the only difference is gender in the response. Investigations have shown that children under the age of eighteen also respond to *N naa!* as the female.

From the Ewe data, there are notably four demarcations of time of the day. There are *ŋdime* (morning), *ŋdɔme* (afternoon), Ɣetrɔme (late afternoon) and *fiẽ/fianyi* (evening). These times inform the choice of an appropriate greeting form as *Ŋdi* (Good morning), *Ŋdɔ* (Good afternoon), *Wɔale* (Good late afternoon*) and *Fiẽ/Fianyi* (Good evening). (*The *late afternoon* seems to be specific to only Ewe languages and culture). The practice of performing the form of routine greetings is a whole process determined by the age, social status, and gender of the interlocutors in the greeting event among Avenɔ Ewe. In the Ewe greeting event, there is a practice of household inquiry between the interlocutors. The greeters take turns to do this inquiry. The beauty of the performance among the Ewe is that as soon as the greeter opens the event, the person who is being greeted change's role quickly to do the household inquiry as though he/she is the greeter. When this responder completes the household enquiry, there is a switch of role, and the greeter then does the household inquiry as determined by the interlocutors' age and social status. In presenting the examples of performance of greeting, we will use (GR) for greeting and (RS) for response.

Illustration 1: performs the short form of the routine greeting in Ewe. The performance is same for all times:

GR: Ŋdi na wò/mi (Good morning to you)
RS: Ŋdi. A*ƒ*ewò me tɔwo? (Good morning. How are your household?)
GR: Wodɔ.
RS: Miefɔ/dɔ nyuiea?
GR: Míedɔ/fɔ

The greeting can end here but may be extended depending on the age of the interlocutors. The older the participants in the performance of the greeting the longer the process. If for instance two elderly men met and have to greet, each person would have to take turns to enquire of the health status of almost all the various households in the village they separately come from as demonstrated in Illustration 2.

This can be prolonged if one of the participants might have returned from a journey. For a male greeting a female, the female may not go as far as the male may hence reducing the length of the performance. This long process of performing greetings is associated only with time-of-day greetings among in the Ewe culture.

Illustration 2: *Extended form of Avenɔ Ewe greeting.*

GR: Ŋdi na wò/mi (Good morning to you)
RS: Ŋdi goo. A*ƒ*enyeme? (My household?)
GR: Wodɔ (They are fine)
RS: A*ƒ*ea me tɔwo? (How is your household?)
GR: Wodɔ (They are fine)
RS: Ame tsitsiawo? (How are the elders?)
GR Woli (They are fine)
RS Ðeviawo? (How are the children?)
GR Wodɔ (They are fine)
RS Fiahawo (The kingmakers?)
GR Woli (They are fine)
RS Agbledzitɔwo (How are those on the farm?)
GR Wodɔ (They are fine)
RS Miedɔ nyuiea? (How are you all?)
GR Míedɔ (We are fine)

It is at this juncture; the GR is also given the forum to do the household enquiry on the RS following same process. This greeting can be prolonged than this demonstration depending on the social status of the interlocutors. In all cases, the performance or the oral part of the greetings is accompanied by handshake.

In the data, it was observed that the Eʋedome Ewe speakers (Central Ewe dialect speakers) generally do not perform this long form of greeting. A simplified version is Illustration in 3.

Illustration 3: *The short form of greetings among the Avenɔ Ewe.*

GR: Ŋdi na wò/mi (Good morning to you)
RS: Ŋdi. A*ƒ*ewò me tɔwo? (Good morning. How are your household?)
GR: Wodɔ.
RS: Miefɔ/dɔ nyuiea?
GR: Míedɔ/fɔ

This simplified version is what the Avenɔ Ewe describe as conflict or pretense greeting. It is explained that greeting is a form of exhibiting a healthy and cooperative relationship. It expresses a mutual communal spirit and expectation for all. Failing to greet or respond appropriately to greeting registers something untoward between the interlocutors. This supports what Egblewogbe (1990) posits that refusal to greet and greet properly may be interpreted as denial of social recognition, which may cause offence and possibly lead to more serious consequences. However, an interlocutor who does not want to announce this interpersonal hitch openly just uses the short form of greeting to save their face.

The Ewe data demonstrates that due to education, religious practices and linguistic interdependency, the daytime greetings have been corrupted over the years into a kind of greeting of foreign attribute. This exotic greeting for is Illustrated in 4.

Illustration 4: *Exotic greeting form among the Ewe.*

Time of day	*Greeting*	*Gloss*
Morning	Mɔnii	Good morning
Afternoon	Guɖee	Good day
Evening	Guɖivinii/Guɖimii	Good evening.

These greetings are demonstrations of foreign and cultural forms in one's language. However, for global citizenship and linguistic interdependency, these greeting forms have been recognized in the language and culture of the people. It is due to this both children and adults, educated and non-educated people in the Ewe land also proffer this form of greetings.

Illustration 5 looks at the performance of greetings in Dagbani for the three time zones.

1) *Morning greetings:*
   Asiba (Morning)
   GR: Dasiba (Good morning)
   RS: Naa! (Am fine) (male)
   N naa! (female)
2) *Afternoon greetings:*
   Wuntaŋni: Afternoon
   GR: Antire (Good afternoon)
   RS: Naa! (male)
   N naa! (female)
3) *Evening greetings*
   Zaawuni / Yuŋ: Evening/night
   GR: Aninwula! (Good evening)
   RS: Naa! (male)
   N naa! (female)

As mentioned for the Ewe data, these forms of greetings can be extended. The extension depends on the interlocutors involved and the length of time for which they meet or have at their disposal at the time of meeting. If they are familiar acquaintances and have met for a longer time, the length of the time of the greeting is expected to be longer. In both cultures, unfamiliar acquaintances may exchange a shorter greeting.

Illustration 6 exemplifies the extension of the greeting in Dagbani.

6 a)
GR: Dasiba! (Good morning)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)
6b)
GR: A yiŋ be wula? (How is your home?)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)
6c)
GR: A ba be wula (How is your father?)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)
6d)
GR: Ti daba-ayi? (Our two days?/It's been a while)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

Culturally among the Dagbamba, the time-of-day greetings are basic to any other greetings be it seasonal, occasional, funeral greetings. Apart from the Palace greetings where the time-of-day greetings are not sometimes applicable, they could be used in any of the above types of greetings. These types of greetings are usually proffered to familiar acquaintances or people who have been long seen. It can equally be proffered on unfamiliar acquaintances, that is, if the visitor is not a passing by person. The Dagbani greetings create a distinction between single and group of the people in the greeting event. This form of greeting is exchanged only by peers and or adults to the youth. This group form is demonstrated in Illustration 7:

7a)
GR: Dasib-ya! (Good morning)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)
7b)
GR: Antire-ya! (Good afternoon)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)
7c)
GR: Aninwuli-ya! (Good evening)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

The plural form can only be proffered on subordinates or co-equals where they are familiar acquaintances. It is impolite to proffer such a greeting on higher-ups. Consequently, the work or chore greetings are more proffered at this time of the day than the *antire* which is specifically for the afternoon. This suggests that chore or work greetings supersede the time-of-day greetings in the Dagbon speech act.

B. Referential Greetings

We propose to call such greetings *referential greetings* because they apply appropriately to specific pragmatic referent (event, situation/occurrence) but not referenced onto any time of the day. The greeting is proffered to a person who is currently experiencing, had experienced an event as Illustrated in 8.

8a) Funerary greetings
GR: Miawoe se nya vɔ (You have heard bad news (Accept my condolence))
RS: Miawoe le ame fam (Thanks for commiserating with us)

GR: Miawoe kpee (You have heard bad news (Accept my condolence))
RS: Miawoe le ame fam (Thanks for commiserating with us)

8b) Childbirth greetings
GR: Wòe do le eme (Congratulations)
Rs: Miawoe do gbe ɖa (Your prayers. Thank you)

8c) On a sick bed
GR: Wòele ekpem (You are suffering/Accept my sympathy)
Wòele teʃe ɖeka (You are bed ridden)
RS: Miawoe le gbe dom ɖa (Your prayers. Thank you)

C. Dagbani Referential Greetings

We observe that the interlocutor may start with the time-of-day greetings before extending to the event for which the greeting may be cast. This is necessary because it may depend on the time the visitor enters the premises to greet.

Funeral greeting (fresh)
9a) Greeting before burial:
GR: Ni ti biɛɣuni (day/nighttime but not buried)
"How is/our tomorrow?"
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

European Journal of Language and Culture Studies
www.ej-lang.org

9b)
GR: Ni ti yuŋ (night/late day time but not yet buried)
"How is our/ the night?"
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

These greetings are always cast when the corps is still not buried. This is immediately the death occurs; that is the type of greetings offered.

These are cast with the time of the day as an opener.

10a) Childbirth greetings
GR: Dasiba (Good morning)
RES: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

10b)
GR: Ni ti zuɣu suŋ! (Good luck/happy birth)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

Birth related greetings are only associated with adults. Children do not share this kind of greeting either with adults or colleagues. Children only greet the time of the day greetings. If a youth greets the occasional greetings on such occasions, such a child/youth would only be blemished as too known and disrespectful.

11a) In a sick bed
GR: Dasiba (Good morning)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

11b)
GR: Ni ti zuɣu suŋ! (Good luck/speedy recovery)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

11c)
GR: Dasiba (Good morning)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

11d)
GR: A ningbuna be wula (How is your body?)
RS: Naa! (male)
N naa! (female)

11e)
GR: A gbihiya (You slept well?)
RS: iin (yes /fine)

Similarly, as stated in birth related greetings, either death or sick related greetings are only associated with adults. Children do not share this kind of greeting either with adults or colleagues. If a youth greets the occasional greetings on such occasions, such a child/youth would only be blemished as too known and disrespectful.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The paper explored the time-of-day greetings among the people of Dagbon in Northen and Xavi in Volta, Ghana respectively. The data generated and the analysis conclude that the Dagbamba have time of day greetings that is similar to that of the Ewe. From the glossing, it is observed that the time of the day greetings is similar to English time of day greeting, suggesting the universality of greetings. The findings suggest

that greetings among the Ewe and Dagbamba have functional and structural features. Some of the functional features include politeness strategies, observing norms of politeness, face saving, demonstration of linguistic competency and the acts of respect for age and social status greetings. It is also realized that greetings are commands and question forms that demand obvious reply either in a varied form or specific form depending on its formality.

Structurally, it further reveals that some of the greetings are in single word phrases while others are in multiple word phrases. The structure varies from one greeting type to another. Each of the greetings can be opened with the time-of-day greetings then followed with further inquiries. The greeting is usually a single sentence followed with inquiries and supplications. In the context of the two cultures, free expression of greeting sets as an opener into a relationship and a means to resolve trivial or difficult issues that have long existed. Apart from the time-of-day greetings, referential greetings exist and are very relevant to events and occurrences and do not refer to any time. It is established that while the Dagbamba referential greetings sometimes require the time-of-day greetings as an opener, the Eve type do not require such. It is also observed that referential greetings among the Ewe does not respect the act of household inquiry.

VI. Recommendations

Following the findings and conclusions, we recommend a conscious effort by teachers of the Ghanaian Languages in the various Senior High Schools to consider teaching greetings rigorously in their lessons. A purposeful teaching of greetings in the early grade classrooms as part of the oral language development would encourage young learners to acquire this traditional value and sustain it. We would wish to recommend that adults should desist from directly translating the foreign language greetings to our local greetings or using the colloquial form of the foreign greetings to the local greeting forms.

Conflict of Interest

There has not been any known form of conflict of interest regarding the process of this study or in the process of submission to its authors.

References

Abdulai, S. A. and Ibrahim, J. G. M. (2014). Convergence and divergence strategies in greetings and leave-taking: a view from the Dagbon kingdom in Ghana. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6(4), 224–225.

Adukpo, J., Wumbei, C.K. & Kumi, E. (2019). Greetings or information exchange in Ewe community. *Journal of African Studies and Ethnographic Research*, 1(1), 20–35.

Agyekum, K. (2008). *The pragmatic of Akan greetings: Discourse Studies*, 10(4), 493–516.

Agyekum, K. (2010). The Sociolinguistics of thanking in Akan. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 19(2), 77–97.

Akindele, D. F. (2007). Lumela/Lumela: A socio-pragmatic analysis of Sesotho greetings. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 16(1), 1–17.

Akindele, D. F. (1990). A sociolinguistic analysis of Yoruba greetings. *Journal of African languages and Cultures*, 3(1), 98–113.

Ameka, F. K. and Osam, E. K. (eds 2002). *New directions in Ghanaian Linguistics.* Accra: Black Mask Ltd.

Ameka, F. K. (2010). *Access rituals in West African Communities: An Ethnopragmatic perspective.*

Ameka, F. K. (1991). *Ewe: Its grammatical constructions and illocutionary devices*. [Unpublished Australian National University PhD thesis].

Brown, P.& Levinsan S.C. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. (1980). How and why women are more polite. In McConnell-Ginet, S., R. Borker and N. Furman (eds.) *Women and language in literature and society* (pp. 111-136). New York: Praeger.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In Rechards, J.C. and R. W. Schmidt (eds) *Languages and communication* (pp. 2-27). New York: Longman.

Chenilo, N. L. (2012). A socio-morphological analysis of Koring verbal greetings. *An International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 1 (3), 104–115.

Coulmas, F. (Ed.) (1981). *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech*. The Hague: mouton Publishers.

Coupland, J. Coupland, N. and Robison, J. D. (1992) How are you? Negotiating phatic communion. *Language and society*, 21, 207–230.

Duranti, A. (1992). Language and bodies in social space: Samoan ceremonial greetings. *American Ethnologist*, New Series, 94(3), 657–691.

Duranti, A. (1997). Universal and culture specific properties of greetings. *Journal of Linguistics Anthropology*, 7(1), 63–67. American Anthropological Association.

Dzameshie, A. K., 2002. The Forms, Functions and social value of greetings among the Ewe. In Ameka F. K and Osam, E.K. (eds) *New Directions in Ghanaian Linguistics*. Accra: Black Mask.

Dzameshie, Alex K, (1993). The use of politeness strategies as solidarity and deference moves in Christian sermonic discourse. *The SECOL Review*, 17, 113–126.

Dzameshie, A. K. (1995). Social motivations for politeness behavior in Christian sermonic discourse. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 37(2), 192–215.

Dzameshie, A. K. (1992). *Motivation for the use of politeness strategies in Christian sermonic discourse*. [Unpublished: University of South Carolina PhD. Dissertation].

Egblewogbe, E. Y. (1990). The social and psychological aspect of greetings among the Ewe of West Africa. *Research review NS*, 6(2), 8–18.

Emery, P.G. (2000). Greeting, congratulating and commiserating in Omani Arabic Language. *Culture and curriculum*, 13(2), 196–217.
Firth, J. R. (1972). Verbal and bodily rituals of greetings and parting. In: la Fontaine, J. S. (ed). *The interpretation of ritual* (pp.1-38). London: Tavistock.
Geertz, C. (1972). Linguistic Etiquette. In: J.A. Fishman, ed. *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton. Harvey.
Goody, E. (1972). Greetings, begging and the presentation of respect. In La Fontaine, J.S. (ed.) *Interpretation of ritual* (pp. 39-72). London: Tavistock.
Guffman, E. (1967). *Interactional Ritual*: Essays on face behavior. Double day.
Hymes, D. (1962). *The ethnography of speaking.* In *Anthropology and human behavior*. (pp. 15-54). Anthropological society of Washington.
Hymes, D. (1968). The Ethnography of speaking. In Fishman, J.A (ed.) *Reading in the sociology of language* (pp. 99-138). The Hague: Mouton.
Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J.Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 35-71). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Ibrahim, A.G.Y., Grimshaw, A.D. and Bird, C.S. (1976). Greetings in the desert. *American ethnologist*, 3, 797–824.
Laver, J. (1981). Linguistic routines and politeness in greeting and parting. In: F. Coulmas, (ed.) *Conversational routines.* The Hague: Mouton.
Lim, T. (1988) *A new model of politeness in discourse.* [A paper presented at the speech communication]. Association convention in New Orleans (November) MS.
Malinowski, B. (1972) Phatic communion. In Laver, J. and S. Hutcheson (eds.) *Communication in face-to-face interaction* (pp146-152). Harmonds-worth: Penguin.
Mohammed, H. J. (2010). *Address terms in Dagbani: A Sociolinguistic study.* Winneba: Mphil Thesis, Department of applied Linguistics.
Naden, T. (1980) "How to greet in Bisa". *Journal of pragmatics*, 4, 137–145.
Nantogmah A. S. (2010). Signaling politeness, power, and solidarity through terms of address in Dagbanli. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 19(4), 274–292.
Salifu, A. (2000). Speaking with the chief: ethnography of royal discourse in Dagbon. [Accra: MA Dissertation]. University of Ghana.
Salifu, A. (2011). *Politics and ethnicity: political anthroponymy in northern Ghana*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sekyi-Baidoo, Y. & Koranteng, L.A. (2008). English general greetings in the Ghanaian sociolinguistic context. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture, LSC ISSUE*, 26, 113–125.
Warren-Rothlin, A. (2007). Politeness strategies in biblical Hebrew and west African languages, *Journal of Translation*, 3(1), 55.
Yahya-Othman, S. (1995). Aren't you going to greet me? Impoliteness in Swahili greetings. *Text*, 15(2), 209–227.